

## 1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The co-chairs introduced themselves and welcomed other working-group members:

- a. Co-chairs
  1. Jorge Barreto
  2. Ruth McQuillan
- b. Members
  1. Cristian Mansilla
  2. Elie Akl
  3. Lynn Laidlaw (arrived late due to another commitment)
  4. Ooi Cheow Peng (regrets)
  5. Richard Ballerand
- c. Secretariat members
  1. John Lavis
- d. Researcher-observer
  1. Ahmadiani Saeed (missed meeting due to a scheduling issue)

## 2. REVIEW TERMS OF REFERENCE

- a. The co-chairs pointed working-group members to the working group's draft terms of reference (see below) and invited comments
- b. John pointed working-group members to the [list of priorities](#), which will soon be updated based on the February horizon-scanning panel meeting
- c. Working group members offered the following comments about the terms of reference and approach to addressing them
  - i. Need a framework to go from demand (as expressed through the horizon-scanning process) and supply (primary studies, evidence syntheses of different types, guidelines, and knowledge translation)
    1. Map what evidence syntheses already exist (using the COVID-END inventory) and what guidelines already exist (using eCOVID and possibly other sources like ECRI)
    2. Review the the relevance, quality and currency of what is there (which can easily be done with both the COVID-END inventory and eCOVID), as well as whether citizens and/or patients were engaged in the syntheses (or guidelines) and in the primary studies included in them
    3. Identify where gaps exists, particularly for living evidence syntheses +/- living guidelines
    4. Brainstorm about potential teams who could address each gap and what might encourage them to take on the work
  - ii. Likely don't need a separate horizon-scanning process for guidelines given the panelists are focused on evidence-based insights, not whether they come in the form of an evidence synthesis or a guideline

- iii. Likely need to more explicitly prompt the panelists to drop topics that they no longer see as relevant
- iv. May want to monitor and evaluate the working group's process so we know whether we achieved our objectives and to understand the facilitators and barriers to such work
- d. Working group members agreed that at the next meeting we will:
  - i. Hear more about the horizon-scanning process
  - ii. Focus attention on further developing the above framework

### **3. DISCUSSION**

- a. Working group members didn't have a chance to discuss potential additional members who should be invited to contribute to the working group, so we will address this at the next meeting
- b. Ahmadiani wasn't present to describe the Université de Montréal research study on communities of practice (see attachment 2 for description of study; see attachment 3 for observation consent), so we will also address this at the next meeting

### **4. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

- a. No other business

#### **Terms of reference for Prioritizing Working Group:**

This working group identifies the topics for which living syntheses (and guidelines) are most needed and who can maintain them

Terms of reference

- 1) To review on a quarterly basis and suggest improvements to the methods being used in the COVID-END horizon-scanning project and more generally in priority setting for evidence syntheses and guidelines
- 2) To review on a monthly basis the COVID-END list of priority topics where living evidence syntheses are urgently needed and suggest improvements to their framing to enhance their decision relevance
- 3) To identify the potential leads of teams who can take on living evidence syntheses, encourage them to create interdisciplinary teams to do so, and foster collaboration across synthesis teams
- 4) To support these teams with tips, tools and other relevant resources that are made available on the COVID-END website