



**COR-NTD 2015**

**Philadelphia, PA, October 22-23**

### **Breakout Group Summary Report**

This document is intended to capture the key outputs of your breakout discussion, and to be representative of the group as a whole. Please denote your group's topic, presentations and research priorities before the start of the session, and dedicate the latter portion of your session to determining the key discussion points, knowledge gaps and recommended steps. Also, please indicate whether your group's recommendations align with the specified initial priority target. Your report will be shared on the NTD-SC website, and will inform future advisory panel discussions and donor priorities.

#### **Section I**

*To be filled out before the session begins.*

#### **Breakout Topic:**

1E: How to Make a Case for De-Worming

#### **Presentations:**

- 1) Cochrane Review: approach, rationale and policy implications for control - David Taylor-Robinson and Paul Garner
- 2) The Educational and economic impact of mass deworming - Sarah Baird
- 3) Worm wars in the media - Katrin Verclas
- 4) Program perspective - Charles Mwandawiro

#### **Research priorities to be discussed:**

- 1) Take stock of challenges to STH control posed by the publicity surrounding the recent Cochrane Collaboration Review on STH and the re-analyses of an article by Miguel and Kremer
- 2) Bring together divergent perspectives on these challenges and their implications for STH control and the operational research that supports it
- 3) Establish priorities for communications and for operational research in light of recent events

*Form continues on the next page.*



**COR-NTD 2015**

**Philadelphia, PA, October 22-23**

## **Section II**

*To be filled out as the session concludes.*

### **What were your group's key discussion points?**

- What are the limitations of the Cochrane Review?
- Much of the media hype surrounding the Cochrane Review and the reanalysis studies seems to have been generated and encouraged by the authors or the journals themselves – is this a dangerous new trend in medical publishing?
- Given the recent controversy sparked by the Cochrane Review and replication of the Miguel and Kremer study how do we move forward?
- How do the quality and types of scientific evidence required for public health differ from those needed for clinical medicine and bench science
- How should the NTD community engage with social media?

### **What knowledge gaps (if any) did your group identify?**

- How to design epidemiological studies that robustly and ethically measure the impact of our mass deworming interventions?
- What additional outcome indicators and markers should we be measuring?

### **What next steps does your group recommend?**

- The community should consider alternative approaches, such as that taken by the Campbell Collaboration, for synthesizing data from mass deworming treatments.
- It would be beneficial to compile a data bank of epidemiological data from STH trials to permit secondary analyses, re-analyses, and meta-analyses of the data.
- In the future, when an academic or media controversy emerges that calls into question aspects of our global programs, it would be helpful to have a strong and rapid statement in response from WHO.

**Do your recommended steps align with the research priorities identified on page 1?**

Yes  No