



EMENTA

TITLE OF THE ACADEMIC CURRICULAR ACTIVITY: Systematic Review II	CODE: SCA 811	Workload		
		Theoretical	Practical	Total
		15h	--	15h
NATURE" () MANDATORY (X) OPTIONAL	MASTER AND DOCTORATE			
PROFESSORS: Carolina de Castro Martins Pfeifer, Lucas Guimarães Abreu				
SYLLABUS: This course aims to address the analysis of evidence certainty using the GRADE (GRADing of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation) tool in classes conducted in the English language.				
GOALS: General Objective: To empower students to analyze and interpret scientific evidence generated through systematic reviews using GRADE (GRADing of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation) in educational activities conducted in the English language. Specific Objectives: To equip students for the analysis and interpretation of meta-analysis and evidence generated through narrative assessment and meta-analysis in educational activities conducted in the English language.				
BIBLIOGRAPHY Basic Bibliography: 1. Martins-Pfeifer CC, Stefani CM, De Luca Canto G (org). Abordagem GRADE para avaliação da certeza da evidên- cia em revisões sistemáticas. Ed. Habitus: Florianópolis, 1ª ed, 2023. 200 p. 2. Schünemann H, Brožek J, Guyatt G, Oxman A. GRADE Handbook. 2013. Available at: https://gdt.grade.pro.org/app/handbook/handbook.html 3. Martins CC, Firmino RT. Análise da certeza da evidência científica usando o Grades of Recommendation, Asses- sment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE). In: Honório, Heitor Marques; Santiago-Jr, Joel Ferreira. (Org.). Fundamentos das Revisões Sistemáticas em Saúde. 2ed.São Paulo: Santos Publicações, 2020, p. 1-23. 4. Martins CC, Melo G, Porfírio GJM. Método GRADE para análise da certeza da evidência. In: Graziela De Luca Canto. (Org.). Revisões Sistemáticas da Literatura: Guia Prático. 1ed.Curitiba: Editora Brazil Publishing, 2020, p. 121-136.				



Supplementary Bibliography:

1. Atkins D, Briss PA, Eccles M, Flottorp S, Guyatt GH, Harbour RT, et al. Systems for grading the quality of evidence and the strength of recommendations II: Pilot study of a new system. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2005;5:25.
2. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, Rind D, et al. GRADE guidelines 6. Rating the quality of evidence -imprecision. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2011;64:1283-93.
3. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 8. Rating the quality of evidence--indirectness. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2011;64(12):1303-10.
4. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Woodcock J, Brozek J, Helfand M, et al. GRADE guidelines: 7. Rating the quality of evidence--inconsistency. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2011;64(12):1294-302.
5. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Montori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 5. Rating the quality of evidence--publication bias. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2011;64(12):1277-82.
6. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Sultan S, Glasziou P, Akl EA, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 9. Rating up the quality of evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2011;64(12):1311-6.
7. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 4. Rating the quality of evidence--study limitations (risk of bias). *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2011;64(4):407-15.