



Scoping Working Group
 Notes from the Webex call on 20 July 2020
<https://mcmaster.webex.com/meet/rise>

Participants on call:

- Airton Stein*
- Charles Wiysonge*
- Gabriel Rada*
- David Gough*
- Jeremy Grimshaw*
- Kayongo Edward*
- Lucy Nakibuuka*
- Ocan Moses*
- Ruth Stewart*
- Safa Al-Khateeb*

<p>1. FOLLOW-UP ON ACTION ITEMS</p> <p><i>a. Review notes from previous meeting held on July 6 (see attachment 2)</i></p> <p><i>b. ‘Commentary on LMIC perspectives’ submission to Lancet</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACTION: <i>To be submitted by the end of the week by Ruth</i> • <i>Planning over a longer bit of time to collect more commentaries from global collaborators around the world which can be submitted later as a longer paper (Ruth offered to drive this forward with another WG member)</i> • <i>The second paper intended to add further richness, focus on socioeconomic concerns, and sustainability in low resource settings</i> 	10 min
<p>2. FUNDING</p> <p><i>a. Advice for funders on commissioning syntheses</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Aim is to try and provide general ideas or advice on what funders could do to be more effective in their commissioning to address their funded projects’ goals</i> • <i>Some advice that was raised included:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>This could provide a good opportunity to liaise with research groups involved in database screening and finding the same work/research in different databases – duplication in different repositories. It may be more efficient to have the same funding bodies for the various work streams in the evidence synthesis process.</i> ○ <i>One of the initiatives that funders can focus on is a need for infrastructure that allows re-use of information and allows efficiency (and reduce future cost) of groups to conduct and update their living reviews</i> 	15 min

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Investing in infrastructure that efficiently supports conducting and updating living reviews</i> ○ <i>Funders can focus on a more rapid process of conducting and submitting systematic reviews</i> ○ <i>Improve the ability to generate high-quality evidence for decision-makers</i> ○ <i>Evidence synthesis utilization and uptake by local organizations</i> ○ <i>Investing in evidence ecosystems and existing (trusting) relationships among knowledge intermediaries. Ruth pointed out that trusting relationships assists the process of getting evidence in the hands of decision-makers</i> ● ACTION: <i>Working group members to think about this further and circulate feedback to Jeremy via email</i> 	
<p>3. DISCUSSION OF COVID-END MID-TERM PROJECTS</p> <p><i>a. Sharing of lessons learned and insights from health sector to non-health sector</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Outside of the health sector, knowledge translation is more innovative and developed. J-PAL conducts thorough meta-analyses (do not synthesize their own studies)</i> ● <i>There is a need for further understanding policy options and ensuring the syntheses match the policy questions</i> ● <i>There is a need for increased health literacy</i> ● <i>Working group members raised the concerns of existing tools and guides in other non-health sectors</i> ● <i>Transparency of health evidence can be achieved through risk of bias tools, however in the area of social and economic research, there is little emphasis on structured methodology or risk of bias in evaluating research</i> ● <i>David Gough discussed national and regional portals of evidence that use the basis of 1-2 high-quality studies of positive effects to recommend programs. Therefore, the focus should be on the evidence base</i> ● ACTION: <i>David Gough to share evidence standards paper</i> ● ACTION: <i>Agenda item to be on the next meeting's agenda for further discussion</i> 	30 min
<p>4. ANY OTHER BUSINESS</p>	5 min