

User feedback on SURVTOOL applied to *AMR in Salmonella isolated from pigs – a part of the DANMAP system*

March 2020

Contact: [Marianne Sandberg](#)

General information

Name of evaluation tool: SURVTOOL

Name of surveillance programme used in case: AMR in Salmonella isolated from pigs – a part of DANMAP (DANMAP is an integrated approach for AMU/AMR in animals and humans in Denmark)

Country of programme: Denmark

Surveillance component or programme covers (tick one):

- AMU
- AMR
- Both
- Other, please describe:

What is covered by (part of) component or programme evaluated (tick at least one):

- Humans
- Livestock
- Aquaculture
- Bees
- Green environment
- Aquatic environment
- Food chain
- Companion animals
- Equidae
- Camelids and Deer
- Wildlife
- Other, please describe:

Objective(s) of evaluation (tick at least one):

- Performance
- Infrastructure
- Functionality
- Operations
- Collaboration
- One Health-ness / the strength of One Health
- Impact
- Other, please describe:

Main result of evaluation: Evaluation undertaken as an exercise with focus on assessment of the tool

Time period for evaluation: July-October 2019

Name(s) of evaluator(s): Marianne Sandberg, Lis Alban

Affiliation of evaluator(s): The Danish Agriculture and Food Council

Evaluator(s) relationship with tool (tick at least one):

- Owner
- Developer
- User without involvement in development or ownership of tool
- Other, please describe:

Citation of work, if published: Liza Nielsen, Lis Alban, Johanne Ellis-Iversen, Koen Mintiens and Marianne Sandberg, 2020, Evaluating integrated surveillance of antimicrobial resistance: experiences from use of three evaluation tools, *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2020.03.015>

Scoring of different aspects of the evaluation tool

When answering, please describe in words and use a scale with four levels, where 1 = not satisfactory, 2 = major improvements needed, 3 = some improvements needed, 4 = satisfactory, and provide a short explanation for the score.

1) User friendliness: 3 & 2 - Easy to fill in the tool: 3, More complex to conduct the evaluations: 2.

2) Meets evaluation needs/requirements: 3 - Covers the epidemiological performance of a surveillance system e.g., effect of number and type of samples collected, and limit of detection.

3) Efficiency: 3 - It takes some time to fill in the tool

4) Use of a step-wise approach to the evaluation: 2 - Does not follow a step-wise approach in the sense that the order is a result of the choice of the evaluation question(s), and not given by the tool itself.

5) Overall appearance: 3 - Supports the process of making a framework for evaluation. If the evaluations are conducted according to the given framework, the results are objective and scientific valid. It would be time consuming to conduct the evaluations for ecosystems that require integrated surveillance.

6) Generation of actionable evaluation outputs: 1 & 3 - Filling in the tool will not necessarily give actionable outputs (1). Use of a generated evaluation plan could produce actionable outputs for efficiency of testing system, whereas for structure and process it is less clear how it would be possible to get actionable outputs (3)

7) Allows evaluation of One Health aspects: 2 - Not addressed particularly in the tool (only animal components possible to add), but the tool could in principle be applied to all types of surveillance systems.

8) Workability in terms of required data (1: very complex, 4: simple): 4 & 1 - To fill in the tool to acquire an evaluation framework (4). To conduct evaluations, it will be dependent upon the defined evaluation questions (4/1)

9) Workability in terms of required people to include (1: many, 4: few): 4 - In theory, one person could do it. It is necessary to gather information from all relevant stakeholders, but it could be done by questionnaires or interviews.

10) Workability in terms of analysis to be done (1: difficult, 4: simple): 4 & 1 - Depends upon the defined evaluation questions whether complex analysis or not.

11) Time taken for application of tool (1: > 2 month, 2: 1-2 months, 3: 1 week - 1 month, 4: < 1 week): 4 & 1 - Filling in the tool can be done in < 1 week (4); to conduct the evaluation would take longer (1).

Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats

1) Things that I really liked about this tool, or that the tool covers really well:

- Could in principle be used for evaluating, and contribution to implementation, of all kinds of surveillance systems.



- Provides information about how to evaluate efficiency and efficacy of: testing system, the process and whether it leads to the desired change
- It made me think about the difference in complexity of the different surveillance activities.
- The results would have a high degree of objectivity because the information is gathered independently from different stakeholders (no requirement for a group to gather)
- Technical epi efficiency evaluations are possible to do in this tool in a relatively easy way because of the “epi-calculator”

2) Things I struggled with:

- The whole process of evaluation would require a long time
- The terminology is not always clear, with different ways of interpretation
- The layout is not always optimal

3) Things people should be aware of when using this tool:

- This tool was developed for animal health (human components are not on the drop-down list). In order to use it for OH one has to go beyond the drop-down list to define a human component.
- If a full evaluation should be done it would require many resources

4) Things that this tool is not covering or not good at covering:

- Gives only a structural framework for an evaluation given a set of selected evaluation questions
- Provide only information on how to conduct the evaluation (scientific references)
- Does not include information on structural/process evaluation for laboratories
- Current version not optimal for One Health evaluation

Scoring of themes

Score the degree that the themes are covered by the evaluation tool.

Scoring scale: Well covered, More or less covered, Not well covered, Not covered at all.

WG1	Tool: SURVTOOLS (AMR Integrated Surveillance Systems)	
	Score	The reasoning for the score
AMR/AMU	Not well covered	Not developed specifically for AMR/AMU
Collaboration	Not covered at all	No particular guidance, and difficult to understand how to go about to evaluate the degree of collaboration
Resources	More or less covered	A guide to a framework for economic evaluation, as well as references to which method to use as well as a statistical tool are available
Output and use of information	More or less covered	If the full evaluation is done, most of the aspects would be covered very well and enabling an assessment of impact and output. Unclear how this should be done for inter-mediate and final outputs/impacts
Integration	Not well covered	Not included
Adaptivity	Not well covered	Not included specifically, but it might be possible if the evaluation of the process is done progressively and the results are compared
Technical operations	More or less covered	The tool covers technical efficiency evaluation quite well (3), but all other aspects of the laboratory part are not very well guided regarding how to cover (2)

Open comments

Governance is not particularly covered in this tool.



Disclaimer statement (for corresponding author):

By submitting this case study report to the CoEvalAMR consortium, I grant permission for it to be uploaded to the CoEvalAMR website in the section "case studies" for public access and use under the relevant CC license. I understand that name, email (where applicable), affiliation, and geographic region of the author(s) will be published along with the submitted document.

I confirm that the information in the report is accurate and does not violate General Data Protection Regulation / national data protection legislation or copyright laws. I confirm that the report contains the author's/authors' own subjective view stemming from the application of the tool and does not represent an institutional view. I acknowledge that the site editors may reject my report should the content be deemed offensive or inappropriate.

I confirm that I understand the above statement and give consent to the report being used in the way described.

- Yes**
- No

Name and date: Marianne Sandberg, 04/05/2020