## **WORLD DEVELOPMENT GROUP**

INCORPORATED

## Ratified Research Guidelines Directory (RRGD) First edition (May 2010)

| Name:                | REDHOT: Reporting Data on Homeopathic Treatments   |  |
|----------------------|--|--|
| First published:     | 2006   |  |
| Most recent update:  | December 2006  |  |
| Most recent version: | Unknown  |  |
| Organization:        | University of York   |  |
| Organization type:   | University   |  |
| Contact:             | Mike Emmans Dean Department of Health Sciences Seebohm Rowntree Building University of York York YO10 5DD UK       |  |
|                      | Tel:<br>Fax:<br>E-mail:  | Unknown Unknown info@redhot-homeopathy.info                              |
|                      | http://www.redhot-homeopathy.info/index.html   |  |
| RRG Contact:         | Name:<br>Title:<br>Tel:<br>Fax:<br>E-mail:   | Mike Emmans Dean Coordinator Unknown Unknown info@redhot-homeopathy.info |
|                      | http://www.redhot-homeopathy.info/Checklist/checklist.html   |  |
| Purpose:             | To be used as an adjunct to CONSORT, when reporting randomized controlled trials regarding homeopathic treatments. |  |
| Focus:               | Report of primary research   |  |
| Governance:          | Unknown  |  |

Methods: An international email conference of 12 experts in the field was convened. Members of the panel were drawn from

Unknown

Finance:

practitioners and nonpractitioners who had published reports of homeopathic research, as trialists, authors of comprehensive systematic reviews, or CAM journal editors. A three-stage Delphi consensus process was adapted. In round 1, panelists were provided with the CONSORT and STRICTA guidelines as prompts and asked to list items; these were successively voted on and refined in rounds 2 and 3. Participation in each stage varied from 8 to 10 members. At the end of round 3, 57 items had been accepted by 70% or greater of the panel. These items were then compiled as 28 brief items under 8 headings, crossreferenced to CONSORT items 2, 3, 4, and 19. Where multiple items had been compiled under a heading, additional explanations of the criteria were created, along with examples. As an enduser quality measure, the checklist and explanatory text were sent to three CAM journal editors who sat on the original panel, to assess the acceptability and feasibility of implementing the guidelines.

Updates: Unknown

Maintenance: Unknown

Feedback? Yes

Feedback use: To update guidelines.

Evaluation? Unknown

Verification: Updated by WDG

Date of profile: 2-Jun-10