Prioritizing Working Group meeting
Agenda for the MS Teams call on 1 June 2021
Link: Click here to join the meeting

1. REVIEW AGENDA AND ACTION ITEMS
 	
   a. Agenda additions
   b. Notes and actions from previous meeting (see attachment 2)
	5 min

2. LIST OF PRIORITY TOPICS
 	
   a. Identify the most relevant type of synthesis needed for each topic (see attachment 3), with the following considerations:
      i. Splitting column G into multiple columns
         1. type of product (e.g., guideline vs evidence synthesis
         2. type(s) of studies to be included
         3. topic (potentially) – e.g., intervention vs implementation of intervention
         4. living or not (and consider dropping 'rapid')
      ii. Clarifying criteria for when an evidence synthesis versus guideline is needed
      iii. Requiring all criteria to be met for a 'living' evidence synthesis to be needed
      iv. Adding an additional column for feasibility (e.g., may conclude that it is not feasible to conduct a meaningful evidence synthesis of modeling studies, or may conclude that a scoping review would be more helpful)
      v. Reviewing comments from working group members (see notes from Cristian Mansilla below)
   b. Identify any specific considerations related to involving people with lived experience in the evidence synthesis
   c. Discuss framework of demand and supply of demand (as expressed through thehorizon-scanning process) and supply (primary studies, evidence syntheses of different types, guidelines, and knowledge translation)
	50 min

3. ANY OTHER BUSINESS	**5 min**

From Cristian Mansilla, Monday 31 May 2021

1. The content of column H includes the type of synthesis (e.g., overview, rapid review, etc.) for some cases, and the type of included studies (e.g., modelling studies, qualitative, etc.). Related to this, I would suggest to:
   a. Not specify the type of study designs to be included. From my point of view, this lays probably in the reviewers' decision based on the questions that we outline.
   b. Specify whether or not we need a living review or a living guideline for that question (and clarify the criteria that we will use for this recommendation).

  c. If a synthesis is suggested, specify whether or not the synthesis should include primary studies, or other syntheses (i.e., overview) (and clarify the criteria that we will use for this recommendation). I would not specify whether or not the review should be 'rapid', or if should include a meta-analysis, etc.

2. Regarding column J, I would suggest structuring a bit more the judgement of whether or not we need a living evidence synthesis for each topic. I would expand this column on priority for decision making (we could use the panel ranking for this), existent certainty of the evidence, and availability of upcoming evidence.

3. I think the role of column D is key for building this table. We could define the following categories:
  a. At least one living evidence synthesis exists.
  b. At least one living evidence synthesis planned.
  c. At least one non-living evidence synthesis exists.
  d. At least one non-living evidence synthesis planned.
  e. No evidence synthesis has been conducted or planned.

  Based on this, we could also re-orient the priorities for what questions would need a living review, and the specific characteristics of the research team that would eventually conduct them.

4. Finally, the column of comments/queries probably mentions this several time, but it might be that each topic in this spreadsheet might fit to more than one review, so we might need to consider that as a potential possibility.