



## Participating on call

*Andrea Tricco*  
*Brenda Kawala*  
*Cheow Peng Ooi*  
*Cristian Mansilla*  
*David Tovey*  
*Elie Akl*  
*Gabriel Rada*  
*Stephanie Chang*  
*Taryn Young*

*Secretariat: Anna Dion Safa Al-Khateeb*

## 1. FOLLOW-UP ON ACTION ITEMS

- *Taryn reviewed notes from previous meeting with no follow-up action items (see attachment 2)*

## 1. RAPID REVIEW METHODS IN THE CONTEXT OF COVID-19

*[Andrea Tricco]*

- *Andrea presented on a paper recently published on rapid review methodological challenges during COVID-19 (see attachment 3)*
- *The discussion then focused on:*
  - *choice of review methods in context of COVID, often driven by decision-maker needs and availability of evidence*
  - *deciding when to translate rapid reviews to full SR and/or living RR; often driven by decision-maker needs (often they are happy with rapid review), funding and capacity, need for in-depth literature search (particularly among more complex questions). Andrea mentioned her group is running a prospective quasi-experimental study to assess accuracy and conclusions from assessing same question through rapid review and systematic review*
  - *challenge of incorporating pre-prints into rapid reviews (challenging to search, appraise, and often poor indication that article has been updated, often with new data)*
  - *Brenda shared that rapid reviews are often produced in Ugandan context (and through COVPRES); they also train journalists to benefit from rapid reviews as often have ear of decision-makers*

- *similar to rapid guideline development, using standard methods but in a more intense and asynchronous process, though remains a challenge to apply previous knowledge about RR and SR to COVID-specific context*
- *repositories important resource to produce reviews rapidly without sacrificing quality*
- *opportunity for working group to provide more specific guidance when evidence process moves so quickly and address under-represented issues in current literature (e.g. duplication of work and how to address it)*

### 3. IDENTIFYING NEXT PRIORITIES IN TERMS OF REFERENCE

#### *Terms of reference*

1. *Contribute to the development and maintenance of the resources and tools for researchers considering and conducting COVID-19 evidence syntheses and encouraging its use by researchers and evidence users to avoid unnecessary duplication*
  2. *Encourage updating or extending existing reviews in conjunction with other interested groups within and beyond COVID-END*
  3. *Share evidence tables that can be used in local guideline-development processes (or local evidence-contextualization processes more generally)*
  4. *Identify and promote guidance and expectations for conducting and reporting all the different forms of evidence synthesis that may be used to inform decisions and address issues related to COVID-19*
  5. *Promote and share the quality assurance, publishing, translation and other benefits that come from working with major international evidence producers and publishers and considering how these should be applied in the context of COVID-19*
  6. *Draft guidance for and promote living reviews (and living guidelines) where appropriate as an emerging standard for evidence synthesis in the context of COVID-19, ensuring that these encompass different content areas, intervention and review types*
- *Not discussed at this meeting*

### 4. ANY OTHER BUSINESS