

Identifying Trial Recruitment Uncertainties using a James Lind Alliance Priority Setting Partnership - The PRioRiTty (Prioritising Recruitment in Randomised Trials) Study

Healy et al. (2018)

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-018-2544-4>

For which topic were research priorities identified?

recruitment in randomized trials

In which location was the research priority setting conducted?

Europe - United Kingdom

Why was it conducted at all?

Despite the problem of inadequate recruitment to randomised trials, there is little evidence to guide researchers on decisions about how people are effectively recruited to take part in trials.

What was the objective?

to identify and prioritize important unanswered trial recruitment questions for research

What was the outcome?

a ranking list of 10 research questions

How long did the research prioritization take?

July 2016 - December 2016

Which methods were used to identify research priorities?

JLA method

How were the priorities for research identified exactly?

Step 1: setting up PS: establishing steering group, identifying and engaging with partners and stakeholders. Step 2: collecting research questions: survey asking people to consider their own experiences of being involved in randomized trials across specific areas, 1880 question submitted. Step 3: data processing: data cleaning and collating uncertainties into research questions: merging similar themed questions and removing duplicates resulted in 496 questions, literature review conducted to ensure that all of the included questions were questions for which there was insufficient evidence, questions asked by more than 15 people and/or at least 6 of the 7 stakeholder groups were selected resulting in 31 unique questions for research. Step 4: interim ranking: via survey, participants were asked to select and rank their 10 important questions, resulting in shortlist of questions which were then cross-referenced with identified systematic reviews, weighted ranking based on stakeholder group computed, 25 questions moved forward to prioritization. Step 5: final prioritization: workshop: small group were formed: each group provided with shortlisted questions with stakeholder group rankings and an example quote from original survey submissions, questions had been sent to participants prior to meeting so that they could familiarize themselves with the list and decide on what was important to them, small group discussions, small group rankings, plenary consensus on ranking

Which stakeholders took part?

Members of the public approached to take part in a randomized trial or who have represented participants on randomized trial steering committees, health professionals and research staff with experience of recruiting to randomized trials, people who have designed, conducted, analyzed or reported on randomized trials and people with experience of randomized trials methodology. Survey: 790 participants: 83 persons invited to take part in a trial, 154 researchers involved in recruiting participants, 77 non-researchers, 124 principal investigators, 183 researchers involved in aspects of the trial other than frontline recruitment, 87 trial methodologists. Interim ranking: 815 participants: 108 persons invited to take part in trial, 146 researchers involved in recruiting participants, 63 non-researchers, 186 principal investigators, 206 researchers involved in aspects of the trial other than frontline recruitment, trial methodologists. Workshop: 26 participants: 10 public members from trials or trial steering committees, 7 frontline researchers or non-researchers involved in recruitment, 6 trial methodologists, 3 researchers or principal investigators.

How were stakeholders recruited?

Potential partner organizations were identified through a process of peer knowledge and consultation, through the Steering Group members' respective networks and through the JLA's existing contacts. Interim survey: The survey link was distributed by email and the survey was also available in paper format if participants preferred this format.

Steering Group members and partners were asked to promote the PS and survey to stakeholders via social media, relevant meetings, social media and any other opportunities that arose. Also social media profiles which developed with all Steering Group members requested to use pre-worded tweets, which included the link to the survey. no incentives were offered for return of the survey.

Were stakeholders actively involved or did they just participate?