

1. INTRODUCTIONS

David welcomed Dr. Brenda Kawala, African Centre for Systematic Reviews and Knowledge Translation, Uganda who is currently a graduate student at the University of Gothenburg, Sweden.

Also participating in call:

Cristian Mansilla

David Tovey

Edoardo Aromataris

Elie Akl

Gabriel Rada

Kamga Emmanuel

Karla Soares-Weiser

Taryn Young

Secretariat: Anna Dion and Safa Al-Khateeb

2. FOLLOW-UP ON ACTION ITEMS

- *David reviewed notes from last meeting (see attachment 2)*

3. DEVELOPING A COVID-END REPOSITORY *[John Lavis]*

- *John reviewed the proposed inventory (see attachment 3) and outlined the classification process to identify the best products available for each section of the taxonomy and outlined the proposed process to support mutual recognition and benefit by sharing information across existing databases and inventory, as well as embedding links back to source databases to direct traffic to more comprehensive view of evidence than the high quality, high yield products in inventory*
- *Several working group members had comments and/or suggestions:*
 - *Karla highlighted the opportunity to collaborate with “evidence synthesis producers” in identifying areas within inventory prioritized for new and/or updated reviews*
 - *Gabriel shared that L*VE is developing database of COVID-specific evidence assessed for currency, credibility (which includes assessment of quality, readiness for incorporating into decision-making process; existence of evidence profile), comprehensiveness (e.g. if has indirect evidence related to COVID; multiple vs. pairwise comparison of interventions). Most easily applied to clinical and biomedical applications, though Gabriel suggested that could also be applied across other domains, such as health and social system arrangement and public health though*

may require greater judgment by assessor. Happy to contribute, share and collaborate with inventory development

- *David suggested identifying ways to also include systematic reviews developed as part of guideline development process (that are rarely in public domain). John highlighted that he continues to liaise with Julian Elliott and others in guideline space about making evidence profiles for living reviews publicly accessible.*
- *Elie made the following three comments and suggestions: 1) living (or recency) does not capture whether the review includes all relevant studies and pointed to the potential to use something like Epistemonikos' matrix tool to assess study inclusion; 2) raised issue of relevance of systematic reviews to decision-maker questions, highlighting difference between PICO questions of reviews and those of the decision-makers; and 3) assessing concordance across different systematic reviews*
- *John shared that systematic reviews in health and social systems, economic interventions often have do not have definitive answers or are less amenable to meta-analysis, making concordance assessment challenging in this domain (though not impossible)*
- *Use of declarative statements in REPs and in title column of taxonomy inventory meant as a navigation tool (with link directly to study) to help decision-makers identify evidence most relevant evidence to their question of interest (including statement describing nature of studies and where relevant*

4. IDENTIFYING NEXT PRIORITIES IN TERMS OF REFERENCE

Terms of reference

- 1. Contribute to the development and maintenance of the resources and tools for researchers considering and conducting COVID-19 evidence syntheses and encouraging its use by researchers and evidence users to avoid unnecessary duplication*
 - 2. Encourage updating or extending existing reviews in conjunction with other interested groups within and beyond COVID-END*
 - 3. Share evidence tables that can be used in local guideline-development processes (or local evidence-contextualization processes more generally)*
 - 4. Identify and promote guidance and expectations for conducting and reporting all the different forms of evidence synthesis that may be used to inform decisions and address issues related to COVID-19*
 - 5. Promote and share 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*
 - 6. Draft guidance for and promote living reviews (and living guidelines) where appropriate as an emerging standard for evidence synthesis in the context of COVID-19, ensuring that these encompass different content areas, intervention and review types*
- *Group briefly discussed whether guidance and reporting standards around a more diverse range of study types would be helpful.*

- *Shared a JCE paper lead by Andrea - Rapid review methods more challenging during COVID-19: Commentary with a focus on 8 knowledge synthesis steps
[https://www.jclinepi.com/article/S0895-4356\(20\)30616-8/pdf](https://www.jclinepi.com/article/S0895-4356(20)30616-8/pdf)*
- *Discussion will continue at next working group meeting*

4. ANY OTHER BUSINESS