

## 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 centre 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/5e6fdb9669c00e4ac072701d>*
  - *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) continuously 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**