1. INTRODUCTIONS

Taryn welcomed David Nunan from the Oxford Centre for Evidence Based Medicine. They launched a COVID evidence service in March (now have 200+ articles in various different forms; publish daily data of COVID rates and have produced 20 rapid reviews and syntheses) https://www.cebm.net/oxford-covid-19-evidence-service/

Others participating in the call:
Cheow Peng Ooi
Cristian Mansilla
David Nunan
David Tovey
Elie Akl
Gabriel Rada
Gunn Vist
Karla Soares-Weiser
Nikita Burke
Stephanie Chang
Taryn Young

Apologies: Andrea Tricco and Vivian Welch

Secretariat: Anna Dion and Safa Al-Khateeb

2. FOLLOW-UP ON ACTION ITEMS

   a. Notes from last meeting and any additional comments (see attachment 2)
   b. Final document on resources and tools for evidence synthesis for publication (see attachment 3)
      • Remains a living document that will be continually updated.
      • Group comfortable posting document on website and will refine in several weeks.

ACTION ITEM: Secretariat to share the document with the partners at Thursday’s meeting and send to COVID-END communications support to prepare for posting on the website.

3. NEXT ACTIVITIES IN LINE WITH TERMS OF REFERENCE

   a. Working group members sharing COVID-19 current evidence synthesis activities
• Evidence Synthesis Ireland (Nikita): working on reviews for prioritized questions identified by Cochrane, and aligning with CEBM and EPPI cente around questions that they need answered; fact checking service iHealthFacts

• Cochrane: (Karla Soares-Weiser): future 6 months is focused on series of living systematic reviews on diagnostic accuracy; and two LSRs combined with network meta-analysis on; treatment and prognosis.

• ARQS (Stephanie Chang): series of rapid reviews, including updates for practice pointers; ACTS Accelerating Clinical Transformation- digitally linking evidence ecosystem; shifted direction to focus on COVID topics; currently piloting linking initiative focused on anti-coagulation in the emergency department.

• Epistemonikos (Gabriel Rada): released L*VE COVID-19 collection; (iloveevidence.com) 6000 articles relevant to COVID-19 from across 30 databases; welcome feedback and testing with review groups. Gabriel asked all working groups member to share within their networks https://app.iloveevidence.com/loves/5e6f6b9669e00e4ac072701d

• NIPH (Gunn Vist): rapid reviews that have gone through 2-3 updates; maintain evidence map of COVID-19 https://www.fhi.no/en/qk/systematic-reviews-hta/map/

• McMaster Health Forum (Cristian Mansilla): contribute to rapid evidence profiles in response to questions coming from provincial and national governments https://www.mcmasterforum.org/new-at-the-forum/news-item/2020/05/21/rapid-evidence-profiles-addressing-challenges-related-to-covid-19

• Revisiting TORs and objectives to make sure we are doing work that really needs to be done; and making it most user friendly.

• Some comments from working group members:

b. Discussion of next activities related to terms of reference

• David Nunan suggested several advances. that would be important for the evidence synthesis community, including sharing evidence and evidence tables; guidance for living reviews as well as guidance on how to turn an existing reviews into living review.

• Critical to identify which reviews are planned to be (or are currently) continuous updated to reduce and complement updating efforts. Stephanie suggested linking to SRDR resource, which is a repository of the underlying studies and meant to allow better use and reuse of data by others
  • Unpacking what necessary vs. excessive duplication and how do we practically implement that (what would it take for a group to actively stop updating a review they have been working on)

• Important gap in information as many don’t know what others are doing and highlights role for coordination
• The group discussed how we would know we had an influence on the evidence synthesis community and how we would evaluate our work.
• Need clear criteria to appraise quality of systematic reviews and be able to filter these transparently to quickly meet needs for high quality evidence for decision-making
• Need a transparent process to prioritize content for reviews (particularly around complex topics)

ACTION ITEMS: Working group member to think about potential next priorities to address the TORs

4. ENGAGING WITH WORKING GROUPS AND ORGANIZATIONS
   a. Request for feedback from Packaging working group: suggestions of plain-language summaries of key evidence synthesis terms (e.g. definition of rapid reviews, what does a high AMSTAR rating mean, etc)

ACTION ITEM: Working group members to share any plain-language summaries on MS Teams

5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS