

External Guideline Rating Equivalencies

The Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics (A.N.D.) Oncology Expert Work Group concurs with the following external guidelines and has approved their respective A.N.D. Evidence Analysis Library (EAL) rating equivalency scales:

American Society of Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition (A.S.P.E.N.) Clinical Guidelines: Nutrition Support Therapy During Adult Anticancer Treatment and in Hematopoietic Cell Transplantation, 2009.

- A:** Supported by at least two level I investigations (EAL Rating Equivalent: **Strong**)
- B:** Supported by one level I investigation (EAL Rating Equivalent: **Fair**)
- C:** Supported by level II investigations only (EAL Rating Equivalent: **Fair**)
- D:** Supported by at least two level III investigations (EAL Rating Equivalent: **Weak**)
- E:** Supported by level IV or level V evidence (EAL Rating Equivalent: **Consensus**).

Clinical Oncological Society of Australia (COSA) Evidence-Based Practice Guidelines for the Nutritional Management of Adult Patients with Head and Neck Cancer, 2011.

- A:** Body of evidence can be trusted to guide practice (EAL Rating Equivalent: **Strong**)
- B:** Body of evidence can be trusted to guide practice in most situations (EAL Rating Equivalent: **Fair**)
- C:** Body of evidence provides some support for recommendation(s) but care should be taken in its application (EAL Rating Equivalent: **Fair**)
- D:** Body of evidence is weak and recommendation(s) must be applied with caution (EAL Rating Equivalent: **Weak**)

Oncology Nursing Society (ONS) Putting Evidence into Practice (PEP), 2009

- **Recommended for practice** - Effectiveness is demonstrated by strong evidence from rigorously designed studies, meta-analyses, or systematic reviews. Expected benefit exceeds expected harms. (EAL Rating Equivalent: **Strong**)
- **Likely to be effective** - Evidence is less well established than for those listed under recommended for practice [EAL Rating Equivalent: **Fair, or Consensus (if only based on consensus documents)**]
- **Benefits balanced with harms** - Clinicians and patients should weigh the beneficial and harmful effects according to individual circumstances and priorities (EAL Rating Equivalent: **Weak**)
- **Effectiveness not established** - Data currently are insufficient or are of inadequate quality (EAL Rating Equivalent: **Weak**)
- **Effectiveness unlikely** - Lack of effectiveness is less well established than those listed under not recommended for practice (EAL Rating Equivalent: **Weak**)
- **Not recommended for practice** - Ineffectiveness or harm clearly is demonstrated, or cost or burden exceeds potential benefit (EAL Rating Equivalent: **Strong, Fair or Weak**).