1. FOLLOW-UP ON ACTION ITEMS

   a. Review previous meeting notes and action items from August 28 (see attachment 2)
   b. Discuss inventory presentation from previous meeting and next steps for Recommending WG
      - Ivan reviewed the inventory presentation and discussed potential implications for Recommending working group
         o Possibility to highlight high quality guidelines in an additional column in the inventory, but would require assessment expertise, time and funds to do comprehensively.
      - Focus initially on low hanging fruit
         o link to work led by Yasser on critical care guideline assessments
         o link to INAHTA database, especially with respect to COVID-specific guidelines
      - Challenging to identify broadly applicable guidelines due to variations in context and different interpretations of SR findings; need to explicitly recognize these variations
      - Suggest increased accessibility of inventory by including outcomes assessed and time of treatment to know utility of reviews

ACTION: Group to consider any role for Recommending group in supporting inventory and linkages to guideline community; to be discussed at future meeting

2. RECOMMENDING WG PRESENTATION AT PARTNERS MEETING

   a. Debrief and discuss the presentation ‘International alliance and AGREE-ment of 45 rapid guidelines on the management of critical care patients with COVID-19’ (see attachment 3)
   b. Questions from presentation:
      i. From Per Olav Vandvik: Great work Yasser. How do you think your AGREE II scores compare with TRUST scores (IOM trustworthy guideline criteria tool, as used by ECRI Guideline Trust) compare?
      ii. From Elie Akl: Thanks Amer. Rapid guidelines use a number of “shortcuts”. could that explain the results on domain 3? AGREE II was developed for standard guidelines, and might not be optimal for rapid guidelines?
      iii. From Gabriel Rada: Thanks Amer, did you measure or plan to explore if the recommendations were up to date (e.g. based directly or indirectly [through reviews] including all of the available trials)?
      iv. From Per Olav Vandvik: I think rapid guidelines need to be assessed for trustworthiness and any shortcuts should be communicated through quality assessments
• Ivan shared that Yasser’s presentation was well-received at partners meeting and that a journal article describing this work has been submitted; he will update the group once published

3. GUIDELINES DOCUMENT
• Michael shared the guideline development document, with incorporated comments, a navigation guide at the beginning and an interactive flow charts later in the document
• Group members made several suggestions:
  o Stating that many organizations develop guidelines and document includes several examples
  o Including tools that INAHTA posts to support the evaluation of HTAs
  o Indicate databases that require sign-ins, registering, membership, etc (SIGN, EUnetHTA)
• Group to finalize document within next 7-10 days and then identify how to link together with the Synthesizing resource document

ACTION: Michael to share the document on Monday evening, group members to provide feedback by Friday September 18th to have a finalized version for the following Friday

4. JOINT SYNTHESIZING-RECOMMENDING MEETING

  a. Next meeting: Wednesday September 16th at 7am EST
  b. Agenda to include:
     i. Allison Tong from the University of Sydney to join to discuss core outcomes set
     ii. Discuss registry of guidelines (to be confirmed)

ACTION: Safa to send invitations for joint Synthesizing-Recommended working group to all members of Recommending working group