



Social Science Working Group Meeting

Wednesday, 07 Oct 2020

12:00 pm BST / 1:00 pm CET / 2:00 pm EAT

Action Items

- Coordinate our efforts with other planned webinars and see who to best link up with for coordination.
- Coordinator to share timeline for submission, draft of piece, and target journal. One person will bring the write-up together.
- Other working group members to input into the document by the deadline.
- Coordinator to extend an invitation to the Steering Committee member to observe the Social Science WG meetings.
- Co-chairs to follow up and contact *The Lancet* editors to find a best fit and format for our commentary piece.

Notes

Working group outputs

1. Vaccine webinars
 - a. A small group of us are planning the vaccine webinar series. The Secretariat has other webinars coming up, so let's plan ours after Nov. 16.
 - i. Comment: If we still want to do ours sooner, we can do it sooner. We can overlap with other planned webinars.
 - b. Cornell University organized a seminar on Covid-19 vaccine hesitancy in Africa.
 - c. Another one on Monday organized by WHO – Vaccine hesitancy and ethics.
 - i. One professor from Canada was on that call.
 - d. LSHTM group led by Prof. Larson is planning a webinar on vaccines as well. This is their second one of the year. The date is tentatively end of October.
 - e. Co-chair is working with the WHO on advising on community engagement for vaccine trials. They're engaging local actors in Colombia and India. She'll be in touch about linking up efforts for this roundtable. This is still in the very early stages of planning.
 - f. Action: coordinate our efforts with other planned webinars and see who to best link up with for coordination.
2. Commentary piece
 - a. Coordinator shared the outline earlier in the week. How can we move this forward?
 - b. The commentary piece can be led by one person and everyone else inputs in specific sections.
 - i. Submission goal of three weeks.
 - c. **What is our target journal?**
 - i. *BMJ Global Health* is good, but there are others as well.
 - ii. *The Lancet Global Health* is one option.

1. They have various options – viewpoint, etc.
2. Others agree – The Lancet is a good option. This is our 1st choice.
- d. WG members can input into the shared Teams document.
 - i. Coordinator to share a timeline – you have until X date to contribute.
- e. Action: Coordinator to share timeline for submission, draft of piece, and target journal. One person will bring the write-up together.
- f. Action: other working group members to input into the document by the deadline.
- g. *The Lancet Global Health*:
 - i. There is scope for the kinds of outputs we are thinking of.
- h. **Discussion on main point of the commentary piece. What is our main argument?**
 - i. Are we trying to plug into existing literature? Are we just trying to make this argument?
 - ii. What is the Steering Committee planning?
 1. The Steering Committee is following up their Commentary piece previously published.
 2. They were very impressed by the Social Science working group. They learned a lot about social science priorities. They also expressed that one member would like to participate in the working group meeting as an observer.
 3. Action: Coordinator to extend an invitation to the Steering Committee member to observe the Social Science WG meetings.
 - iii. **We should link our piece to *The Lancet* piece that the Steering Committee wrote.** The Coalition thought it's necessary to include social scientists in this work, and this is why. Then we can show what the priorities are.
 - iv. Rather than state the four themes, do we want to do mini **literature reviews to show what contributions social scientists have already made** regarding those topics? We could also highlight examples of where social science & clinical research have collaborated.
 1. This may take longer to produce, but it's another way of doing it.
 2. Should we include literature review?
 - a. We should situate it in the literature.
 - b. Agreed. **We should think of perhaps two papers**, 1 as a letter to the editor, and 1 as a literature review. We don't necessarily have space in the letter to expand on our arguments or situate them in the literature.
 - v. Other thoughts on having two papers rather than just one?
 1. Perhaps a Viewpoint would be most appropriate?
 2. **Do we want to get in touch with *The Lancet* editor and ask how to best situate our piece?**
 - a. Action: Co-chairs to follow this up and contact *The Lancet* editors to find a best fit for our commentary piece.
 - 3.



3. Discussion about our WG being a repository for topic guides and protocols
 - a. This idea is to create a repository to facilitate research on Covid-19. We could identify important documents, topic guides, and protocols for ongoing Covid-19 research and house this on our webpage.
 - b. Question: does the WG want to serve as a “home” for Covid-19 research topic guides?
 - i. Having examples would facilitate cross-learning.
 - ii. However, social science is of course different from clinical trials, so this may not apply to our discipline.
 - c. Responses: we should ask other social scientists what they are doing on Covid-19 globally, and to submit a very short abstract on the research question, topics, and geographic focus.
 - i. We don’t want to gather specific protocols or topic guides, as these can be very specific to a context. It’s not the norm in social science to share these documents with one another.

All other business and next meeting

1. Next meeting in two weeks