

Council paper 160522-8

Co-Eds Online Meeting with Karla Soares-Weiser, 28 March 2022

Chat text from the meeting:

21:07:43 From Roger Soll to Everyone:

I greatly appreciate your taking the time for these sessions...especially as a non UK group

21:14:36 From Zarko Alfirevic to Everyone:

How can we ensure that we have adequate communication regarding emerging thematic groups to avoid duplication of efforts and ensure that all relevant stakeholders have an opportunity to contribute. Is 'confidentiality' and competition be a big problem in this respect?

21:16:12 From Emma Sydenham (Injuries) to Everyone:

Dear Karla, I think there has been some confusion in the communication thus far. The strategic plans have indicated that Cochrane does not want 52 Groups going forward. It is not clear whether Cochrane wants CRGs to continue if the existing staff are willing/interested in carrying on?

21:16:33 From Karla Soares-Weiser to Everyone:

That is one of the ideas we are discussing - creating specific webinars and whenever possible to identify ways of meeting face-to-face. All results of discussions will form the topic of workshops later on (3-6 months) before a final decision

21:21:05 From Jacob Rosenberg to Everyone:

In Denmark we have 4 CRGs, and we are all willing to continue as such. We currently have funding, and if this structure with the 4 CRGs is changing then our funding is actually in danger of going away. So it may actually be a little dangerous to force a new structure through when looking from the Danish point of view. Maybe it is a similar situation in other countries where funding is secured?

21:23:06 From Emma Dennett to Everyone:

Where is the money coming from for the thematic groups?

21:24:13 From Alex Todhunter-Brown to Everyone:

I'm part of the "vascular" thematic group which has been mentioned. There is a question of what comes first - the thematic group or the funding. We have identified UK topic specific funding we could apply for - but don't feel we can apply without being able to explicitly say that we will definitely be recognised as a thematic group.

21:25:10 From Jan Hoving (v2) to Everyone:

Jacob, yes we have a similar challenge. New funding is coming and our funders like to 'recognize' our CRG's topic

21:26:01 From GRAZIELLA FILIPPINI to Everyone:

from Graziella

21:26:06 From Martin Burton to Everyone:

The question we have for discussion about thematic groups is as follows: 3.

What are the aims and objectives of the thematic hubs and what are the core activities and optional activities? Activities may include

- a. knowledge translation activities,
- b. promoting evidence-based practice and Cochrane within disciplines,

- Cochrane
- c. providing expertise for peer review, editing and prioritization within
 - d. seeking funding for hub activities and/or review production
 - e. review production*,
 - f. training in a variety of things, including but not limited to, using systematic reviews, understanding systematic reviews, preparing systematic reviews, etc
 - g. others

* but with the caveat that the decision to publish rests solely with the Central Editorial Team

21:26:58 From Zarko Alfirevic to Everyone:

Thank you Alex - your point is absolutely critical. Without a new Cochrane badge of approval, there will be no new funding and even current one may be lost.

21:27:17 From Roger Soll to Everyone:

what constitutes "all" editorial work? Does this include deciding what reviews will be undertaken by the review groups? Title registration? Assignment of authors? protocol development?

21:29:19 From Martin Burton to Everyone:

"review production" in the context I outlined above = authoring reviews, and not editing them

21:29:41 From Neil O'Connell to Everyone:

Suggest we need a clear demarcation of roles for thematic groups soon, currently they are a bit of an odd proposition to sell to a funder

21:29:45 From Alex Todhunter-Brown to Everyone:

My understanding of Martin's list of activities is that thematic groups could potentially "author" reviews, but not edit. Cochrane Stroke and others can see the advantage of this....

21:30:22 From Martin Burton to Everyone:

"My understanding of Martin's list of activities is that thematic groups could potentially "author" reviews, but not edit. Cochrane Stroke and others can see the advantage of this...." = YES - exactly what I mean

21:33:08 From Emma Dennett to Everyone:

Good Q Roger - are "we" keeping registered titles and publishing protocols?

21:33:29 From GRAZIELLA FILIPPINI to Everyone:

from Graziella Filippini. the MS and Rare diseases CNS Group has produced several Cochrane reviews in the last 20 years and was able to obtain independent public grants, . We would like to continue supporting Cochrane

21:33:44 From Zarko Alfirevic to Everyone:

Martin, have you any thoughts on the possible funding models for the thematic groups - thanks.

21:38:09 From Jan Hoving (v2) to Everyone:

Jacob: we have a similar luxury of getting more funding the next few years

21:39:01 From Jim Wright to Everyone:

We also have a similar situation to Jacob and Jan.

21:39:16 From Roger Soll to Everyone:

we have similar funding issues...nice to know this vision is several years downstream

21:39:26 From Emma Dennett to Everyone:

Is it desirable to find out CoEd's thoughts about what is going to happen with their CRGs? What if some big UK ones just disappear before March 23?

21:41:04 From Zarko Alfirevic to Everyone:

Unless someone waves a magic wand, our Pregnancy and Childbirth Group will s]cease

21:41:15 From Zarko Alfirevic to Everyone:

Opps

21:41:32 From Emma Dennett to Everyone:

Airways too, Zarko.

21:41:39 From Zarko Alfirevic to Everyone:

...will cease to exist on March 23

21:42:05 From Francesco Nonino to Everyone:

Multiple Sclerosis RG: For us too the possibility of surviving as a Cochrane group within a funding institution is connected with a topic (might not be MS, but should be within a similar area)

21:44:39 From Karla Soares-Weiser to Everyone:

I am mindful there are a number of questions in the chat - we will do our best to answer all questions, but could you please raise your hands if you would like to discuss in this call?

21:50:13 From Martin Burton to Everyone:

If you can find a funder who wants to pay for something to be done by volunteers (supported by a professional systematic reviewer) rather than by an experienced, professional author team able to work quickly and efficiently, then all will be well. But my guess is that most funders don't want to pay for that sort of review production.

21:50:41 From Martin Burton to Everyone:

And "he who pays the piper calls the tune" as they say

21:51:03 From janclarkson to Everyone:

I think it is so hard - to generate the next phase - it requires time and many co-eds don't have that precious commodity in addition to their regular jobs

21:53:03 From Alex Todhunter-Brown to Everyone:

In response to Martin - perhaps better articulated as a model "co-production"....a thematic hub with methods expertise, working in partnership with leading international clinical topic experts. This would potentially enhance knowledge translation as well...

22:00:16 From Robin Grant to Everyone:

The thematic groups when formed have to get in discussion with the international theme bodies - e.g. Cancer or Neurosciences as they have more contacts within the groups than Cochrane. Need to get the themes out quickly

22:00:51 From GRAZIELLA FILIPPINI to Everyone:

da g filippini we need to know whether cochrane is a UK editorial publication or an international collaboration

22:01:08 From Francesco Nonino to Everyone:

I agree in keeping these regular meetings

22:01:44 From gianni virgili to Everyone:

Thanks