

# Top 10 Research Priorities for U.S. Military en Route Combat Casualty Care

<https://doi.org/10.1093/milmed/usaa480>

## For which topic were research priorities identified?

military en route combat casualty care

## In which location was the research priority setting conducted?

North America - USA

## Why was it conducted at all?

Despite these innovations and improvements, there are gaps in knowledge for which research is needed to fill to guide practice and policy decisions about individual patient movement, medical planning factors, and the future state of en route care. Recognizing the need to ensure evidence-based practice and policies, the Committee on En Route Combat Casualty Care (CoERCCC) was established in 2016 as part of the DoD Joint Trauma System with the goal of creating practice guidelines, recommending training standards, and identifying research priorities using methods previously developed by the Committee of Tactical Combat Casualty Care.

## What was the objective?

to identify the top 10 priority topics as a road map for future en route care research

## What was the outcome?

a ranking list of 10 research topics

## How long did the research prioritization take?

No information provided.

## Which methods were used to identify research priorities?

survey

## How were the priorities for research identified exactly?

Step 1: research topics, research questions, and technological developments were identified. Step 2: survey: participants asked to review each topic and definition and indicate any recommended changes, participants then asked to rate the importance of each topic

## Which stakeholders took part?

Physicians, enlisted medical personnel (flight medics, respiratory therapists, and special forces medics), and nurses. 33 participants: 16 physicians, 7 enlisted flight medics, 5 other enlisted positions, 5 registered nurses.

## How were stakeholders recruited?

Participants were recruited via CoERCCC.

## 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.