

Session 2

How can we come to consensus on research priorities?



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

Objectives

- To develop skills in research priority setting with patients

James Lind Alliance Approach

- Research uncertainties identified and verified
- Interim priority setting process reduced the list to 25 items

Final Priority Setting

- Nominal Group Technique
 - Used by groups to make decisions quickly
 - Individuals voice their views but a consensus opinion results
- Preparation
 - Declaration of interests form
 - Agenda
 - List of questions/uncertainties
 - Experience with small groups
 - Participant bios

- Small group discussions of each item
 - Clarify views on the questions
 - Small group ranking – rank from 1 to 25
- Large group review
 - Review each group's rankings
 - We will limit to top 3
- (second small group ranking and large group review would follow)

Task

- Small group discussions of each item
 - Clarify views on the questions
 - Small group ranking – rank from 1 to 25
 - Be ready to report on priorities and perceptions/experiences with process
 - 30 minutes to do this
- Ground rules for small groups
 - Listen to and respect other people's ideas
 - Share discussion but do not ascribe individual names to specific statements (Chatham House Rules)