

# Use of a Modified Delphi Process to Develop Research Priorities in Major Trauma

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00068-021-01722-z>

## For which topic were research priorities identified?

major trauma

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

Europe - United Kingdom

## Why was it conducted at all?

Major trauma is one of the most common causes of morbidity and mortality worldwide. The burden of major trauma is increasing in the UK with over 20,000 cases of Major trauma annually in England. There is no consensus regarding research priorities within the multi-disciplinary field of major trauma. This changing face of trauma requires consensus driven questions to address the research priorities affectin this new demographic.

## What was the objective?

to identify key research questions pertaining to the management of major trauma, involving key stakeholders in major trauma

## What was the outcome?

a list of 56 research questions

## How long did the research prioritization take?

February 2019 - July 2020

## Which methods were used to identify research priorities?

Delphi

## How were the priorities for research identified exactly?

Step 1: Delphi round 1: survey, participants were asked to submit research questions pertaining to all aspects of major trauma via an online survey, 201 questions were submitted. Step 2: data analysis: submitted questions were collated, anonymised, and then grouped into six distinct categories, after analysis and with consensus achieved 186 questions were taken forward for prioritisation in phase 2. Step 3: Delphi round 2: list of 186 questions, participants were asked to prioritize each question. Step 4: Delphi round 3: list of 114 questions, 56 prioritised major trauma research questions across 6 categories were identified

## Which stakeholders took part?

Delphi round 1: 65 participants: 2 patients, remainder were healthcare practitioners or researchers involved in major trauma. Delphi round 2: 37 participants. Delphi round 3: 64 participants. Participants: 30 medical staff (46.9%), 30 allied health professionals (46.9%), and 4 full-time academics (6.2%): medical staffs were either surgical (n=12), anaesthetic (n=8), emergency department (n=6), or elderly care physicians (n=4), within the allied health professional groups, the majority were paramedics (n=16).

## How were stakeholders recruited?

No information provided.

## 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.