*Three primary use cases to consider (see David Tovey's document for comprehensive walk-through of the use cases)*

1) *Researcher conducting a new review and wanting comprehensive results*
2) *Researcher continuously updating an existing review or overseeing living reviews and wanting to maintain comprehensive results*
3) *Policymaker/policy analyst who just wants to know, for a particular decision (in the COVID-END taxonomy) what the single 'best quality' piece of evidence says, and with supports for relevance assessment (e.g., quality, time stamp)*

*Key considerations/principles*

1) *Develop our thoughts in ways that can easily be understood by our colleagues (e.g., be ready to illustrate a practical application of any idea that is to be shared with the Synthesizing group)*
2) *Focus on 'ready for users' solutions (while understanding that many of them require complex technical underpinnings)*
3) *Others?*

*Other issues/ideas to consider*

1) *How encouraging reviewers' use of 'tools' (e.g., MAGIC, DistillerSR, REVMAN) can help with digital solutions to gaining efficiencies in the process (e.g., pulling classifiers/data from COKA to save time) while facilitating other important aims of the COVID-END community (e.g., updating living reviews - developing softward to suggest 'like' studies indexed in COKA, providing new meta data)*
2) *Whether integrating opportunities in the review registration process to do things like upload structured meta-data/results from reviews to a standardized format is worth considering (e.g., once a review is published, upload an exported RIS/CSV file that feeds data into a place like COKA so it can constantly source new data for citations in real time - putting in place something similar to what Cochrane has for REVMAN for other registries for COVID reviews only)*

| Use cases | Overlap with sections of the synthesizing 'flow diagram' for which digital solutions may exist | COVID-END diagram currently points user to following digital tools | Other digital supports that can help | Unmet needs (support from Synthesizing group?) | Opportunities (Digitizing group) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. *Researcher (new review)* | *Avoid duplication*<br>• *Access existing reviews (for a given decision-relevant taxonomy category)* | *Existing repositories (e.g., PLUS, L\*VE) and registries (e.g., PROSPERO)* | | • *Not all existing repositories/registries enable search by decision-relevant taxonomy domain*<br>• *Not all existing repositories include and* | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | • *Assess existing reviews (quality, comprehensiveness)*<br>• *Identify ongoing evidence synthesis* | | | • *report key assessment criteria (quality, last date searched, comprehensiveness)*<br>• *Not all existing repositories include non-indexed records (e.g., Oxford's rapid reviews)* | |
| | *Update 'out of date' review* | *None suggested* | | • *Not all existing repositories or registries provide ongoing support for 'new additions' since last date searched* | |
| | *Use digital applications and "crowd"* | *Lists of digital tools to support study identification and data extraction (e.g., COVIDENCE, DistillerSR)* | <mark>Enhance RIS</mark> | • *TBD* | |
| | *Register new protocol* | *Existing registries PROSPERO, Campbell and Cochrane registries* | | • *No registries for reviews focused on economic and social responses outside of Campbell (PROSPERO only focuses on health)* | |
| | *Plan methods and carry out search/search best sources of primary studies* | *Existing repositories for single studies (e.g., TRIP, L\*VE)* | <mark>COKA<br>Enhance RIS</mark> | | |
| | *Conduct and report review using robust methods* | *Methods guides (e.g., Cochrane, Joanna Briggs) – not digital tool per se* | <mark>COKA</mark> | | |
| 2. **Researcher (updating review)** | *Update 'out of date' review* | *None suggested but same repositories and digital tools needed as for conducting new review* | | • *Not all existing repositories or registries provide support for 'new* | |

| | | | | *additions' since last date searched* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *3. Policymaker /analyst only wanting the best review* | *No overlap* | *N/A (but possibly curated COVID-END inventory once available)* | • *Existing repositories of reviews, but* | • | |

Clarify the issue or decision to be informed

Avoid duplication of effort:
Identify and appraise existing reviews for currency, credibility and comprehensiveness

Access and assess existing evidence syntheses

Identify ongoing evidence syntheses

**Determining need for a review**

If you identified a current, credible and comprehensive review

If you identified an existing review but it is not current, credible or comprehensive

If you found no existing reviews, conduct a new review

**Use review to inform decisions**

**Update an out-of-date review**

**Consider replication**

- Identify the research question and most appropriate approach
- Assemble an appropriate team
- Use digital applications and 'crowd'
- Register the review protocol
- Search best sources of primary studies
- Conduct and report the review using robust methods

- Contact authors to determine their plans to update
- Assemble an appropriate team
- Consider guidance for updating a review
- Plan methods and search for the update

**Conduct the review or update**