AN INTERNATIONAL STUDY OF THE GRID-HAMD: HAS IT FULFILLED ITS PROMISE?

J. Williams[1], M. Ondrus[2], M. Kitzinger[2], J. Persson[2], M. Popescu[2], R. Valjakka[2]

[1]Global Science, MedAvante, Hamilton, USA ; [2]CTS, MedAvante, Hamilton, USA

Introduction. An international group developed the GRID-HAMD to address critiques of the HAMD and improve its administration. The GRID-HAMD provides novel grid scoring, structured interview guide and scoring conventions, and revised anchor points for problematic or inconsistently rated items.

Objectives. To conduct a survey of clinicians' experience using the GRID-HAMD.

Aims. To evaluate the clinical acceptability of GRID-HAMD.

Methods. A survey distributed to 74 clinical trial raters covered usability and ease of use of the GRID-HAMD, including 20 statements rated from strongly disagree to strongly agree, and listed four statements asking raters to compare the GRID-HAMD with the SIGH-D.

Results. Fifty-seven questionnaires were completed (77%). Most raters agreed that wording of GRID-HAMD questions made it easy to administer (77%), the conventions were clear (82%) and helpful (86%), and guidelines for rating symptom intensity were clear (79%). Fewer rated it 'easy to decide on a frequency level' (61%). A large majority (89%) thought 'having the scoring conventions integrated into the interview guide has made scoring easier.' More than half (54%) of 44 raters who had used both preferred the graphical layout. However, slightly more preferred the SIGH-D for its 'ease of use' (50% vs. 45%) and 'efficiency' (39% vs. 36%), and expressed 'overall preference for the SIGH-D' (45% vs. 43%).

Conclusions. The raters evaluated clarity and ease of use of the GRID-HAMD positively. Surprisingly, they did not indicate overall preference for the GRID-HAMD over the SIGH-D. Several areas of improvement were indicated for both, and the 'most difficult' items were highlighted.