

Defining a Research Agenda for Layperson Prehospital Hemorrhage Control a Consensus Statement

<https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.9393>

For which topic were research priorities identified?

prehospital hemorrhage control

In which location was the research priority setting conducted?

international

Why was it conducted at all?

Trauma is the leading cause of death for US individuals younger than 45 years, and uncontrolled hemorrhage is a major cause of trauma mortality. The US military's medical advancements in the field of prehospital hemorrhage control have reduced battlefield mortality by 44%. However, despite support from many national health care organizations, no integrated approach to research has been made regarding implementation, epidemiology, education, and logistics of prehospital hemorrhage control by layperson immediate responders in the civilian sector.

What was the objective?

to create a national research agenda to help guide future work for prehospital hemorrhage control by laypersons

What was the outcome?

a list of 24 research questions

How long did the research prioritization take?

2 days

Which methods were used to identify research priorities?

Delphi

How were the priorities for research identified exactly?

Step 1: literature review: to collect research priorities. Step 2: 2-day meeting: to conduct Delphi process, before meeting the literature review was distributed to participants, and each participant was assigned 2 of the 5 themes for rating. Step 3: Delphi round 1: question generation: participants wrote research questions on color-coded index cards, 487 research questions generated. Step 4: study team members collected cards and grouped, deduplicated, and condensed them into candidate research questions, 162 research questions remained within 5 themes. Step 5: Delphi round 2: participants were asked to rate each question, results were sorted into high-, low- and uncertain-priority groups, 92 questions scored as high priority and 70 scored as uncertain priority. Step 6: Delphi round 3: discussion of summary results, participants were asked to re-rate the 70 uncertain-priority questions, resulting in final consensus on 113 high priority questions, among them 24 top high priority questions

Which stakeholders took part?

Subject matter experts, professional society-designated leaders, representatives from the federal government, and representatives from private foundations. 45 participants.

How were stakeholders recruited?

Participants were recruited via a conference.

Were stakeholders actively involved or did they just participate?

Stakeholders were mere participants of the research prioritization process; they were not actively involved in the process.