

Joanna Briggs Institute

Scientific Committee Minutes

Minutes of the 3rd Scientific Committee meeting held in the JBI Boardroom on Wednesday 17th August 2016 commencing at 8.30am

1. WELCOME

The Chair welcomed all present.

2. PRESENT

Assoc Prof Zachary Munn (Chair), Assoc Prof Ed Aromataris, Assoc. Prof Craig Lockwood, Dr. Micah Peters, Dr. Catalin Tufanaru, Ms. Alexa McArthur, Mr. Sandeep Moola, Dr Lucylynn Lizarondo, Dr Jared Campbell, Ms Dagmara Riitano, Mrs. Pam Fletcher (Minutes)

ON TELECONFERENCE

Prof Hu Yan, Dr. Hanan Khalil,

APOLOGIES

Assoc. Prof Christina Godfrey, Prof Fiona Bath-Hextall, Assoc.Prof Trish McInerney, Dr Matthew Stephenson

3. STANDING ATTENDEE

Ms Dagmara Riitano

4. MINUTES

The minutes of the 2nd meeting of the Scientific Committee for 2016 held on 11 May 2016 were moved by Dr. Hanan Khalil and seconded by Assoc Prof Ed Aromataris as an accurate record.

5. MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

Action item for Alexa under Implementation Reports has not been done. Unsure of exact requirement. **ACTION:** Pam to listen to original voice recording and advise Alexa of instruction.

Action item for Ed regarding Complementary Subscriber List for JBISRIR has been addressed and all Centre Directors should have received their access by now.

6. FORMAL BUSINESS

SYNTHESIS- Assoc Prof Ed Aromataris

6.1 2016 Reviewers Manual update

- Not discussed.

6.2 Methodology groups updates and chapter review

6.2.1 Effectiveness –

- NEW Effectiveness Chapter finalized by Catalin on 27 May 2016; received feedback from Zac on 02 June 2016; waiting for feedback from Ed.

6.2.2 Psychometric – Call for chair of Group to be made.

ACTION- Ed to send email to JBC to ask for interest in being chair for this group.

6.2.3 Qualitative - Group meeting in June via teleconference. Meeting report:

- Daphne Standard has been invited, and has joined the group
- The term credibility was established as the preferred term for representativeness of participant voice in meta-aggregative reviews,
- The term plausibility will no longer be referred to in meta-aggregation
- The group agreed to undertake at least one paper per year on aspects of JBI



qualitative synthesis

- The group would have a meeting frequency of 8 weeks
- The group will meet face to face once per year
- Will be presented at the Cochrane Conference in Seoul

6.2.4 Prevalence - Finalising critical appraisal tool write up for the JBISIRIR special edition. Would like to do some further testing and validation of the tool, but have not begun this process as yet. Will be presented at the Cochrane Conference in Seoul.

6.2.5 Scoping – No work has been carried out by the scoping review group. Dr Palle Larsen, Director of the Danish centre, has expressed an interest in joining the group.

6.2.6 Etiology and Risk – The Chapter on 'etiology and risk' was reviewed by Ed as a final step and based on his feedback, there are some changes to the chapter, particularly in the 'synthesis/meta-analysis' section. Will soon make those changes and send the revised version to Ed.

6.2.7 Umbrella – The chapter's methodology will be presented at the Cochrane conference in Seoul during November.

6.2.8 Text and Opinion – The group hasn't met since last meeting, but plans to meet face-to-face at the November conference for further discussion.

6.2.9 Economics – no new work to report

6.2.10 Mixed methods – From the previous meeting (May 2016), it was reported that the mixed methods group have reviewed the 'Mixed Methods Review Manual' and raised a number of methodological issues. What has emerged from the discussions within the group was that more guidance in undertaking a mixed methods review is required to address those issues. Cindy, Matthew and Lucy have also planned to update a mixed methods review (Cindy's review project) and use this as a worked example in the next iteration of the manual.

- The mixed methods (MM) group from JBI headquarters has identified recent mixed methods review publications from the JBI library which can potentially be used as worked examples for the next version of the manual.
- A couple of changes in the online module for mixed methods have been made based on the MM group's discussion (as per above)
 - Reference to the use of economic evidence in mixed methods review was removed
 - The results/overall findings table of the current worked example (i.e. the self-monitoring of blood glucose review)
 - Note: These changes are also reflected in the new face-to-face CSR module
- Cindy, Matthew and Lucy are still working on their review.

ACTION- Ed to send email to JBC to ask for interest in being chair for this group.

6.2.11 Diagnostic – no new work to report

6.2.12 LoEgOR – Have met recently to develop a program of work. Will be reviewing and updating guidance if necessary. Also developing two flowcharts to help decide upon critical appraisal tool and also for deciding what systematic review to include. Also have submitted a proposal to the scientific committee regarding recommendations in reviews.

Methodological Group Discussion:

Ed answered Hanan's query that all this new work (2016) will be on line and moving forward when chapters become available the on line site will be updated quickly specially effectiveness and meta aggregation as they are the two most popular.

Catalin queried our Umbrella chapter has no synthesis only summary or presentation.

- He advised international literature now has methods for meta-analysis in Umbrella reviews.
- Suggest effectiveness and umbrella groups need to work together on developing new methods to get JBI meta-analysis in umbrella reviews.
- Ed talked of need to further develop JBI methodology for summary results on where it worked and where it did not.
- We do not need to invent it as literature is already out there; but need is to adapt it for JBI as now methods can combine observational and quasi experimental, which are now accepted in international literature.

6.2.12.1 LoEGoR 'Proposal from LoEGoR working group (refer Attachment 2)

To make proposals explicit in JBI Reviews re Grades of recommendations. Currently SR's have wording of Implications for Research and Implications for Practice which can be quite variable.

Proposal moved by chair "*That the Implications for practice and Implications for research sections within the templates for JBI reviews be reworded to Recommendations for practice and Recommendations for research. These recommendations will be required to follow JBI guidance and be assigned a JBI GRADE of recommendation.*"

Hanan commented about Cochrane's process and Zac explained they do Summary of findings not Grades of Recommendations and then they rank the findings of each outcome in terms of the confidence according to the GRADE working group. JBI do Summary of finding in effectiveness reviews. The proposal is simply to replace "implications" with "Recommendations" (a change in the heading) and assign a Grade.

Craig explained JBI

- Originally had use of expert reference groups (of clinicians) so the SR's gave simple narrative directions from those clinicians on what was important?
- Had a team that would discuss findings and develop recommendations.
- Over the years has produced fewer recommendations in SR's.
- Now uses software that can deliberately generate information to inform and guide policy and practice.

Hu Yan stated she liked the idea to change from *implications* to *recommendations*

- To make it clear to authors on how to apply their results.
- She noted that a peer group is used to make decisions for recommendations and that an author is not solely able to make decision or have ability to make appropriate recommendations.
- We should use caution with terminology.

Zac advised that JBI guidance addresses

- The fact a SR should have a panel on development and conduct of the SR, although in reality they are not always used, even though guidance has been provided.
- It is envisaged a review team and panel would provide input to craft recommendations.
- He reiterated that it is a multi-disciplinary panel that should be used to review and information has been in all of the previous and current reviewer's manuals.

Catalin noted to make

- Distinction between Recommendations for Practice and applicability of the results in specific circumstances.
- He advised of a new section in the reviewer's manual on the applicability and limitations of the results.
- Factors that should be considered when judging the applicability of the results in different contexts will help authors, users and reviewers of the review when it is OK to apply the recommended practice or not.

Discussion closed and voted all in favour to accept proposal. Work will now begin on implementation of this proposal. SR Templates will be updated and further feedback will be provided to this committee on rollout

ACTION: LoEGoR working group to update SR templates, training materials and reviewer's manual guidance reflecting this change.

6.2.12.2 LoEGoR Critical Appraisal Flowchart (refer Attachment 3)

Comments were taken on Attachment 3 being the flowchart to assist systematic reviewers on choosing a critical appraisal tool based on the study design or characteristic of a paper.

- The reason this has been developed is we know in some SR an inappropriate tool was used and sometimes there is confusion on the correct tool to use.
- Hanan liked it as a student or Journal Club tool.
- Trish sent email saying she liked it too.
- HuYan was impressed it was a clear concise flowchart.
- Craig asked if it was targeted at the level of individual studies is that because within a review- could it be at the next level up then what are the tools that will guide that thinking . If RCT's were pseudo randomly allocated would that meet criteria for quasi experimental.
- Zac explained the way we deal with the results of critical appraisal and that we advise authors to be as specific as possible.
- Ed talked of the "which review for you "target that will join up with this flowchart eventually.
- Jared and Dagmara, did not like the table and suggested a paragraph of words instead.
- There will be a few changes to the flowchart, then formal testing, publish and training.

ACTION: LoEGoR to make changes to the template then send out for testing before incorporating in training materials and reviewer's manual guidance.

6.3 Critical appraisal tools

6.3.11 The Chair confirmed all Critical Appraisal tools are now on line at the .org website and to please promote them. Ed stated the tools have "how to cite" information which can be used in the manuscript instead of an appendix

TRANSFER – Assoc Prof Zac Munn

6.4 Transfer Science Research Program: SUMARI report

Chair advised the plan to launch in November is still on track, with team doing fortnightly updates.

It is being used and tested. All steps in SR up to Meta-Analysis being complete and you can export data. Let Zac know if you want to test software.

Zac answered Hanan's question that you can access new SUMARI in test only and please use current version till launch date.

Zac answered Catalin's query on meta-analysis zero cell saying this will be implemented soon.

IMPLEMENTATION – Ms Alexa Mc Arthur

6.5 Implementation methods group report

Alexa reported that the Implementation group has continued to meet with July meeting having very engaged discussion. Ongoing Internal work at JBI on draft methodology chapter which is still a work in progress and not ready to be sent out to the working group externally.

Continued work on some methodology papers in the Implementation science team.

In November there will be face-to-face meetings for further discussion. There will be an Alumni event at November conference for those involved in Implementation work. New PACES tool has moved to 2017, with work continuing.

Hu Yan praised Alexa on the unique approach JBI has taken to Implementation work, compared to Cochrane, and she looks forward to its fruition. Alexa advised there have been a lot of presentations by JBI staff which has resulted in good conversations around it, which is good.

7. MATTERS FOR REPORTING

7.1. JBISRIR Report -

- PubMed indexing issues– addressing this now.
- Dagmara managing process of receiving feedback from Editorial board to authors
- EM training on platform this Friday
- Impact factor not directly with Web of Science but when in PubMed goes to Medline.
- All of 2015 in WoS – it is a long process.
- Web of science counts the impact – please ensure you cite and support each other in this process.
- Hanan warned to be mindful of having interesting articles - could lose out on a high impact factor.
- JBISRIR mainly has protocols, which will mainly only get one citation.
- Declined articles were from our legacy system because authors had not made requested improvements.
- We are racing to tie off the legacy system as we have lots of new EM content.
- Catalin queried if a Twitter button was available, Ed advised it was in each article however Dagmara will add this to agenda of items to ask at EM training on Friday 19th (if we can we get it on front page).

ACTION: Dagmara and Ed to chat offline with Hanan re her Journal management

MATTERS FOR NOTING

7.2 Timetable of Meeting dates

7.3 New Terms of Reference

7.4 Aims and objectives of the Scientific Committee for 2016.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Hu Yan asked about GIN 'adapt' network. JBI is a founding and organizational member of Guidelines International Network (GIN).

Adapt is a legacy system, not updated for a very long time and GIN not sure what to do with it.

No website, integrated with GIN, is out of date and due for major upgrade and revision, GIN cannot do this work themselves and rely on volunteer groups around the world to do it.

CAN Implement is based on strong scholarly work from the Canadian Institutes for Health Research funded for 5 year program across provinces to develop an approach to adapt guidelines more appropriate to novice groups, clinicians, societies and associations where primary role was not actually Guideline development. Founded on the Knowledge to Action cycle (KTA), it has robust theoretical base behind it and JBI has worked with queens University in Toronto to take the Can Implement approach and turn it into an on-line resource. Called CAN Implement PRO. Now in open access beta testing. Welcome queries from anyone interested in using it and give feedback on their use of it. Hoping it will become more analogous with guideline adaptation than previous old 'adapt'.

Catalin discussed the concept of comprehensive review versus mixed method review. Do we want to continue to use the term comprehensive or discontinue comprehensive and replace with mixed methods and provide guidance about different types of mixed methods reviews?

Zac advised the mixed methods group is working on changes in terminology, which will be brought to this committee in the future.

9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be during the Committee of Directors as a face-to-face meeting on 7 or 8 November 2016 - exact date and time will be advised as soon as possible.

Meeting closed at 9.26am