



# MuSE *letter*

MuSE Newsletter - December 2024

## MuSE Consortium: Interest-holders

We have published a commentary about the replacement of the term stakeholder with 'interest-holder'. Read it here: [“Interest-holders”: A new term to replace “stakeholders” in the context of health research and policy](#) (Akl et al, 2024).



## MuSE Guidelines: Published Scoping Review

We published a scoping review of guidance for engagement in health guideline development. The objective of this review is to identify, describe, and summarize existing guidance and methods for multi-interest-holder engagement throughout the health guideline development process. Click [here](#) to read the review.

## MuSE Evidence Synthesis

We have published three protocols for syntheses that will inform the development of our guidance for engagement in evidence synthesis.

# of 4 protocols are now listed on our [OSF project page](#). The reviews will assess:

1. Methods for engaging people in evidence synthesis.
2. Impacts of engagement in evidence synthesis.
3. Conflict of interest issues when engaging interest-holders in evidence synthesis.

Stay up to date with the [Muse News](#)



# MuSE Posters from the Global Evidence Summit



## Involving interest-holders in evidence synthesis

Jennifer Petkovic, Joanne Khabisa, Lyubov Lytvyn, Olivia Magwood, Etie Akl, Pauline Campbell, Thomas Concannon, Holger Schunemann, Alex Todhunter-Brown, Peter Tugwell, Vivian Welch, and the MuSE Evidence Synthesis Team

**Project Goal:** To develop guidance for engaging interest-holders throughout the evidence synthesis process

### Background

Engaging interest-holders in the process can enhance the relevance and impact of evidence syntheses. While there is growing recognition of the importance of such engagement, guidance on effectively involving different groups remains limited, with most focus on patient and public involvement in primary research.

### Project Plan



### Types of Interest-Holders (11 Ps)



### Current Status

- Currently conducting the series of evidence syntheses, preliminary results available for 3/5
- Working with co-leads for each of our 11 Ps to discuss draft guidance, building from the preliminary review results and previous MuSE work

### Next Steps

- Plan to conduct international surveys regarding engagement at each step of the evidence synthesis process for each of our 11 Ps



Scan here to learn more!



## MuSE-Guidelines

This poster presents preliminary results of the MuSE Guidelines systematic review assessing the impacts of engagement on the guideline development process.

See the full poster:

<https://methods.cochrane.org/equity/muse-guidelines-impact-poster>

Want to learn more about MuSE? Read the [MuSE News](#) or contact [Jennifer](#)

## MuSE-ES

This poster presents our protocol for the MuSE-ES project.

See the full poster:

<https://methods.cochrane.org/equity/muse-es-poster-protocol>



## Assessing the impact of interest-holder engagement on guideline development: A systematic review

Lyubov Lytvyn, Jennifer Petkovic, Joanne Khabisa, Olivia Magwood, Caitlin Shyng, Pauline Campbell, Ivan D Graham, Kevin Pottie, Julia Bidonde, Heather Limburg, Danielle Pollock, Etie A Akl, Thomas Concannon, Peter Tugwell, and the MuSE Guidelines Team

### Objectives

1. What are the empirical examples of impact on the process in health guideline development across any of the 18 topics of the GIN-McMaster Checklist?
2. What are the empirical examples of impact on the content in health guideline development across any of the 18 topics of the GIN-McMaster Checklist?

### Background

Engaging interest-holders in guideline development is encouraged both for the democratic right to be involved and for methodological reasons to improve guideline quality. We considered 10 interest-holders: patients and caregivers, public, health care providers, product makers, payers of health research, payers of health services, publishers, policymakers, researchers, and program managers.

### Methods

This review is part of a four-review series by the MuSE Guideline Development team on interest-holder engagement (methods, barriers and facilitators, conflicts of interest, and impact). A comprehensive search was conducted for all reviews (until September 2022), and screening was done for all reviews simultaneously. There is no standard definition of the impact of engagement in guideline development, therefore, to guide data extraction of impact outcomes, we developed a draft conceptual framework. The framework categorizes impact on both the process and the content of guidelines, across each of the 18 topics of the GIN-McMaster Guideline Development Checklist, and across each of the 10 interest-holder categories.



### Results \*preliminary

A total of 35 studies (reported in 42 articles) were included in this review. Most studies were case reports (qualitative and mixed-methods studies). Reporting of the impact of interest-holder engagement was limited and heterogeneous. Authors reported impact on process or content for 4 of the 18 guideline development topics. Some studies grouped together their interest-holders when reporting on impact, thus this was reported under "mixed interest-holders." Impact was sometimes reported on more than one topic without clear distinction (e.g., 5 - topic selection and 8 - question generation), thus some impact statement contributed to multiple topics. Patients and caregivers are the most frequently reported interest-holder. Limited reporting about healthcare providers is likely because guideline panels consist of healthcare providers, and individual impact is not specifically isolated.

### Next steps

The findings of this review are intended to be used with the other reviews in the series to assist guideline producing organizations with engagement of different interest holders to improve the relevance and uptake of health care and public health guidelines.

Scan to learn more!

