COVID-END
COVID-19 Evidence Network to support Decision-making

Synthesizing Working Group
Notes from Webex call on 3 June 2020
https://mcmaster.webex.com/meet/rise

1. INTRODUCTIONS

- ***David welcomed new members to call:***
  - ***i. Cristián Mansilla; PhD candidate at McMaster University; previously worked supporting the Chilean MOH in evidence-based decision-making***
  - ***ii. Stephanie Chang, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, USA; lead Evidence Based Practice Centre systematic reviews in partnership with federal agencies as well as some rapid reviews in coordination with several EBPCs across the US.***

Also participating on call:
Andrea Tricco
Birte Snilsveit
Cristian Mansilla
Cheow Peng Ooi
David Tovey
Edoardo Aromataris
Gabriel Rada
Gunn Vist
Kamga Emmanuel
Nikita Burke
Stephanie Change
Vivian Welch

Secretariat: Anna Dion and Safa Al-Khateeb

2. FOLLOW-UP ON ACTION ITEMS

- ***The proposed goal statement (now on website) shared with the group:***

  "This working group supports efforts to synthesize the evidence that already exists in ways that are more coordinated and efficient and that balance quality and timeliness."
- ***No changes were suggested, members welcome to suggest edits as needed***

3. EVIDENCE RESOURCES AND TOOLS

a. The group went through the Resources and tools document (see attachment 3)
- ***Clarified primary audience is researcher undertaking a review with varying levels of experience.***

- ***Adding resource to check for replication before carrying out the reviews: list-serve and page of on-going studies through VA, SRDR have a repository of individual studies, data extraction forms and evidence forms that are available for updating (under creative commons) enabling collaboration in process.***
- ***David asked for any additional organizations identifying priority review questions (decided worth doing but haven't got a research team to take them on yet)***
- ***Stephanie suggested to also include decision-aids around updating reviews and coordinating around this later stage in evidence synthesis (particularly as evidence base increases)***

ACTION: All working group members asked to add description of any additional resources into Resources and Tools document

b. Group discussed key quality criteria/standards for COVID-19 reviews (see attachment 4)

- ***More appropriate descriptor as "Reporting Requirements" than quality standards***
- ***Including criteria around both transparency (around use of methodological guidance and reporting standards) and quality criteria***
- ***Don't need to develop new criteria or standard, but point to those that already exist (e.g. NCCMT)***
    - ***Needs to include assessment of how data was summarized (e.g. meta-analysis, vote counting, and how quality of studies was accounted for in synthesis)***
    - ***Transparency about what conventional steps where amended if a rapid approach***

c. Identifying burn-out as an issue in the evidence synthesis community (as well as in the service provider and decision-maker communities)

- ***Discussed at co-chairs and Secretariat- agreed was important issue***
- ***Group to continue to discuss what might be a helpful contribution in this space***

3. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- ***Gabriel shared powerpoint presentation on pilot as part of Digitization working group and L*VE tool (to be launched next week) (attachment 6)***
- ***Lean approach to coordinating across repositories, with evidence enhancers. As a first step, sharing minimal information between repositories (DOI, title, ID)- creating one repository with all documents, or sharing documents between all of them as a way to better coordinate efforts across the 20-30 main repositories and help identify overlap and duplication between databases***
- ***L*VE tool organizes all studies in repository by questions, article type (using AI algorithm to sort meta-data) together with comparison tool across different repositories***