

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The co-chairs introduced themselves and welcomed other working-group members:

- a. Co-chairs
 - 1. Jorge Barreto
 - 2. Ruth McQuillan
- b. Members
 - 1. Cristian Mansilla
 - 2. Elie Akl
 - 3. Lynn Laidlaw (arrived late due to another commitment)
 - 4. Ooi Cheow Peng (regrets)
 - 5. Richard Ballerand
- c. Secretariat members
 - 1. John Lavis
- d. Researcher-observer
 - 1. Ahmadiani Saeed (missed meeting due to a scheduling issue)

2. REVIEW TERMS OF REFERENCE

- a. The co-chairs pointed working-group members to the working group's draft terms of reference (see below) and invited comments
- b. John pointed working-group members to the [list of priorities](#), which will soon be updated based on the February horizon-scanning panel meeting
- c. Working group members offered the following comments about the terms of reference and approach to addressing them
 - i. Need a framework to go from demand (as expressed through the horizon-scanning process) and supply (primary studies, evidence syntheses of different types, guidelines, and knowledge translation)
 - 1. Map what evidence syntheses already exist (using the COVID-END inventory) and what guidelines already exist (using eCOVID and possibly other sources like ECRI)
 - 2. Review the relevance, quality and currency of what is there (which can easily be done with both the COVID-END inventory and eCOVID), as well as whether citizens and/or patients were engaged in the syntheses (or guidelines) and in the primary studies included in them
 - 3. Identify where gaps exist, particularly for living evidence syntheses +/- living guidelines
 - 4. Brainstorm about potential teams who could address each gap and what might encourage them to take on the work
 - ii. Likely don't need a separate horizon-scanning process for guidelines given the panelists are focused on evidence-based insights, not whether they come in the form of an evidence synthesis or a guideline

- iii. Likely need to more explicitly prompt the panelists to drop topics that they no longer see as relevant
- iv. May want to monitor and evaluate the working group's process so we know whether we achieved our objectives and to understand the facilitators and barriers to such work
- d. Working group members agreed that at the next meeting we will:
 - i. Hear more about the horizon-scanning process
 - ii. Focus attention on further developing the above framework

3. DISCUSSION

- a. Working group members didn't have a chance to discuss potential additional members who should be invited to contribute to the working group, so we will address this at the next meeting
- b. Ahmadiani wasn't present to describe the Université de Montréal research study on communities of practice (see attachment 2 for description of study; see attachment 3 for observation consent), so we will also address this at the next meeting

4. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- a. No other business

Terms of reference for Prioritizing Working Group:

This working group identifies the topics for which living syntheses (and guidelines) are most needed and who can maintain them

Terms of reference

- 1) To review on a quarterly basis and suggest improvements to the methods being used in the COVID-END horizon-scanning project and more generally in priority setting for evidence syntheses and guidelines
- 2) To review on a monthly basis the COVID-END list of priority topics where living evidence syntheses are urgently needed and suggest improvements to their framing to enhance their decision relevance
- 3) To identify the potential leads of teams who can take on living evidence syntheses, encourage them to create interdisciplinary teams to do so, and foster collaboration across synthesis teams
- 4) To support these teams with tips, tools and other relevant resources that are made available on the COVID-END website