

Minutes from Steering Group, EBRNetwork

October 7th, 2015, 7:30-8.45 AM, CET

At Cochrane Colloquium, Vienna,

Location: Galerie 13-14

Participants:

Matt Westmore

Mona Nasser

Karen Robinson

Klara Brunnhuber

Robin Christensen

Hans Lund

Agenda

1. RC reported from a meeting for the Cochrane administration.
 - a. They would like to increase contact between the many different subgroups related to Cochrane Collaboration. EBRNetwork was mentioned. AGREED: RC and MN will try to make sure that EBRNetwork will be included in that process
 - b. The same meeting in the Cochrane Collaboration discussed Patient Reported Outcomes (PRO). The EBRNetwork should remember to include that issue in the relevant papers at our road map for publications. One possibility could also be an EBR approach the PRO chapter in the Cochrane Handbook.
2. Status for the EBRNetwork since December 2014:
 - a. A list was presented.
 - b. DIGEST initiative discussed: EBRNetwork should make it very clear that EBRNetwork are involved "only" for the purpose of making the preparation of SR in relation to research more efficient.
 - c. AGREED: The EBRNetwork should identify all organisations, groups, and networks of relevance to the purpose of EBRNetwork. Both to know who to collaborate with and to secure we are not doing double work in different groups.
3. Issues from sessions at Cochrane Colloquium 2015:
 - a. "Where is the patient?" was a comment to the Bergen Statement on EBR. The steering group discussed the possibility to amend that to the paper under review, or as a commentary after publication. Patients could be related to the EBR approach in at least two different ways: A) As advocates for the of an EBR approach when doing research, B) As part of a research team.
 - b. The way a peer reviewer can use SR should be elaborated (see for example: Chapter 20 (in F. Godlee PEER REVIEW IN HEALTH SCIENCES, 2nd ed): The use of systematic reviews for editorial peer reviewing: a population approach, by T Jefferson and J Deeks.
 - a. A common agreement was made that the EBRNetwork needs to

- i. DEFINE a systematic review,
 - ii. The definition is necessary when the EBRNetwork are linking to or preparing a search filter for SR.
 - iii. The search filter may not be enough: clear inclusion criteria based upon the definition is needed too in order to secure that researchers are identifying earlier SR of relevance to their research.
 - iv. Finally, the definition is very important when preparing a new SR.
 - c. EBRNetwork should describe / publish something about the information specialists role in EBR
- 4. Strategy for the EBRNetwork. MN suggested that the EBRNetwork have three main area to consider right now:
 - a. Fundraising for the EBRNetwork's meetings and alike
 - b. Fundraising for the secretariat
 - c. Be very clear about how to collaborate with other organisations like EBRNetwork, such as Cochrane Collaboration, REWARD, etc.
 - Other areas:
 - d. "Systematic Sundays" blog. Matt has a colleague from NIHR who could help with the technical parts, and KB suggests Caroline Blaine from BMJ to assist in editing and alike. We still need an editor: all should consider a possible name.
 - e. When it comes to communication and dissemination EBRNetwork could be helped a lot with a "Campaign Manager". We should ask among all members of the EBRNetwork if they know someone or could help themselves.
 - f. International conference in 2017. AGREED: Should be one or a half day adjacent to Cochrane Colloquium or REWARD/EQUATOR conference.
 - g. The EBRNetwork should consider to initiate the development of frameworks to identify research gaps from systematic reviews regarding other types of question than the effect-question.
- 5. Organisational partnerships: there wasn't time to discuss that. **SUGGESTION: all steering group members should look through the attached suggestion and give feedback to Hanna and Hans before Friday October 16th, 2015.**
- 6. Steering group meetings: frequency and time at day. AGREED: Once every month. 5:00 pm, CET.
- 7. Unfinished: tagline, education kit and funding. there wasn't time to discuss that. On next meetings agenda.

NOTE:

All presentations from Cochrane Colloquium should ASAP be available at ebrnetwork.org ASAP.

If you have any suggested titles please mail HL.

NOT DISCUSSED AT THE MEETING

SUGGESTION FOR EVERY STEERING GROUP MEETING: Progress in our Road Map of publications.

STATUS per October 7th, 2015:

Paper 1: Evidence-based Research. An introduction and a systematic review.

First author	Second author	Authors	Last author	FUNDING
Klara Brunnhuber	Hans Lund	Carsten Juhl, Gro Jamtvedt, Karen Robinson, Marlies Leenaars, Bertil Dorch, Thea M Drachen, Matt Westmore, Monica Nortvedt, Peter Tugwell, Olwen Beaven, Mona Nasser	
STATUS as of: Oct 7th	The protocol has been submitted to Cochrane Methodology Review Group. The literature search has been performed. Individuals to select papers has been identified and they have received the hits they should go through.			

Paper 2: The Bergen Statement about Evidence-based Research.

First author	Second author	Authors	Last author	FUNDING
Hans Lund	Klara Brunnhuber	Carsten Juhl, Karen Robinson, Marlies Leenaars, Bertil Dorch, Robin Christensen, Gro Jamtvedt, Monica Nortvedt	Iain Chalmers	
STATUS as of: Oct 7th, 2015	Submitted Sept. 12th, 2015 to The BMJ			

Paper 4: The implications of Evidence-based Research for funding agencies – a checklist with explanations

First author	Second author	Authors	Last author	FUNDING
Matt Westmore	Mona Nasser	Sheetal Bhurke (One of Matt's research fellows)		
STATUS as of Oct 7th, 2015	Matt and Mona was encouraged to go on with this paper – September 30th, 2015			

Paper 5: The implications of Evidence-based Research for editors – a checklist with explanations

First author	Second author	Authors	Last author	FUNDING
[Klara would like to identify someone]		Matt could ask one of our Editors (NIHR Journals Library), Peter Tugwell		
STATUS as of: Oct. 7th, 2015	Klara B made a very useful presentation at Cochrane Colloquium that could be the first outline for the paper. One of the participants at the session asked specifically for the content of the presentation			

Paper 6B: The implications of Evidence-based Research for patients – a checklist with explanations

First author	Second author	Authors	Last author	FUNDING
Peg Ford				
STATUS as of: Oct. 7th, 2015	Peg Ford has accepted to be first author of this paper.			

Paper 7(Clinical): How to write the Introduction incorporating systematic reviews of existing evidence in clinical trials.

First author	Second author	Authors	Last author	FUNDING
Karen Robinson	Kjetil G. Brurberg	Rita Banzi? (rita.banzi@marionegri.it) Carsten Juhl, Hans Lund, Sheetal Bhurke (Matt's research fellows), Amanda Young (Matt's Senior Research Fellow), Peter Tugwell		
STATUS as of Oct 7 th , 2015	Authors has been asked whether they would include Rita Banzi (member of the ECRIN (http://www.ecrin.org/en/) as author.			

Paper 8(Clinical): How to write the Discussion incorporating systematic reviews of existing evidence in clinical trials.

First author	Second author	Authors	Last author	FUNDING
Karen Robinson	Kjetil G. Brurberg	Rita Banzi? (rita.banzi@marionegri.it) Carsten Juhl, Hans Lund, Sheetal Bhurke (Matt's research fellows), Amanda Young (Matt's Senior Research		

		Fellow), Peter Tugwell		
STATUS as of Oct 7 th , 2015	Authors has been asked whether they would include Rita Banzi (member of the ECRIN (http://www.ecrin.org/en/) as author.			

Paper 9: When is enough enough? Methods to decide when a new study would add new knowledge or would be redundant. An evidence-based research approach when preparing new scientific studies.

First author	Second author	Authors	Last author	FUNDING
Robin Christensen	Carsten Juhl	Mona Nasser, Kjetil G. Brurberg, Hanna Nykvist, Amanda Young (Matt's Senior Research Fellow), Asbjørn Hrobjartsson, Birgitte Espehaug, Peter Tugwell, Hans Lund	Karen Robinson	
STATUS as of: Oct. 7 th , 2015	Robin will write an outline (September 2015). Participants at the last EBR session at Cochrane Colloquium asked for that paper			

Paper 10 The Vienna Principles for automation of systematic reviews

First author	Second author	Authors	Last author	FUNDING
Karen Robinson	Hans Lund	Robin Christensen	Paul Glasziou	
STATUS as of: Oct. 7 th , 2015	Karen will draft an outline			

NOT IN PROGRESS:

Paper 3: The implications of Evidence-based Research for ethics committees – a checklist with explanations

Paper 6: The implications of Evidence-based Research for educators – a checklist with explanations

Paper 7(Animal): How to write the **Introduction** incorporating systematic reviews of existing evidence in animal studies.

Paper 7 (Epidemiology): How to write the **Introduction** incorporating systematic reviews of existing evidence in epidemiologic studies.

Paper 7 (Humanistic): How to write the **Introduction** incorporating systematic reviews of existing evidence in humanistic studies.

Paper 7 (Mechanistic): How to write the **Introduction** incorporating systematic reviews of existing evidence in mechanistic studies.

Paper 8(Animal): How to write the **Discussion** incorporating systematic reviews of existing evidence in animal studies.

Paper 8 (Epidemiology): How to write the **Discussion** incorporating systematic reviews of existing evidence in epidemiologic studies.

Paper 8 (Humanistic): How to write the **Discussion** incorporating systematic reviews of existing evidence in humanistic studies.

Paper 8(Mechanistic): How to write the **Discussion** incorporating systematic reviews of existing evidence in mechanistic studies.