

# International Consensus on Military Research Priorities and Gaps - Survey Results from the 4th International Congress on Soldiers' Physical Performance

Lovalekar et al. (2018)

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2018.05.028>

## **For which topic were research priorities identified?**

military personnel's health and physical performance

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

international

## **Why was it conducted at all?**

The physical demands and conditions under which military personnel perform are unique. Most countries and militaries have scientists, clinicians and human performance personnel researching factors that affect military personnel's performance, readiness, resiliency and health. This applied research needs to address a wide array of factors, both in the training and operational environment. There is a need for innovative strategies to improve physical fitness, physical training, resiliency, and prevent injuries.

## **What was the objective?**

to identify perceived priorities related to military personnel's health and physical performance

## **What was the outcome?**

a list of 10 research areas

## **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: survey: to assess opinions about perceived gaps and priority topics related to military health and physical performance, participants were asked to rate 43 general areas of research important to military personnel's physical performance

## **Which stakeholders took part?**

Experts in military performance, clinicians and military personnel from all over the world. 140 participants: 40.6% military, 58.9% civilian.

## **How were stakeholders recruited?**

Participants were registrants of the 3rd International Congress on Soldiers' Physical Performance.

## **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.