



MINUTES of PIG management meeting held on 10 March 2003

Present: Edgardo Abablos, Marion Campbell, Kirsty McCormack, Craig Ramsay, Shaun Treweek
Apologies: Barbara Farrell

Actions

1. Welcome and apologies

Noted: Apologies were received for BF. MC reported that BF would like to be kept informed of PIG's activities but unlikely to participate actively.

2. PST feedback forms

Noted: MC reported that the feedback forms had been reviewed and some common themes had emerged. It was suggested that these be discussed one at a time and a decision be made as to whether we should incorporate into the PST.

Noted: *'Front end' or introduction to the PST* - The first theme to emerge was the suggestion of an overall 'front end' to the PST. This would include a descriptive paragraph of what the PST was about and what it is designed to deliver. ST discussed the various software options and asked if this was required per section.

Agreed: An overall 'front end' was agreed and this will include a descriptive paragraph. This was not required for each section. ST will explore the various software options and circulate for comment.

ST

Noted: *Further reading* - EA reported that developing countries may find it difficult to access textbooks. Key papers could be included as core content but this would have implications for the size of the PST. It was noted that the Cochrane Library was not freely available but the Health Reproductive Library was free. Users of the PST could be directed to known free resources for key papers. MC suggested the use of an email repository service which could hold all key papers. This could be linked with Susanne Doepfmer and the protocol clinic. The PST could list all papers available on request. ST reported that this was feasible.

Agreed: It was agreed that ideally, further reading will direct the user firstly to free resources, secondly to an email repository, and thirdly will include as core content in the PST. ST will explore the possibility of setting up an email repository service.

ST

Noted: *Pilot studies* - MC asked if a separate section on pilot studies was required or if a sentence could be added to the appropriate sections. KMc agreed that a 'reminder' where necessary could be added rather than a separate section.

Agreed: A 'reminder' where necessary will be added highlighting the importance of pilot studies.

Noted: *Ethics* – All participants confirmed that feedback from their small groups emphasised the need for a single separate section on ethical considerations. It was currently lost in the other sections and needed to be much more upfront. KMc reported that if adopted this would be a different structure to the other sections. EA suggested that ethical issues specific to individual countries could be developed by each partner. KMc asked if EA could draft an example of such specific issues which could then be used as a template for other partners. The same could be developed for regulatory issues.

Agreed: There will be a separate section for ethical considerations. Each partner will be asked to produce ethical issues specific to their own countries. EA will draft an example to be used as a template by the end of June.

EA

Noted: *Staffing requirements* – EA suggested that this could be linked with a budgeting tool. KMc suggested that this could be a sub-section in trial management. MC noted that this could probably be covered by a checklist.

Agreed: This will be added as a sub-section in trial management and linked with the budgeting tool.

**KMc,
ST**

Noted: *Funding* – EA reported that the Health Reproductive Library has a list of all funders including telephone numbers and email addresses etc. CR asked if this was up to date and how often it was updated. EA reported that it was annually updated.

Agreed: Users will be directed to the Health Reproductive Library for a list of funders.

Noted: *Glossary* – All participants suggested relevant existing glossaries. These included ICH and Cochrane amongst others. The glossary has to be core content and should not occupy too much space.

Agreed: A glossary will be included as core content in the PST.

Noted: *FAQ* - MC suggested that a 'have you considered' at the end of each section would cover this. CR asked what the difference was between a 'have you considered' at the end of each section and 'things to consider' which has already been developed for each section. KMc asked if a FAQ about the PST was required. ST reported that this could be generated from future feedback.

Agreed: 'Things to consider' currently covers FAQ. FAQ is not currently a priority but may be developed in the future.

3. 'Other' feedback

Noted: *Stories* – EA noted that including stories depends on: a) whether they can be found; and b) the style of the writer. The difficulties in obtaining relevant stories were discussed in general.

Agreed: Stories will not be included as core content at present but reviewed at a later date.

4. Work Schedule

Noted: The work schedule was discussed and the timetable for expected drafts and expected translation was volunteered by the task leaders.

Agreed: The document is attached (appendix I).

All

5. Dave Sackett

Noted: Dave Sackett has offered to comment on all sections of the PST as and when required.

Agreed: The following approach was agreed: a) a draft will be prepared; b) this will be distributed to Dave Sackett and the PIG management group who will have 1 month to comment; c) any amendments will be made; d) this will then be sent to Argentina for translation.

6. Plans for the PIG meeting in Barcelona

Noted: EA reported that he has applied to Cochrane for funding to attend the Colloquium in Barcelona and should know the result by next month. If he is successful then he will not have to use Practihc funds and an additional face to face meeting could be arranged for another time with this money. If he is unsuccessful then Practihc funds will have to be used for Barcelona and a face to face meeting would have to be replaced by a teleconference.

Agreed: A PIG meeting in Barcelona around the time of the Cochrane Colloquium will go ahead.

7. Date of next meeting

Agreed: A teleconference or face to face meeting (depending on the outcome of EA's application) will be arranged for June.

KMc

8. Any other business

Agreed: References for each section will be kept to a maximum of 5-10.

Agreed: There will be links to key websites only.

Agreed: The publishing tool is an extra to the minimum deliverables and will be reviewed at a later date.

Noted: EA has developed a follow-up tool which could be included as a project management tool.

Agreed: KMc will contact the co-ordinating office re copyright issues. Global permission will be required and this should be centrally co-ordinated.

KMc

Agreed: The group needs to keep in touch via regular emails!!!!