Appendix 6. Grading and efficacy matrices

Grading of information received

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gradingcriteria**  | **Weak evidence**Do not consider an alert | **Medium evidence**Only consider if supported by multiple criteria | **Strong evidence**Consider an alert | **Exceptional circumstance** |
| 1. Local relevance | Not locally relevant | Maybe relevant | Locally relevant | Exceptional circumstances |
| Tick one box |[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| 2. Anecdotal report | Anecdotal without support | Anecdotal supported by multiple reports | Anecdotal supported by multiple sources and other criteria | Exceptional circumstances |
| Tick one box |[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| 3. Source of evidence | Unreliable or unknown source, no other evidence | Unreliable but multiple sources or supported by other evidence | Reliable source and specific enough to be of use | Exceptional circumstances |
| Tick one box |[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| 4.Forensic evidence | No forensic evidence | No forensic evidence but other compelling evidence  | Forensic evidence | Exceptional circumstances |
| Tick one box |[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| 5.Confirmed harm | No confirmed harm | Potential serious harm or death | Serious harm or death confirmed | Exceptional circumstances |
| Tick one box |[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
|  | Boxes ticked in this column are a good indication that an alert **is not** warranted | Boxes ticked in this column are neutral and should be supported by other strong evidence to warrant an alert | Boxes ticked in this column are a good indication that an alert **is** warranted | Exceptional circumstances for one criteria, may make an alert more likely or even justify an alert by itself |
| **Result of grading matrix (no. of ticks)** |[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| **Initial LDIS panel decision** | [ ]  **Do not alert**[ ]  **Undecided**[ ]  **Alert or other actions considered** |

Efficacy of alert

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Efficacyquestions** | **Do not consider an alert** | **Efficacy neutral** | **An alert is more likely**  | **Exceptional circumstance** |
| Information is in the public domain | An alert is unwarranted and press reporting is not causing concern | An alert is unwarranted but press reports are causing concern | As alert is being considered and press reports are causing public concern  | An alert is more likely because of intense media and public attention |
| Tick one box |[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| Will an alert enable avoidance or risk reduction? | An alert would not be specific enough to enable avoidance or risk reduction | An alert would not be specific but generic harm reduction advice is applicable | An alert would enable a drug avoidance or harm reduction response | An alert would not be not specific but other exceptional concerns override |
| Tick one box |[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
| Will an alert be counterproductive? | An alert is likely to be counterproductive | An alert may be counterproductive but harm reduction message suitable | An alert is unlikely to be counterproductive | An alert is warranted despite the risk of it being counterproductive |
| Tick one box |[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Use the answers to the efficacy questions to review the initial LDIS panel decision and arrive at a final decision recorded below.

Panel decision

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Final decision** | Click here to enter text. |