

1. FOLLOW-UP ON ACTION ITEMS

- a. *Review previous meeting notes and action items from August 28 (see attachment 2)*
- b. *Discuss inventory presentation from previous meeting and next steps for Recommending WG*
 - *Ivan reviewed the inventory presentation and discussed potential implications for Recommending working group*
 - *Possibility to highlight high quality guidelines in an additional column in the inventory, but would require assessment expertise, time and funds to do comprehensively.*
 - *Focus initially on low hanging fruit*
 - *link to work led by Yasser on critical care guideline assessments*
 - *link to INAHTA database, especially with respect to COVID-specific guidelines*
 - *Challenging to identify broadly applicable guidelines due to variations in context and different interpretations of SR findings; need to explicitly recognize these variations*
 - *Suggest increased accessibility of inventory by including outcomes assessed and time of treatment to know utility of reviews*

ACTION: Group to consider any role for Recommending group in supporting inventory and linkages to guideline community; to be discussed at future meeting

2. RECOMMENDING WG PRESENTATION AT PARTNERS MEETING

- a. *Debrief and discuss the presentation 'International alliance and AGREE-ment of 45 rapid guidelines on the management of critical care patients with COVID-19' (see attachment 3)*
- b. *Questions from presentation:*
 - i. *From Per Olav Vandvik: Great work Yasser. How do you think your AGREE II scores compare with TRUST scores (IOM trustworthy guideline criteria tool, as used by ECRI Guideline Trust) compare?*
 - ii. *From Elie Akl: Thanks Amer. Rapid guidelines use a number of "shortcuts". could that explain the results on domain 3? AGREE II was developed for standard guidelines, and might not be optimal for rapid guidelines?*
 - iii. *From Gabriel Rada: Thanks Amer, did you measure or plan to explore if the recommendations were up to date (e.g. based directly or indirectly [through reviews] including all of the available trials)?*
 - iv. *From Per Olav Vandvik: I think rapid guidelines need to be assessed for trustworthiness and any shortcuts should be communicated through quality assessments*

- *Ivan shared that Yasser's presentation was well-received at partners meeting and that a journal article describing this work has been submitted; he will update the group once published*

3. GUIDELINES DOCUMENT

- *Michael shared the guideline development document, with incorporated comments, a navigation guide at the beginning and an interactive flow charts later in the document*
- *Group members made several suggestions:*
 - *Stating that many organizations develop guidelines and document includes several examples*
 - *Including tools that INAHTA posts to support the evaluation of HTAs*
 - *Indicate databases that require sign-ins, registering, membership, etc (SIGN, EUnetHTA)*
- *Group to finalize document within next 7-10 days and then identify how to link together with the Synthesizing resource document*

ACTION: Michael to share the document on Monday evening, group members to provide feedback by Friday September 18th to have a finalized version for the following Friday

4. JOINT SYNTHESIZING-RECOMMENDING MEETING

- a. Next meeting: Wednesday September 16th at 7am EST*
- b. Agenda to include:*
 - i. Allison Tong from the University of Sydney to join to discuss core outcomes set*
 - ii. Discuss registry of guidelines (to be confirmed)*

ACTION: Safa to send invitations for joint Synthesizing-Recommendng working group to all members of Recommending working group