



Prioritizing Working Group meeting

Notes from the call on 6 July 2021

1. INTRODUCTIONS

- a. Jorge welcomed a new working group member, Elizabeth Opondo (and noted that another new member, Cynthia, couldn't join today)

2. REVIEW AGENDA AND ACTION ITEMS

- a. Jorge pointed working-group members to the notes and actions from previous meeting (see attachment 2)

3. PROGRESS OF WORKING GROUP ACTIVITIES

- a. Jorge pointed working-group members to the progress report (see attachment 3) and the next steps for working group

4. LIST OF PRIORITY TOPICS

- a. Working-group members discussed the columns in the spreadsheet (attachment 4) where prompts had been added in red font to note the need for additional criteria to review the current spreadsheet (see attachment 4)
 1. Consider dropping column H (about evidence syntheses versus guidelines) and instead noting in the instructions that some questions may not be about 'knowledge' and/or well served by evidence syntheses but by other types of inputs (like guidelines or policy briefs)
 2. Consider clarifying that column I (overview of reviews versus review of single studies) may need to be determined by whether existing reviews had already been identified in column G
 3. Consider converting column J (study designs) to a mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive list of study designs
 4. Consider operationalizing column K (priority) based on the horizon-scanning panel rankings and adding an additional column for time sensitivity (e.g., if something isn't prepared soon then decisions will be made anyway)
 5. Consider operationalizing column M (availability of upcoming evidence) based on trial and other study registries
 6. Consider re-naming column P as need for involving people with lived experience
 7. Considering adding an additional column about feasibility and using criteria like lack of conceptual clarity in the question and difficulty of conducting empirical studies (or dropping it if feasibility is too hard to operationalize)

ACTION: Ruth and team to consider the above feedback as they continue their excellent work

c. Working-group members noted the excellent ‘Citizen Engagement Guide for Researchers’ (see attachment 5) that teams will be asked to draw upon if they take up one or more of the questions

ACTION: Members to share any feedback to Maureen Smith

d. Working-group members discussed how to communicate and support the take up of priority questions (e.g., communicating both to umbrella groups like Cochrane and to teams/individuals, explaining the need to move quickly, and clarifying the lack of funding but the willingness to write letters of support to funders)

ACTION: Ruth and team to ask the Engaging working group about releasing the priorities in a COVID-END webinar and on the COVID-END listerv and to consider writing directly to groups like Cochrane

ACTION: Safa to ask Ileana Ciurea from the COVID-END secretariat to share our list of communication channels that can be accessed

e. Working-group members deferred the following point to a future meeting: Discuss framework of demand and supply of demand (as expressed through the horizon-scanning process) and supply (primary studies, evidence syntheses of different types, guidelines, and knowledge translation) and whether there is potential to write up the process using this framework (e.g., process paper)

ACTION: Safa to carry forward this agenda item

5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

a. No other business