

Name: Mona Nasser

Standing for: Author representative

Nominated by: Zbys Fedorowicz (Bahrain), seconded by Donna Gillies (Australia)

1) How long have you been contributing to the work of Cochrane, and how did you first become involved? *I have had a variety of roles in The Cochrane Collaboration since 2005. I was a clinician at that time and was fascinated by the rigorous methodological approaches, the inclusiveness of the organization and the potential of systematic reviews to influence health practice, policy and future research. Since then, I have been involved in more than 20 Cochrane reviews with 9 Review Groups. From early stages, I was involved in training and mentoring new authors from around the world in conducting Cochrane reviews, disseminating the message of The Collaboration and increasing the geographical diversity of the collaboration. I had set up networks of authors in developing countries along with my collaborator Zbys Fedorowicz. I had represented authors in several internal committees and meetings of the Collaboration (see response to question 7). I have also been involved in creating new groups and committees in The Collaboration (Author Forum and Agenda and Priority setting Method Group).*

2. Have you helped to prepare or bring into practice a Cochrane Review? If so, what was your involvement? **Preparing Cochrane reviews:** *I have been involved in preparing several Cochrane reviews; contributing both methodological and content expertise. In May 2014, I have been author on 18 Cochrane reviews and three protocols. In five of the reviews and two of the protocols, I am the lead author. **Brining Cochrane reviews into practice:** I have been involved in discussions with policy makers and decision makers in Europe and Middle East on raising awareness about The Cochrane Collaboration, The Cochrane Library and supporting the use of Cochrane reviews in policy making and clinical practice. I worked for three years in German Institute for Quality and Efficiency in Health care (IQWiG) on quality assessment of systematic reviews (including Cochrane reviews) to incorporate them into a German/English evidence based patient information website (www.informedhealthonline.org). Currently, I work as Clinical Lecturer in Plymouth University teaching undergraduate's critical appraisal and using evidence to inform their practice and doing research around methods to conduct systematic reviews or prioritise topics for systematic reviews.*

3. What experience do you have of committee work (particularly at the policy-setting level) nationally, internationally, and within Cochrane? **Within the Collaboration:** *For the last 3 years, I have been the author rep on the Steering group of the Cochrane Collaboration and co-chair of the Author Forum of the Collaboration. I had also represented authors on the RevMan Advisory Group (it has been changed to a new committee in the last months). Other roles: Co-chair of the Bill Silverman Prize Committee (2014); Chair of the Agenda and Priority Setting Methods Group (2013-now), member of Methods Board (2013-now). I was previously the coordinator of the developing countries network, member of stipend, abstract and scientific committees of previous Cochrane colloquia. **Outside the Collaboration:** Member of the Research Committee of Plymouth University Peninsula School of Medicine and Dentistry, (2013-now) member of the Ethics Committee of Faculty of Health, Society and Education, Plymouth University (2013-now), member of the management team of PenCLAHRC (2012-now) and Institute of Sustainability Solutions Research (Plymouth University) (2013-now). I had other roles including: member on the advisory panel of 'Health care information for all by 2015', doing consultancy work for the Micronutrient Unit of the World Health Organization (WHO) and the World Workshop of Oral Medicine and was the international advisor for the EBM committee of Eastern Mediterranean Medical Journal Editors (EMAME). I represented the Cochrane Developing Countries Field and civil society in one of the ministerial preparatory meetings for the 2008 Global Ministerial Forum on Research for Health.*

4. What do you think would make you an effective member of the Steering Group? (a) **Diversity in the Cochrane Author's Community:** *It is critical that the author rep takes account of the diversity of the author community in the Collaboration in their work on the Steering Group, and I believe that I am able to do this. I have been working closely with many different groups in The Collaboration; worked with authors from developing and developed countries; native English speakers/authors for whom English is not their first language; and people with a wide range of health and methodological knowledge; patients/consumers, clinicians and policy makers. **Knowledge of internal structure and processes:** I have extensive knowledge how different groups in the Collaboration work as I had opportunities to attend meetings of centre directors, methods group convenors, editors and etc. I also facilitated the engagement of several external groups with*

*The Collaboration and set up new initiatives in the Collaboration so recognize the involved challenges in getting new projects forward. **Independence:** Despite extensive involvement, I had always voluntarily positions in The Collaboration so understand the difficulties of the voluntarily authors who are key in developing the content of the Cochrane Library. It also ensures that I have an independent view in engaging in internal discussions or decision of The Collaboration.*

5. What would you like to change about Cochrane and/or the Steering Group, and why? *When I joined three years ago the Steering group as the Author representative, I had three objectives that I hoped to achieve which are outlined in Question 7. For the coming years, I want to continue with the work that I had already done more specifically (a) to increase the geographical and language diversity of author representation in the organizational structure of The Collaboration (b) ensure that authors' perspective and satisfaction is adequately considered in the current organizational and strategic changes across The Collaboration. Any changes in the process or organization of The Cochrane Collaboration need to improve the experience of all individuals involved in conducting and updating Cochrane reviews. (c) to ensure that the technological enhancement in the Cochrane Collaboration facilitates communication and work processes for the Cochrane Authors. I am keen to highlight the importance of the "human" aspect along with the technological developments in achieving these objectives. For example, a culturally sensitive communication can be very helpful in enhancing communication between groups.*

6. What would you wish to achieve as a member of the Steering Group? *My respond to the previous questions outlines mainly what I want to achieve. My overall aim would be to identify strategies to increase the involvement of authors in the processes of selecting, preparing and updating reviews, and in the organizational structure of The Cochrane Collaboration. Through this, I would hope that the number of high quality, up-to-date and relevant Cochrane reviews and the number of authors who have regular collaboration with the Cochrane entities, will increase.*

7. For individuals seeking re-election: What do you think you have contributed to the work of the Steering Group during your previous three-year term of office? *I had three objectives outlined in my previous statement (a) Increasing author representation in the organizational structure of The Cochrane Collaboration; I worked with the previous author rep and Editor-in-Chief on establishing the Author Forum of the Collaboration and chaired the forum in the last three years. I worked across the collaboration to ensure that authors from different backgrounds are involved in committees and meetings as author representatives to diversify the author involvement across the organisations. I also pushed that more often author forum will be consulted in issues relevant to authors and tried to get issues rose in our discussion on the agenda. Details are available on <http://www.cochrane.org/community/author-forum>. Several of the issues raised addressed the objectives (b) Identify barriers that authors have in getting involved in Cochrane reviews and (c) Identify ways to enhance effective collaboration between authors and Cochrane entities in developing and updating Cochrane reviews. I tried to ensure that the diversity of the author community will be considered in this step. This included increasing the communication of important development with the author community through the author list, encouraging a two-way discussion by increasing the projects that ask for authors for comments and feedback, working with several committees including the RevMan Advisory Group, training working group and other meetings around linked data and other technology development meeting on ensuring that the future developments fits the need of authors. I am working with the central staff on developing platform to enhance the communication between authors and The Collaboration. The latter is still under development. I have also a key role in supporting the collaboration in achieving some of the strategic objectives especially target 1.1.*

8. Please state any potential conflicts of interest that might limit your participation in Steering Group discussions and decision-making:

(a) Core conflicts of interest: None

(b) Internal conflicts of interest: None

(c) External conflicts of interest: None