

# DELPHISTAR

Delphi studies in health and social sciences –  
recommendations for a standardized reporting



## Delphi studies in social and health sciences – recommendations for an interdisciplinary standardized reporting (DELPHISTAR).

From: Niederberger, M., Schifano, J., Deckert, S., Hirt, J., Homberg, A., Köberich, S., Kuhn, R., Rommel, A., Sonnberger, M. & the DEWISS network (2024) Delphi studies in social and health sciences—Recommendations for an interdisciplinary standardized reporting (DELPHISTAR). Results of a Delphi study. PLoS ONE 19(8): e0304651. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0304651>  
More information under OSF (<https://osf.io/gc4jk>) and DEWISS (<https://delphi.ph-gmuend.de/>)

**This reporting guideline is meant for studies using Delphi techniques in the health and social sciences.** These also include all Delphi variants and modifications that meet the following criteria:

1. Survey of several people with specialized knowledge (e.g., operational knowledge, experiential knowledge, functional knowledge, contextual knowledge);
2. Structured communication process that involves a group of people with relevant expertise;
3. Carrying out at least two survey rounds or the option to respond at least two times;
4. Feedback: the (interim) results are presented to the respondents starting in the second round;
5. Basis is a quantitative questionnaire with the possibility to contribute or supplement arguments for the respective position;
6. All answers, quantitative and qualitative, are systematically analyzed (quantitative: e.g., descriptive statistics, qualitative: e.g., thematic analysis).

This reporting guideline is available in English and German at <https://delphi.ph-gmuend.de/activities/delphistar>.

Topic	Section	Item	Checklist Item	Location where item is reported	Exemplary answer
I Title and Abstract		1	Identification as a Delphi procedure in the title		What is a public health intervention? Results of a Delphi study.
		2	Identification as a Delphi procedure in the abstract		A Delphi procedure was selected to answer the research question.
		3	Structured abstract		e.g., background, method, results and discussion
II Context	Formal	4	Information about the sources of funding		The Delphi study was funded by [SOURCE].
		5	Information about the team of authors and/or researchers (e.g., discipline, institution)		The Delphi study was conducted by an interdisciplinary team with representatives from medicine, public health, and health promotion.
		6	Information about method consulting		The study group was advised by external experts from [INSTITUTION] regarding statistics. Or: No outside consulting in regard to method took place.

Topic	Section	Item	Checklist Item	Location where item is reported	Exemplary answer
		7	Information about the project background		The Delphi survey was part of a mixed-methods study on [AIM].
		8	Information about the study protocol		The study protocol is available at [LINK].
	Content	9	Justification of the chosen method (Delphi procedure) to answer the research question		The Delphi method is suitable for answering the research question because it systematically gathers the judgments of different expert groups and can identify agreement and disagreement.
		10	Aim of the Delphi procedure (e.g., consensus, forecasting)		The aim of the Delphi study is to find consensus on criteria to define a public health intervention.
III Method	Body & Integration of knowledge	11	Identification and elucidation of relevant expertise, spheres of experience, and perspectives (e.g., theory, practice, affected groups, disciplines)		The experts should represent the sciences and clinical practice because [REASON].
		12	Handling of knowledge, expertise and perspectives which are missing or have been deliberately not integrated		If it is not possible to recruit experts specialized in [AREA], this is openly communicated to the other respondents during the Delphi process.
		13	Basic definition of expert <sup>1</sup>		A person who has been active in the area for at least [NUMBER] years is considered to be an expert.
	Delphi variations	14	Identification of the type of Delphi procedure and potential modifications (e.g., classic Delphi, real-time Delphi, group Delphi)		A classic Delphi procedure was used [LITERATURE REFERENCE].
		15	Justification of the Delphi variation and modifications, including during the Delphi process, if applicable		If the willingness to participate clearly decreases between the first and second rounds, a third round will not be held.
	Sample of experts	16	Selection criteria for the experts (per round if there are different expert groups)		All of the experts who met the definition were invited to the first round. All of the experts who completed the previous round were invited to participate in the subsequent round.
		17	Identification of the experts		The experts were identified based on publications in [DATABASE].
		18	Information about recruiting and any subsequent recruiting of experts		The experts were informed about the Delphi study and invited to participate.
	Survey	19	Elucidation of the content development for the questionnaire <sup>2</sup>		The questionnaire was developed based on the results of systematic reviews [LITERATURE REFERENCE].
		20	Description of the questionnaire (content and structure)		The questionnaire was divided into three segments on [TOPICS]. The statements made in the questionnaire were evaluated using standardized items, with the option to comment in free-text boxes.

Topic	Section	Item	Checklist Item	Location where item is reported	Exemplary answer
	Delphi rounds	21	Number of Delphi rounds		Three Delphi rounds were held.
		22	Information about the aims of the individual Delphi rounds		The first Delphi round focused on exploring relevant aspects. These aspects were then presented to the experts in the second Delphi round for standardized evaluation.
		23	Disclosure and justification of the criterion for discontinuation		The number of rounds was defined in advance to be a maximum of three rounds.
	Feedback	24	Information about what data was reported back per round		In terms of feedback, we shared the statistical results plus the summary of the open responses.
		25	Information on how the results of the previous Delphi round were fed back to the experts surveyed (e.g., via frequencies, mean values, measures of dispersion, listing of comments)		Mean values, standard deviations and percentage frequency distributions were reported.
		26	Information on whether feedback was differentiated by specific groups (e.g., by field of expertise, institutional affiliation)		The feedback was aggregated across all expert groups.
		27	Information about how dissent and unclear results were handled		The results showing dissent were presented again for evaluation in the next Delphi round.
	Data analysis	28	Disclosure of the quantitative and qualitative analytical strategy		The quantitative items were descriptively analyzed. The open-ended items were analyzed using thematic analysis [LITERATURE REFERENCE].
		29	Definition and measurement of consensus		Consensus was defined as percentage agreement, meaning that agreement was assumed if at least 80% of the respondents agreed on an item.
		30	Information on group-specific analysis or weighting of experts (e.g., theory vs. practice, discipline-specific analysis)		In the analysis, the mean values for percent agreement are weighted for each expert group in terms of the number of group members.
IV Results	Delphi process	31	Illustration of the Delphi process (e.g., in a flow chart)		A summary of the process is illustrated in a flow chart (Figure 1).
		32	Information about special aspects during the Delphi process (e.g., deviations from the intended approach with justification)		During the Delphi procedures the political discussion mentioned climate change and the effects on health. It is possible that this influenced the experts' responses.
		33	Number of experts per round (both invited and participating)		The number of experts participating in the first Delphi round was [NUMBER], and the number of experts in the second round was [NUMBER]. This corresponds to a response rate of [NUMBER]% in the first round and [NUMBER]% in the second round.

Topic	Section	Item	Checklist Item	Location where item is reported	Exemplary answer
	Results	34	Presentation of the results for each Delphi round and the final results		In the first Delphi round [NUMBER]% of the respondents agreed, in the second [NUMBER]%, and in the third [NUMBER]%.
V Discussion	Quality of findings	35	Highlighting the findings from the Delphi study		The central findings can be summarized as follows: [STATE FINDINGS].
		36	Validity of the results (e.g., transferability of the findings)		The results are not transferable to other countries due to different legal regulations.
		37	Reliability of the results (e.g., split half, inter-rater reliability)		The responses in the free-text comments were analyzed by two independent reviewers [SPECIFY].
		38	Reflection on potential limitations (e.g., distortion, skewing, bias)		The results are to be viewed critically with regard to the composition of the panel because [REASONS].

<sup>1</sup> “Experts” are the participants; this can be people from academia, practice, or representatives of lived experience (e.g., patients, family members).

<sup>2</sup> The term “questionnaire” stands for the survey instrument regardless of whether quantitative or qualitative items are integrated or weighted.

## Contact

Prof. Dr. Marlen Niederberger

E-mail: marlen.niederberger(at)ph-gmuend.de

Department of Research Methods in Health Promotion and Prevention

Institute for Health Sciences, University of Education Schwäbisch Gmünd,

Oberbettringer Straße 200, 73525 Schwäbisch Gmünd, Germany