**Table S2: Modified AGREE II Questions Used to Guide Scoring of CAM Sections of Each Guideline**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AGREE II Instrument Item** | AGREE II Question (Ranked between 1 [Strongly Disagree and 7 [Strongly Agree]) | 1. The overall objective(s) of the guideline is (are) specifically described. | 2. The health question(s) covered by the guideline is (are) specifically described. | 3. The population (patients, public, etc.) to whom the guideline is meant to apply is specifically described. | 4. The guideline development group includes individuals from all relevant professional groups. | 5. The views and preferences of the target population (patients, public, etc.) have been sought. | 6. The target users of the guideline are clearly defined. | 7. Systematic methods were used to search for evidence. | 8. The criteria for selecting the evidence are clearly described. | 9. The strengths and limitations of the body of evidence are clearly described. | 10. The methods for formulating the recommendations are clearly described. | 11. The health benefits, side effects, and risks have been considered in formulating the recommendations. | 12. There is an explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence. | 13. The guideline has been externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication. | 14. A procedure for updating the guideline is provided. | 15. The recommendations are specific and unambiguous. | 16. The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented. | 17. Key recommendations are easily identifiable. | 18. The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application. | 19. The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice. | 20. The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered. | 21. The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria. | 22. The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline. | 23. Competing interests of guideline development group members have been recorded and addressed. | Rate the overall quality of this guideline. (Ranked from 1 [Lowest Possible Quality] to 7 [Highest Possible Quality]) | I would recommend this guideline for use: (Select from between "Yes", "Yes with Modifications" and "No") |
| **AGREE II Evaluation 1: Overall guideline (i.e. which includes both CAM and Non-CAM sections).** |  | Item Unchanged | Item Unchanged | Item Unchanged | Item Unchanged | Item Unchanged | Item Unchanged | Item Unchanged | Item Unchanged | Item Unchanged | Item Unchanged | Item Unchanged | Item Unchanged | Item Unchanged | Item Unchanged | Item Unchanged | Item Unchanged | Item Unchanged | Item Unchanged | Item Unchanged | Item Unchanged | Item Unchanged | Item Unchanged | Item Unchanged | Based on final score | Based on final score |
| **AGREE II Evaluation 2: CAM Section(s) and Recommendation(s)** |  | Were the overall objective(s) of the guideline specifically described? | Is the health question(s) covered by the guideline specifically described? | Is the CAM population (patients, public, etc.) to whom the CAM-sections of the guideline is meant to apply is specifically described? (likely an identical score to the overall guideline score) | Does it involve CAM experts? | Were the views and preferences of CAM-related therapies in the target population sought? | Were CAM patients of the CAM guidelines clearly defined? | Were systematic methods used to search for CAM evidence? | Were the criteria for selecting CAM evidence clearly described? | Were strengths and limitations of the body of CAM evidence clearly described? | Were methods for formulating the CAM recommendations are clearly described? | Were the health benefits, side effects, and risks have been considered in formulating CAM recommendations? | Was an explicit link between the CAM recommendations and the supporting evidence? | Was the guideline externally reviewed by CAM experts prior to its publication? | Is there a procedure to include the CAM section(s) of the guideline (i.e. this can be scored equally if there's a procedure to update the entire guideline). | Were the CAM recommendations specific and unambiguous? | Were the different CAM options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented? | Were key CAM recommendations are easily identifiable? | Did the guideline describe facilitators and barriers to the application of CAM-specific recommendations? | Did the guideline provide advice and/or tools on how the CAM recommendations can be put into practice? | Were potential resource implications of applying the CAM recommendations been considered? | Did the guideline present monitoring and/or auditing criteria for the CAM-specific recommendations? | Did views of the funding body influence the CAM content of the guideline? | Were competing interests of CAM members of the guideline development group members recorded and addressed? | Based on final score | Based on final score |