

Users' Experiences With an Interactive Evidence to Decision (iEtD) Framework: A Qualitative Analysis

Jose Meneses-Echavez (✉ jose.meneses@fhi.no)

Norwegian Institute of Public Health

Sarah Rosenbaum

Norwegian Institute of Public Health

Gabriel Rada

Epistemonikos Foundation

Signe Flottorp

Norwegian Institute of Public Health

Jenny Moberg

Norwegian Institute of Public Health

Pablo Alonso-Coello

Cochrane Centre, Biomedical Research Institute (IIB Sant Pau-CIBERESP)

Research Article

Keywords: decision-making, clinical decision support, evidence-based health care, GRADE approach.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-151040/v1>

License:  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Background

Evidence to Decision (EtD) frameworks bring clarity, structure and transparency to health care decision making. The interactive Evidence to Decision (iEtD) tool, developed in the context of the DECIDE project and published by Epistemonikos, is a stand-alone online solution for producing and using EtD frameworks. Since its development, little is known about how organizations have been using the iEtD tool and what characterizes users' experiences with it.

Methods

This study aimed to describe users' experiences with the iEtD and identify main barriers and facilitators related to use. We contacted all users registered in the iEtD via email and invited people who identified themselves as having used the solution to a semi-structured interview. Audio recordings were transcribed, and one researcher conducted a content analysis of the interviews guided by a user experience framework. Two researchers checked the content independently for accuracy.

Results

Out of 860 people contacted, 81 people replied to our introductory email (response rate 9.4%). Twenty of these had used the tool in a real scenario and were invited to an interview. We interviewed all eight users that accepted this invitation (from six countries, four continents). 'Guideline development' was the iEtD use scenario they most commonly identified. Most participants reported an overall positive experience, without major difficulties navigating or using the different sections. They reported having used most of the EtD framework criteria. Participants reported tailoring their frameworks, for instance by adding or deleting criteria, translating to another language, or rewording headings. Several people preferred to produce a Word version rather than working online, due to the burden of completing the framework, or lack of experience with the tool. Some reported difficulties working with the exportable formats, as they needed considerable editing.

Conclusion

A very limited number of guideline developers have used the iEtD tool published by Epistemonikos since its development. Although users' general experiences are positive, our work has identified some aspects of the tool that need improvement. Our findings could be also applied to development or improvement of other solutions for producing or using EtD frameworks.

Background

Decision-making in healthcare can be very complex, involving interactions between numerous actors and different kinds of information, including evidence from research (1;2). Although decisions about treatments, diagnostic tests, coverage, health system or public health interventions involve different types of people and different sets of information, they share a common set of factors that needs to be taken into account by groups making those decisions: the desirable and undesirable effects, values and preferences, acceptability, feasibility, and costs (3;4) and the certainty of the available evidence. If the decision-making process is not well structured, decision makers may neglect some of these factors or give some of them too much emphasis, resulting in unbalanced judgments.

Decision making also needs to be transparent. If decisions are going to be useful, they must be communicated to target audiences (e.g., health care professionals, policy makers or patients) in an easily understandable way (5;6). But people may need to know more than just key messages; in order to understand the relevance of a decision for themselves or their context, they may need to know what considerations and evidence underlie a decision. A systematic approach that helps decision making groups consider all the relevant factors can facilitate a more structured and explicit process (3); a framework documenting this process can render the decisions and underlying considerations more transparent and useful for their target audiences.

The Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) Working Group started, in 2000, work towards the development of a systematic and transparent approach to grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations in healthcare (7). As part of the GRADE Working Group's efforts, the DECIDE project – a 5-year European Union funded project aiming to improve the dissemination of evidence-based recommendations – facilitated the development of different presentations of research evidence for use in decision making, including the GRADE Evidence to Decision (EtD) frameworks (3;4).

The GRADE-EtD frameworks help to ensure the important factors that determine a decision (the criteria) are considered and add structure to discussions. They can be used to identify reasons for disagreements in a decision-making group. Their structure can help render decisions transparent to those affected (3;4;7). The frameworks include: a) criteria, b) judgements that must be made in relation to each criterion, c) evidence to inform each judgement and d) conclusions based on an overall judgement across all of the criteria (3;4;7). In tackling decision making-related complexity, tailorable GRADE-EtD framework templates have been prepared for clinical practice guidelines (3), diagnostics (4), health system and public health decisions (8), and coverage decisions (9).

The iEtD is a stand-alone interactive solution for preparing and facilitating use of GRADE-EtD frameworks by decision-making groups (e.g., guidelines technical teams, panels, clinicians, and researchers). It was developed on a technical platform provided by Epistemonikos during the DECIDE project, with the aim of making it intuitive to use for people without much previous experience using the technical platform (4;7;10).

The iEtD provides functionality for the needs of three main groups: people preparing evidence summaries for use by decision making panels, people making decisions/recommendations, and target audiences for the decision or recommendation output. This includes functionality for creating, tailoring and editing frameworks, for individual or group voting, for documenting draft or final judgments, for exporting interim and final reports, or for reconsidering evidence, judgments and final recommendations in other settings. A central design feature is the structure, which enables placement of concise key messages from summarised evidence in close proximity to each decision criterion, making it easier for people with different levels of background knowledge to access and interpret the evidence while considering that criterion. The clear separation of criteria, evidence and judgments facilitates structured, balanced panel discussions and enhances the transparency of the final decision/recommendation. By laying the ground for a complete summary of the best available evidence to inform judgements, iEtD can facilitate both dissemination and adoption of recommendations (3;7;11).

Despite widespread use (4;8;12), little is known about current utilisation and the user experience of the GRADE-EtD frameworks, nor about the experiences of users of the online tools that include them. An evaluation of the GRADE-EtD frameworks in real guideline panels conducted by members of the GRADE group (using early paper prototypes of the frameworks) showed that methodologists and panel members perceived the frameworks as positive and useful tools that simplified the process of moving from evidence to decisions. However, participants identified some sections of the frameworks that needed improvements (13). Panel chairs have also valued the frameworks as a useful tool for managing discussions and reaching conclusions; keeping guideline panels on track, and dealing with disagreements (7). Since the development of the iEtD online tool for preparing and using frameworks was completed, no published studies exploring users' experiences have been carried out. Our study was conducted to assess users' experiences with the iEtD tool, and to identify potential tool related barriers, and factors for improvement.

Methods

Qualitative study. We followed the standards for reporting qualitative research (14) (Additional file 1).

Recruitment

We sent an introductory email to people registered in the iEtD platform, asking if they had used the tool and in what kind of context (e.g. workshop or guideline). We sent two reminders two weeks after the introductory email. We included people who were registered as users in the iEtD platform and who confirmed that they had actually used the tool, as opposed to just explored it. Once eligible participants were identified, they received an email with a brief description of the study's aim and their potential involvement. All methods were carried out in accordance with relevant guidelines and regulations. Before the interviews, we informed the participants about the voluntary basis of their enrolment, which implied that they were allowed to withdraw at any time without giving a reason, and that all information collected would be used only for research purposes and treated anonymously. Therefore, ethical approval was not

needed for this study, as recommended by the Norwegian Committees for Medical and Health Research Ethics (15). Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in this study.

Data collection

We organized the interviews by inviting participants to log into the iEtD and open an EtD framework, either an actual framework (e.g. from a guideline the participant was involved in) or one used for training purposes that the participant was familiar with. Then, using a semi-structured interview guide, we encouraged the participant to engage in ‘think aloud’ while exploring the tool. This is a method where a participant verbalizes their thoughts and impressions while exploring a product (16;17). We encouraged participants to be honest about their reactions, looked and listened for signs that they were experiencing barriers or difficulties, and posed questions when they became silent (e.g., *how was your experience with formulating the question? did you find any trouble in doing so?*). Further details are described in the interview guide (Additional file 2).

Interview guide

We adapted an interview guide used by the DECIDE project (18;19) that included:

1. Background questions (education, current work, previous knowledge of systematic reviews/summary of findings/GRADE)
2. Free exploration (unguided) of iEtD based on scenario text
3. iEtD walk through, one section at a time with special attention to some specific pre-determined sections that we suspected were problematic (e.g., export formats)
4. General impressions
5. Improvement suggestions

The interview guide (Additional file 2) was based on Rosenbaum’s adaptation of Morville’s “honeycomb” framework of user experience (2). We covered seven of the eight facets in this framework (see figure 1). Accessibility was not evaluated in this study, as it involves checking the application against a set of technical requirements (2).

We probed for more in-depth explanation of places where participants had problems, frustrations or were confused. Follow-up questions covered overall impressions and suggestions for improvement. Additionally, we followed a checklist to ask questions about specific pre-determined parts of the iEtD, such as export formats.

Exploring users’ experiences

Our main interest was to understand user’s experiences of the iEtD. Data collection involved documenting the user’s interaction with the iEtD and his/her experiences/reactions to it. With participants’ permission, we collected data in two ways:

- Audio recording (recording what the participant said while navigating through the iEtD)
- Observational notes (recording participants' behaviour and actions, in context with what they said, and describing problems we observed). We used remote meeting software GoToMeeting (<https://www.gotomeeting.com>) to conduct and record the interviews.

We obtained transcripts of all interviews, and one researcher (JM) checked the accuracy and completeness of the transcripts compared to the original recordings. We based our data analysis on the interview transcriptions, informed by our observational notes.

Data analysis

The interview guide and the facets of the user experience from the honeycomb framework (2) were used as the coding framework to guide the data analysis. One researcher (JM) entered the data from the transcripts and observation notes in an Excel spread sheet and coded first according to the main areas of the iEtD that were included in the interview guide. A second researcher (PAC) checked this data for completeness and accuracy. We then identified and rated findings according to the severity of the problem as expressed by the participant or observed by the researchers:

- High (show-stopper, causes incorrect interpretation, critical errors or high degree of uncertainty or dissatisfaction)
- Medium (causes much frustration or unnecessarily slow use)
- Low (minor or cosmetic problems)

We also registered features that participants explicitly liked, participants' suggestions for improvement and nice-to-haves. Finally, we sorted findings according to their severity ratings and the related section of the iEtD. JM conducted the data analysis, SR and PAC checked the findings for accuracy and completeness. All the researchers prepared a draft-compiled list of problems users demonstrated or expressed explicitly, as well as participant suggestions for improvements. Any disagreements or discrepancies were resolved by discussion. In order to provide a more useful perspective for future users, findings from the interviews are presented according to the main set of tasks users completed when using the iEtD. We made this decision after internal dialogue among project team members.

Results

Participants

We contacted 860 people registered in the iEtD database. The project team sent introductory emails and two reminders in the summer of 2017. Eighty-one registrants responded to these emails (9.5% response rate), and 61 (7%) were excluded as they did not complete an entire framework for a real group decision context or for educational purposes. Twenty participants were considered iEtD users and were invited to the interviews. Eight participants agreed to be interviewed.

Participants worked in international or national organizations that developed guidelines (e.g. World Health Organization, Australian Health and Medical Research Council). Participants used the iEtD mostly for guideline development, but also for educational purposes (i.e., training workshops of panels). Two participants reported expertise in both the GRADE approach and the iEtD; two attended workshops before starting to use the iEtD, and four did not receive any training. All participants were methodologists who were members of guidelines' technical teams, not decision-makers or panelists. Most participants had sole responsibility within their teams for completing GRADE-EtD frameworks using the iEtD solution.

Main findings

We organized findings according to users' general impressions of the iEtD and the tool-specific tasks users carry out using iEtD.

Participants' general impressions

Overall, participants had positive experiences working with the iEtD. They gave several reasons for this, such as the simplicity of the tool, that it was easy to work with, and that it was free. Users liked the way the iEtD is organized, felt that the tool was designed for someone like them, and that it was a useful tool for their organization(s). Regarding the interaction with panelists and other members of the guideline development group, they perceived the iEtD as logical and easy to follow tool during meetings:

"Yes. It was really helpful both for the people compiling the evidence-to-decision framework, but also as a way [for us] to share it with the people making the decisions. So...we shared them with the guideline groups, and they used the decision-making frameworks as they were presented in this format".

Nevertheless, some drawbacks emerged from the interviews. Some participants said that due to the amount of information and type of evidence available they had to conduct additional work to synthesize and present research evidence (e.g. prepare new tables). Participants working in large groups expressed that it was difficult to coordinate framework completion work across the group.

"I think the difficulty is using it in a group situation. I think you have to have a very motivated team who have all been trained in using the online version to be able to really use it well. So I think the challenge for us is that we had a big group with quite a number of different people, often from different departments, all developing their evidence profiles. So, lots of different people putting the evidence in. So, if it's a very small team I can see that it's much easier to use the online version compared to a larger team of people who may not be able to use it".

Getting help to use the tool

Two of the participants expressed they would have liked access to online help or support; however, this did not stop them when using the iEtD. Despite being one of the least commonly used sections of the iEtD as reported by participants, some considered the *help files* as useful.

“Well, first of all the little drop pin boxes that give you instructions are very helpful. So we kept referring back to those”.

Creating GRADE-EtD frameworks

Formulating the question and background

Participants did not report any difficulties with the PICO question section and expressed that the structure of this section was clear.

Assessment

This section, which includes all the different criteria to be considered by a panel, was the most used section of the iEtD. However, not all teams used all of the criteria, for example when conducting rapid health technology assessments that had no formal health economic analysis. Participants' general impressions about this section and its structure were positive. Moreover, they appreciated being able to distinguish between research evidence and additional considerations by placing them in separate cells.

Some participants criticized aspects of this section, although we observed that this was often coupled with basic misunderstandings. For instance, some participants demonstrated a poor understanding of some of the criteria (described below), the purpose of some of the features (e.g. the rationale behind Additional Considerations cells), and more fundamentally, the GRADE approach for formulating recommendations that underlies iEtD structure and functionality.

For six criteria in the assessment section (*Problem, Certainty of the evidence, Balance of effects, Resources required, Cost-effectiveness, Acceptability and Feasibility*), participants reported having only positive experiences. For three criteria (*Values, Desirable and undesirable effects and Equity*), participants had mixed experiences that we describe below.

Values: Some participants found confusing the term “Values” (how people value outcomes) in the Assessment section menu, and others found confusing the signaling question (*Is there important uncertainty about or variability in how much people value the main outcomes?*). However, this difficulty did not stop them using the tool and no other major problems were identified.

“On the ‘values’, the options are, “important”, “uncertainty” or “variability”; “possibly important”, “uncertainty or variability”; “probably not important or no important”. But the question was: “Is there important uncertainty about, or variability in how much people value the main outcome? That is a hard question, and everyone had trouble with reading it.”

“The way the question is phrased is the variability and how much people value it; nearly everybody had problems understanding what that means.”

Desirable and undesirable effects: Despite the overall feedback being positive, participants consistently expressed their wish to have both desirable and undesirable effects in only one section rather than in two

separate sections.

Equity: Most participants expressed favorable experiences with the use of this criterion. However, some participants referred no clear understanding of its definition:

"Ah, I think we had trouble with the definition around "equity". The way that is written and defined... and how you define is... it wasn't nicely articulated so people had often difficulties with it. Otherwise, most things were reasonable. "

They pointed out that there is no information about whether it refers to the intervention or the comparison, and at the time of this judgment, the panel does not know about the direction or strength of the recommendation. To solve this conundrum, two participants suggested moving recommendations right before these three criteria. Some of the comments from some of the participants reflected suboptimal understanding of the GRADE approach.

"I would definitely put "recommendation" under the "desirable" and "undesirable effects". In fact, if it were up to me, I would do desirable effects, undesirable effects, and after that I would put the draft recommendation. And then I worked through values"

Conclusions section

Overall experiences with the *Conclusions* section were positive.

Embedding tabulated summaries

Some participants found difficult to insert tables (e.g. Summary of Findings tables) to present the research evidence within the different criteria. This led them to stop using the iEtD and moved to Excel.

"So it was an easy way for me to use the tool for tables, to do my own tables. And it was too much work and it was not fitting because we couldn't really... I'm trying to remember exactly what the issue was but I think the problem is that any study... So I decided to frame the table, the evidence-to-summary table as GRADE does, so starting from the outcomes. But then for the same kind of outcome we did too many different studies recording the outcomes in different ways. So even for the same kind of outcome I couldn't put anything. So eventually I decided to use the Excel."

Use of the Export-to-Word function

The iEtD was designed to facilitate users to complete GRADE-EtD frameworks in a both online and interactive way. The tool was intended to allow people to create tailored templates for making decisions or recommendations as well as interactive end user summaries. However, such online use was not common among participants we interviewed. Many participants referred completing their work with the GRADE-EtD frameworks in a Word format rather than online. They logged on to the tool, created a framework and exported it as Word document. Overall, participants reported that other members of the

guideline development group were satisfied with using the iEtD just as a guide to structure the work that then continued in Word.

"So for both of those guidelines we downloaded the sheets and used them in Word format. So we used the tool as a template and that's what we used for both guideline meetings, to fill-in for quite a number of different PICO's".

"But there are always people that are not confident with online tools. So I asked them, please use the Word file if you want to send me comments"

The main reasons why participants preferred to work with a Word format were lack of confidence in using a new tool among members of the guideline development group, and their familiarity and perceived ease of use of Word.

"It was easier to get everyone else in the team to use Word than to use it online".

"People tended to find very difficult to...they were all experts in the field but they are not necessarily familiar with that sort of platform"

"Honestly there were also technical issues that I had to face. Not everyone is so comfortable working on these things"

The non-online use of the iEtD implied extra work for the person in charge of completing the frameworks. One participant said: *"I sent them, together with an instruction document explaining how to use the iEtD. Explaining what I did, what we did, and the way they would have to interpret what I did".*

Exporting frameworks

We asked participants about their experience with the (vertical) Word document format that is generated when exporting a framework in iEtD. We also showed them another format from the GRADEpro system, which was horizontal. Participants were also asked to share their experiences with their own formats, which they had produced and tailored. Most of the participants perceived the horizontal format as clearer and more logical; they deemed the vertical format exported from the iEtD as harder to read. Moreover, participants expressed that the vertical format demanded a lot of further formatting once it was in Word:

"It is repetitive; you see the same tables several times...messy"

"It is not friendly,...., and requires too much editing to be able to generate a document that is easily usable and readable by decision makers"

"I think, while the information is the same it doesn't feel like I can see things so well but I think is just because it's all... it's feels like it's more text, which is rare because it's the same text, but it's not as appealing to me."

Tailoring frameworks

Some participants tailored the frameworks. It was common for people to translate and modify the wording, particularly of the judgment options.

"I think it was felt that it was too... introduced too much uncertainty, to have the options as they are... some of them we took out the "various" option, so that we just had, "don't know", "no", "probably no", "probably yes", "yes"."

Participants viewed tailoring as a valuable functionality. It gave them the possibility to modify the frameworks to their specific needs, such as limiting the number of criteria for rapid health technology assessments or modifying the order of the criteria to improve understanding.

Motivations to use the iEtD

Despite some difficulties, participants still expressed motivation to use the iEtD. Some chose it because it is part of the GRADE approach, and they were familiar with it. The attendance to iEtD workshops was also highlighted as a facilitator. Participants said that the systematic and comprehensive structure of the iEtD was a crucial aspect for deciding to use it. They considered it a suitable tool for producing systematic and transparent guidelines, as it provided a comprehensive overview of the different factors involved. Most of the participants expressed that they would like to receive further training on the tool.

"We decided to take the iEtD because we it was a good match between the dimensions considered in framework, to assess the effectiveness and feasibility"

"I went through the criteria for the evidence-to-decision framework and I found that it fit quite well with what I was looking for, a kind of framework or methodological system that could allow me to include everything. So criteria-like values, equity, feasibility, acceptability, were all criteria that we were considering in our guidelines. So that was eventually the reason...."

In addition, participants expressed they chose the iEtD partly due to the online voting function that could be used during meetings.

"Well, we wanted to do real time voting with in the panel meeting and so because that feature was available, and because it was easy to migrate from MAGIC into this, we decided to go with it"

Using iEtD in guideline meetings

In the context of guideline meetings, voting was one of the features most valued by participants and received positive feedback from most. However, the ways that groups used the voting function varied. For instance, some collected votes manually outside the iEtD, then compiled results and entered them into the system.

"We did the voting two ways. We started by asking each panel member to go in and register their vote and comment, and that provided a baseline. We extracted all that information and circulated it to the whole group. Then, we met and put the information up on the screen –and did it live–and we read through and amended it, and then we all voted".

"...only one person in the room had the iEtD framework opened, projected on the screen, and counted out the votes and recorded them in the iEtD".

A few participants expressed connectivity issues when working online.

"The system could not take all ten of us working on the same iEtD, at the same time voting in the same way, so we stopped doing that"

"When we used it live, when everyone was online at the same time and they were all voting together it kept crashing, so what we actually moved into was... we printed the relevant document note, extracted the relevant document, and tables and headings, and send them to people on an email, and they completed the framework. They send it back to us"

Participants' suggestions

Two main suggestions for improvement emerged from the interviews: 1) need to provide more guidance, including examples, about what type of information should be include in each of the criteria; 2) need to improve the wording of some domain headings, signaling questions as well as more detailed definitions. We compiled a list of problems and potential suggestions for further improvement of the iEtD tool (Table 1).

Table 1
Participants' suggestions and potential solutions

Suggestions	Potential solutions
Preference for different order and number of sections and criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making explicit the already available possibility of collapsing several criteria. • Make possible to change the order of sections and criteria (e.g., the recommendation stands at the top rather than at the bottom).
Large amount of work and time invested when completing frameworks in the iEtD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raise awareness regarding the iEtD's flexibility (e.g., that it is not mandatory to include all criteria or to prepare systematic reviews for each criterion). The amount of work needs to be tailored to the resources of each organization.
Difficulties when working with large groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small technical teams might be optimal size; explore what kind of extra guidance might be needed for larger technical teams. • Make sure good Internet connectivity is available for the work with large groups. • Rigorous technical testing needed, simulating use by large panels to resolve stability issues.
Unclear wording of terminology and of the signaling questions in the Assessment section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve guidance, both general and contextual • Improve wording of the criteria. For example, specify for equity whether it refers to the intervention or the comparison • Increase training possibilities. For example, providing tutorials or related resources
Difficulties when inserting Summary of Findings (SoF) tables.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible integration with GRADE-Pro or to facilitate a more flexible way of including tables in the iEtD. • Further training on how to use the iEtD and other resources, such as Interactive Summary of Findings (iSoF) tables.
Preference of some users for the horizontal presentation format (rather than vertical) of the cells for each criterion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include an additional horizontal presentation format, both for visualization and for its exportation.

Discussion

Main findings

Our study explored users' experiences with the iEtD tool in real scenarios. The majority of participants reported an overall positive experience, without major difficulties navigating or using the different sections. They also reported having used most of the framework criteria satisfactorily. Participants reported tailoring the frameworks, for instance by adding or deleting criteria, translating to another language, or by rewording headings. Some participants reported concerns with the having to edit the exportable formats.

We also uncovered some difficulties people experienced using the iEtD. The tool did not work well in large panels, probably due to the panelists' lack of familiarity with the tool as well as some technical instability. A more structured process and group dynamics could facilitate a more favorable experience. A non-online use of the iEtD was also common in this study, as participants preferred to export frameworks to a Word format and then work with them on paper. This demonstrates that the iEtD is flexible and can accommodate the needs of teams with different kinds of workflows, technical environments and degrees of familiarity with the tool. But it also underscores that many technical teams prefer to complete their work in a more standard format. Improving export formats would help those users who prefer to work in Word.

Our results in the context of previous research

Consistent with the findings of the development process of the iEtD (7), participants in our study found the iEtD intuitive and easy to work with. Our participants also highlighted the framework structure as a positive factor for facilitating structured discussions among panelists. Li and colleagues, recently reported similar experiences with the use of the GRADE-EtD frameworks in face-to-face panel meeting discussions for guidelines for the management of venous thromboembolism (12). In their study, authors found that the frameworks not only provided structure but also ensured that the panelists considered all relevant criteria for making decisions. Guideline panelists also experienced the use of the GRADE-EtD frameworks as to be more straightforward when the evidence available was sufficient and clear (12). In a study about the development of WHO guidelines for task shifting, authors describe valuing use of EtD frameworks to structure discussions about a large and complex body of evidence, including qualitative evidence. However, although they valued expanding the evidence base for decision making, they found that summarizing evidence for multiple criteria was very resource demanding (20). Likewise, we observed that some users complained about the magnitude of the work involved completing the framework, given the number of criteria included, the implied expectation that they needed to provide evidence for all criteria, and the difficulty of creating succinct evidence summaries.

Limitations and strengths

We carried out in-depth interviews with eight people, providing us with rich data about their experiences with iEtD that helped us identify several significant problems they had. However, during the interviews, we discovered that the participants varied much more regarding familiarity with the tool and the GRADE approach than we anticipated. Earlier research gives us reason to believe that degree of familiarity with the GRADE approach will impact people's experience of the EtD frameworks (7). Therefore, we can't be confident that we have uncovered all the main problems, either for people who are familiar with GRADE, or likewise, for people who are less familiar with GRADE. Our study would likely have been strengthened by focusing on a more homogenous group of participants.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study addressing the technical teams' user experiences with the use of electronic EtD frameworks. Our findings are applicable for both methodologists and technical team members of guideline development groups who have experience in completing GRADE-EtD

frameworks in real scenarios. We followed research rigorous methods that have been used in previous studies in the field of evidence-informed decision-making (7;13;18;19). The interview guide helped us ensure a comprehensive exploration of the iEtD and facilitated appropriate recall by participants. Nevertheless, we do not discard the likelihood of recall bias.

Implications for practice and research

Guideline developers may use our findings to improve their experiences with the iEtD, for instance by using a trained technical team, helping them develop skills to create succinct evidence summaries, and providing training for panels, both in the GRADE approach and the GRADE-EtD frameworks. Panels using the iEtD and EtD frameworks in general will benefit from the use of a highly structured process and optimal group dynamics. Developers of online tools that include the GRADE-EtD frameworks may also find our results and suggestions for improvement valuable.

In this study, we identified important facilitators of a positive user experience. Further research will help a better understanding in the use of online tools for evidence-informed decision-making processes. Findings from our study might serve as a starting point to explore the extent to which guideline development groups and panelists discuss and use multi-criteria frameworks for decision-making processes. Further research is also needed on which are the factors that influence the use of online tools for decision making, such as group composition, communication styles, and contextual/situational factors. Various methods can be used in further research, such as participatory and non-participatory observation of guideline panels and workshops, prototype sketching, testing examples, user-test interviews, stakeholder feedback, surveys, questionnaires, and discussions in face-to-face meetings (7). We also recommend exploring experiences of end users and stakeholders other than technical team.

Conclusions

A very limited number of guideline developers have used the iEtD tool published by Epistemonikos since its development. Although users' general experiences are positive, our work has identified some aspects of the tool that need improvement. Our findings could be also applied to development or improvement of other solutions for producing or using EtD frameworks.

Abbreviations

GRADE approach, the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) approach; GRADE-EtD frameworks, Evidence to Decisions frameworks; GRADEPro GDT, the GRADEPro Guideline Development Tool; iEtD, interactive Evidence-to-Decision.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

All methods were carried out in accordance with relevant guidelines and regulations. Before the interviews, we informed the participants about the voluntary basis of their enrolment, which implied that they were allowed to withdraw at any time without giving a reason, and that all information collected would be used only for research purposes and treated anonymously. Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in this study. Ethical approval was not needed for this study, as recommended by the Norwegian Committees for Medical and Health Research Ethics.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Availability of data and materials

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

No funding was received for this research project.

Author's contributions

JFME and PAC conceptualized the idea for this study. All authors (JFME, PAC, SR, GR, SF, and JM) contributed to the development of the methods. JFME and PAC conducted the interviews. JFME drafted the manuscript. All authors (JFME, PAC, SR, GR, SF, and JM) read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

References

1. Lavis JN, Ross SE, Hurley JE, Hohenadel JM, Stoddart GL, Woodward CA, et al. Examining the role of health services research in public policymaking. *The Milbank quarterly* 2002;80(1):125-54.
2. Rosenbaum SE. Improving the user experience of evidence. A design approach to evidence-informed health care: Oslo College of Architecture and Design; 2010.
3. Alonso-Coello P, Schünemann HJ, Moberg J, Brignardello-Petersen R, Akl EA, Davoli M, et al. GRADE Evidence to Decision (EtD) frameworks: a systematic and transparent approach to making well informed healthcare choices. 1: Introduction. *BMJ* 2016;353:i2016.
4. Schunemann HJ, Mustafa R, Brozek J, Santesso N, Alonso-Coello P, Guyatt G, et al. GRADE Guidelines: 16. GRADE evidence to decision frameworks for tests in clinical practice and public

- health. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 2016;76:89-98.
5. Grimshaw JM, Eccles MP, Lavis JN, Hill SJ, Squires JE. Knowledge translation of research findings. *Implementation science* : IS 2012;7:50.
 6. Liang Z, Howard PF, Leggat SG, Murphy G. A framework to improve evidence-informed decision-making in health service management. *Australian health review* : a publication of the Australian Hospital Association 2012;36(3):284-9.
 7. Rosenbaum SE, Moberg J, Glenton C, Schünemann HJ, Lewin S, Akl E, et al. Developing Evidence to Decision Frameworks and an Interactive Evidence to Decision Tool for Making and Using Decisions and Recommendations in Health Care. *Global Challenges* 2018;2(9):1700081.
 8. Moberg J, Oxman AD, Rosenbaum S, Schunemann HJ, Guyatt G, Flottorp S, et al. The GRADE Evidence to Decision (EtD) framework for health system and public health decisions. *Health research policy and systems* 2018;16(1):45.
 9. Parmelli E, Amato L, Oxman AD, Alonso-Coello P, Brunetti M, Moberg J, et al. GRADE Evidence to Decision (EtD) framework for coverage decisions *International journal of technology assessment in health care* 2017;33(2):176-82.
 10. Alonso-Coello P, Oxman AD, Moberg J, Brignardello-Petersen R, Akl EA, Davoli M, et al. GRADE Evidence to Decision (EtD) frameworks: a systematic and transparent approach to making well informed healthcare choices. 2: Clinical practice guidelines. *Bmj* 2016;353:i2089.
 11. DECIDE 2011-2015. Interactive GRADE Evidence to Decision (iEtD) framework [cited]. Available from: <http://www.decide-collaboration.eu/interactive-evidence-decision-ietd-framework>
 12. Li SA, Alexander PE, Reljic T, Cuker A, Nieuwlaat R, Wiercioch W, et al. Evidence to Decision framework provides a structured "roadmap" for making GRADE guidelines recommendations. *Journal of clinical epidemiology* 2018;104:103-12.
 13. Neumann I, Brignardello-Petersen R, Wiercioch W, Carrasco-Labra A, Cuello C, Akl E, et al. The GRADE evidence-to-decision framework: a report of its testing and application in 15 international guideline panels. *Implementation science* : IS 2016;11:93.
 14. O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standards for reporting qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations. *Acad Med* 2014;89(9):1245-51.
 15. REK: Norwegian Committees for Medical and Health Research Ethics. Examples of activities that do not require approval from REC.Oslo[cited]. Available from: https://helseforskning.etikkom.no/reglerogrutiner/soknadsplikt/sokerikkerek?p_dim=34999&_ikbLanguageCode=us
 16. Jaspers MWM, Steen T, Bos Cvd, Geenen M. The think aloud method: a guide to user interface design. *International Journal of Medical Informatics* 2004;73(11):781-95.
 17. Eccles DW, Aarsal G. The think aloud method: what is it and how do I use it? *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health* 2017;9(4):514-31.
 18. Rosenbaum SE, Glenton C, Nylund HK, Oxman AD. User testing and stakeholder feedback contributed to the development of understandable and useful Summary of Findings tables for Cochrane reviews.

Journal of clinical epidemiology 2010;63(6):607-19.

19. Rosenbaum SE, Glenton C, Cracknell J. User experiences of evidence-based online resources for health professionals: user testing of The Cochrane Library. BMC medical informatics and decision making 2008;8:34.
20. Glenton C, Lewin S, Gülmezoglu AM. Expanding the evidence base for global recommendations on health systems: strengths and challenges of the OptimizeMNH guidance process. Implementation Science 2016;11(1):98.