Poster Concepts: INTRODUCE THE Making Guidelines Computable Working Group meeting Wednesdays 8-9 am Eastern

1. **Title changed to "What is Needed to Make Guidelines Computable?"**
2. **Background:**
    a. **GIN, Cochrane and GRADE technology work groups share long-standing aspirational goal of Digital Evidence Ecosystem**
    b. **GINTech participants created an interoperability standard - EBMonFHIR**
    c. **many are now contributing weekly in a Making Guidelines Computable Working Group**
3. **Objectives:**
    a. to enable efficient creation, sharing, and use of guideline content in machine-interpretable form
    b. image of multiple tools sharing through common hub
4. Results:
    a. screenshot of print Guideline (a specific recommendation)
    b. screenshot of Recommendation Authoring Tool - recommendation specification portion
    c. screenshot of Recommendation Viewing Tool - recommendation specification portion
    d. screenshot of Recommendation Viewing Tool - JSON for the portion
5. Future Directions:
    a. **Ultimate value is more robust and efficient methods for producing and sharing evidence, evidence synthesis, and guidelines**
6. **Additional concepts for the poster**
    a. **QR code — leads to view of the "Making Guidelines Computable Working Group page"**

What is Needed to Make Guidelines Computable?: A consensus-development exercise

Background:

The technology committees of GIN (GINTech), Cochrane, and GRADE Working Group share a long-standing aspirational goal of enabling a Digital Evidence Ecosystem with efficient sharing of evidence and guidelines. GINTech participants have created an interoperability standard for such data exchange (EBMonFHIR), and it is now time to prioritize system and tool developments to use it. The relevance and importance to the public is ultimately more robust and efficient methods for producing and sharing evidence, evidence synthesis, and guidelines.

Objectives:

To bring together participants who represent users of technology to produce, share, and use evidence and guidance, especially review authors, guideline developers, and guideline consumers.

To achieve consensus on a prioritized list of challenges to overcome to enable efficient creation, sharing, and use of guideline content in machine-interpretable form.

Description:

We will conduct a consensus-development exercise and report our methods using the Accurate Consensus Reporting Document (ACCORD) reporting guideline for consensus methods in biomedicine (https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1004326).

Activities/Interaction Plans:

We will briefly introduce the current state of the infrastructure to support an efficient Digital Evidence Ecosystem, including the standard for data exchange, the implementation guide for technologists, and current tools and systems using the standard.

The participants will then be oriented to the specific consensus development objective and the consensus development methods.

Participants will write their challenges on 3x5 cards that will be posted on the wall. Participants will then group the challenges (cards) by theme or steps in the workflow process, then determine within each group whether challenges are combined as the same or retained as different items.

Participants will individually add a mark to each challenge they consider a priority. The challenges will be initially ordered by the number of marks, then group discussion can increase the relative ranking up or down by discussing each pair of challenges to decide their relative priority.

Throughout the process, facilitators will document clarifications and modifications to the challenges, and proposed solutions, to capture the enriched discussion by the participants.

Alper B [1,2] , **Dehnbostel J** [1,2] , **Robinson K** [1,3] , **Kopp I** [4] , **Kunnamo I** [5]
[1] Scientific Knowledge Accelerator Foundation, Franklin North Carolina, United States
[2] Computable Publishing LLC, Franklin North Carolina, United States
[3] Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore Maryland, United States
[4] AWMF, Germany
[5] Duodecim, Finland

Title:

What is Needed to Make Guidelines Computable?: A consensus-development exercise

Background:

The technology committees of GIN (GINTech), Cochrane, and GRADE Working Group share a long-standing aspirational goal of enabling a Digital Evidence Ecosystem with efficient sharing of evidence and guidelines. GINTech participants have created an interoperability standard for such data exchange (EBMonFHIR), and it is now time to prioritize system and tool developments to use it. The relevance and importance to the public is ultimately more robust and efficient methods for producing and sharing evidence, evidence synthesis, and guidelines.

Objectives:

To bring together participants who represent users of technology to produce, share, and use evidence and guidance, especially review authors, guideline developers, and guideline consumers.

To achieve consensus on a prioritized list of challenges to overcome to enable efficient creation, sharing, and use of guideline content in machine-interpretable form.

Description:

We will conduct a consensus-development exercise and report our methods using the Accurate Consensus Reporting Document (ACCORD) reporting guideline for consensus methods in biomedicine (https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1004326).

Activities/Interaction Plans:

We will briefly introduce the current state of the infrastructure to support an efficient Digital Evidence Ecosystem, including the standard for data exchange, the implementation guide for technologists, and current tools and systems using the standard.

The participants will then be oriented to the specific consensus development objective and the consensus development methods.

Participants will write their challenges on 3x5 cards that will be posted on the wall. Participants will then group the challenges (cards) by theme or steps in the workflow process, then determine within each group whether challenges are combined as the same or retained as different items.

Participants will individually add a mark to each challenge they consider a priority. The challenges will be initially ordered by the number of marks, then group discussion can increase the relative ranking up or down by discussing each pair of challenges to decide their relative priority.

Throughout the process, facilitators will document clarifications and modifications to the challenges, and proposed solutions, to capture the enriched discussion by the participants.

- Submissions must not be longer than 350 words.
- If your workshop does not fit into this format, please choose alternative headings that are appropriate. Please include a statement on the relevance and importance to the public. This may be of direct relevance or it may be as a contribution to methods that result in more robust evidence production.
- The workshop title should not be longer than 20 words.

I suggest submitting a Workshop Abstract in the following Domain:
2. Research integrity making evidence accessible: including but not limited to the current publishing model, moving to open science, improving quality of peer review (or other approaches); challenges of predatory publishing, research integrity, problematic studies, risk of bias.

Subdomain:
- Ensuring accessible evidence for all

Your workshop should have clearly stated goals, include a high level of interaction with participants and provide a structured plan appropriate for the length of your workshop.

The philosophy of Global Evidence Summit 2024 is the power of synergy and collaborative effort. Joint workshops among Global Evidence Summit organising and programme partners are very welcomed and supported.

Think about current topics and issues that are relevant to attendees, the public, and consumers.

Not everything has to be new - participants also love good communicators who teach the basics well. Include hands-on work and examples of good practice or common errors to avoid - and maybe add some fun or a new interactive format to shake things up.

Plan for your discussions to be well-structured and useful - stay on track and make sure you have a good facilitator to guide discussions arising from topics on the day.

Promote networking – if you only have a small number of attendees (less than 15) consider a quick round of introductions. If you have more than 15 and people are on small tables together, enable time for quick small group introductions.

Avoid lectures - if, in a 90-minute workshop, you have more than
10 slides before starting an interactive component, you have too many!

We had brainstormed that the follwing might be addressed
- Backround:
we emphasize the need to etablish a digital trustworthy evidence
ecosystem- requiring collaboration
- Objectives:
Establishing a digital (FHIR- based) language is a necessity
- Activities
Fast Evidence Interoperability Resources (FEvIR),current stand of other activities in this context (Magicapp, Grade-Pro, AWMF-Project...(