# A member of the Sansom Institute

# iCAHE Guideline Clearinghouse

# **iCAHE Checklist Score Sheet**

## **Guideline:**

Specific guidelines for the treatment of diabetic foot infections (2011)

### **Guideline Producer:**

International Working Group on the Diabetic Foot (IWGDF)

### Link:

http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/dmrr.2251/abstract

Score: 4/14

These 'guidelines' were published as a supplement in the Diabetes/Metabolism Research and Reviews journal (Diabetes Metab Res Rev 2012; 28(Suppl 1): 234–235). The published article reads more like a position statement and only presents recommendations. The link to underlying evidence, dates, and references are lacking. However the authors state 'These guidelines are based upon two companion International Working Group on the Diabetic Foot papers: 'A Systematic Review of the Effectiveness of Interventions in the Management of Infection in the Diabetic Foot' and 'Expert Opinion on the Management of Infections in the Diabetic Foot', which may explain in some part its brief nature. It may be better viewed as a summary of the two stated documents rather than a guideline which is reflected in the low iCAHE checklist score.

as a sammary of the two stated documents rather than a galacine which is reflected in the low to an	E effectinge score:
1. Availability	
Is the guideline readily available in full text?	Yes
Does the guideline provide a complete reference list?	No
Does the guideline provide a summary of its recommendations?	Yes
2. Dates	
Is there a date of completion available?	No
Does the guideline provide an anticipated review date?	No
Does the guideline provide dates for when literature was included?	No
3. Underlying evidence	
Does the guideline provide an outline of the strategy they used to find underlying evidence?	No
Does the guideline use a hierarchy to rank the quality of the underlying evidence?	No
Does the guideline appraise the quality of the evidence which underpins its recommendations?	No
Does the guideline link the hierarchy and quality of underlying evidence to each recommendation?	No
4. Guideline developers	
Are the developers of the guideline clearly stated?	Yes
Does the qualifications and expertise of the guideline developer(s) link with the purpose of the guideline and its end users?	No (unclear)
5. Guideline purpose and users	
Are the purpose and target users of the guideline stated?	No
6. Ease of use	
Is the guideline readable and easy to navigate?	Yes