**Participating on the call**:
Andrea Tricco
Anna Dion
David Tovey
Edoardo Aromataris
Gabriel Rada
Gunn Vist
Kamga Emmanuel Berinyuy
Michael Wilson
Nikita Burke
Safa Al-Kateeb
Simon Lewin

*Regrets*: Birte Snilsveit, Isabelle Boutron, Taryn Young, Vivian Welch

| | |
|---|---|
| **1. WELCOME NEW MEMBERS**<br><br>   a. Inviting co-chair | **5 min** |
| **2. REVIEW NOTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING and TERMS OF REFERENCE**<br><br>   a. Review notes from previous meeting (see attachment 2)<br><br>   Proposed revised text for terms of reference:<br>     i. Contributing to the development and maintenance of the guide(s) to COVID-19 evidence sources and encouraging its use by researchers and evidence users, to avoid unnecessary duplication. Encourage updating or extending existing reviews in conjunction with other interested groups within and beyond COVID-END.<br>     ii. Creating and sharing evidence tables and other resources and tools that can be used in local guideline-development processes (or local evidence-contextualization processes more generally)'<br>     iii. Identifying and sharing guidance and expectations for conducting and reporting reviews and other evidence synthesis outputs produced to address issues related to COVID-19<br>     iv. Promoting and sharing the quality assurance, publishing, translation and other benefits that come from working with major international evidence producers and publishers and considering how these should be applied in the context of COVID-19<br>     v. Drafting guidance for and promoting living reviews (and living guidelines) as an emerging standard for evidence synthesis ensuring that these encompass different content areas, intervention and review types. | **25 min** |

| | |
|---|---|
| • Suggested re-wording of item v. above to recognize intersection between rapid reviews, evidence synthesis and living systematic reviews, identifying when each is appropriate. LSR not universally recognized as emerging standard (in part because of resources required) though current context may have important lessons. Suggested text:<br><br>*"Drafting guidance for and promoting living reviews (and living guidelines) as an emerging standard for evidence synthesis in the context of COVID-19 ensuring that these encompass different content areas, intervention and review types."*<br><br>b. Additional objective to support relevant and responsive synthesis and contextualization in low-resource settings (with and without additional funding)<br><br>• Ensuring the question identification and prioritization is included within evidence production system. Relevance for both Engaging and Synthesizing groups.<br><br>c. Other additions or changes | |
| **4. WORKING GROUP MEMBERSHIP**<br><br>a. Suggestions for additional members and organizations with reminder of principles around geographic, linguistic diversity as well as diversity in target audiences | **10 min** |
| **4. EVIDENCE SOURCES AND PRODUCTS**<br><br>a. Review taxonomy document (see attachment 3)<br><br>• Buidling from Taryn's helpful diagram, providing resources and tools at each synthesizing step:<br> o Identifying need for review:<br> ▪ Searching for existing or in-progress reviews in PROSPERO (systematic reviews, health outcomes), Open Science Framework (all reviews, broad outcome measures).<br> ▪ Indicator of review status (underway, published, etc) in PROSPERO (though is author-managed so not always up to date)<br> ▪ JBI has registry but streamlines into PROSPERO<br> ▪ Epistemonikos maintains extensive database of systematic reviews, rapid reviews, single studies. Emergent L*VE platform for curated living overview of reviews related to COVID-19 (follow-up with Gabriel to include rapid reviews within Epistemonikos)<br> ▪ Challenge of single repository (e.g. having a federated search) is having shared definitions of review types and inclusion/quality | |

criteria where different sites need to be able to speak to another. In between solution is similar to Google Scholar or Microsoft Academic. Potential to build on existing infrastructure but suggest most efficient process may be to start with comprehensive databases and adding in information from elsewhere.

- Group to identify and share list of published and registered reviews with aim of developing comprehensive list (suggestions offered during call include Open Science Framework which includes diverse types of reviews (e.g. outside health, scoping reviews, etc.), JBI, Campbell)
- Consider organizing also by filters around quality, end-users
  o Refining search:
    - Identifying where to search (e.g. Cochrane, EPPI map, linking with librarian sources (HLA, MLA, etc.)) and guiding people through most comprehensive repositories (e.g. comparison done by Epistemonikos suggests WHO)
    - Identifying search strategies in addition to boolean, such as citation-based, other meta-data to support linking back to other databases)
    - Tool within Epistemonikos to support refining of search strategy
  o Identifying type of synthesis
    - NCCMT model based on needs of end users
    - Cochrane guidance on rapid reviews
- Working group members to send resources and tools that contribute to these and subsequent steps in synthesizing process to Anna.
- Includes protocols for developing rapid evidence profiles (MHF, Cochrane Ireland)

| **5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS** | 5 min |
|---|---|
| a. Guidance for rapid and other reviews for future meetings<br>b. Group to review and discuss COVID-19 evidence portal | |