Reviewer's report

Title: Systematic Review of the Quality of Osteoporosis Guidelines

Authors:

Ann Cranney (cranneya@kgh.kari.net)
Lisa Waldegger (Lisa.Waldegger@hc-sc.gc.ca)
Ian D Graham (igraham@ohri.ca)
Malcolm ManSon Hing (mhing@ohri.ca)
Anna Byszewski (abyszewski@ottawahospital.on.ca)
Daylily S Ooi (dsooi@ottawahospital.on.ca)

Version: 2 Date: 13 Jun 2002

Reviewer: George Ioannidis

Level of interest: A paper whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Advice on publication: Accept after discretionary revisions

The authors conducted a systematic review of the quality of osteoporosis guidelines that have been produced since 1998. The methodology was well explained and the conclusions of the article are supported by the evidence that was reported. The manuscript is well written.

Discretionary revisions:

It is not explicitly stated in the manuscript why the 1998 cut-off value was chosen for guideline selection.

There seem to be some disagreement between the appraisers for dimension 2, which focused on the context and content of the guidelines, as evident by lower intraclass correlation coefficient (D1=.87, D2=0.63, D3= 0.81) and the appraisers scores that were within 20 percentage points for D2 (D1=95% D2=67% D3=100%). How would the authors explain this apparent lack of agreement?

As pointed out in the discussion a potential limitation of the guideline process is that very few guidelines encourage patient input (and family physician input). I believe that the benefits of including these groups should be highlighted in the discussion.

In the opinion of the authors why do guideline developers neglect the application of guideline development (dimension 3). Is it because they are not familiar with the process or deem the process to difficult to implement?
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