

DDIC Checklist for ATS Proposals Using Delphi or Modified Delphi Methods

Quick screen: Does the proposal give enough information to judge whether Delphi methods are justified, feasible, and methodologically coherent?

Basic checklist

- ☐ **Need for Delphi:** Explains why Delphi/modified Delphi is needed rather than a simpler survey, structured vote, nominal group process, or standard committee drafting.
- ☐ **Role in the document:** States what the Delphi process will accomplish, such as generating items, refining statements, prioritizing topics, or determining agreement.
- ☐ **Planned process:** Describes the number of rounds, survey format, anonymity, controlled feedback, and any planned meetings or discussion.
- ☐ **Panel selection:** Defines who counts as an expert, what perspectives will be represented, how panelists will be recruited, and why the panel size is reasonable.
- ☐ **Conflicts and oversight:** Explains how conflicts will be identified and managed, and who will oversee the process.
- ☐ **Item development:** Explains where candidate statements/items will come from and how they will be edited before round 1.
- ☐ **Consensus rules:** Prespecifies thresholds for agreement/disagreement, item retention/revision/rejection, and stopping rules.
- ☐ **Attrition and dissent:** Describes how nonresponse, attrition, missing data, and dissenting views will be handled.
- ☐ **Analysis and reporting:** Describes how ratings/comments will be analyzed and how the process will be reported in the final ATS document.
- ☐ **Resource implications:** Acknowledges the added timeline, administrative burden, and methodological support needs.

Suggested reviewer language for inadequately detailed proposals

Minimal detail: The proposal states that a Delphi or modified Delphi process will be used but does not provide enough detail for DDIC to assess whether the approach is justified, feasible, or methodologically rigorous. Please revise to describe the role of Delphi in the document, panel selection, round structure, feedback between rounds, consensus thresholds, stopping rules, analysis plan, and expected resource/timeline implications.

Modified Delphi not defined: The proposal uses the term “modified Delphi,” but does not specify what is modified relative to a conventional Delphi process or how those modifications affect anonymity, iteration, controlled feedback, or interpretation of consensus. Please make the modifications explicit.

Delphi may not be necessary: It is not yet clear that a Delphi process is necessary for the aims of this document. Please explain why a less resource-intensive approach, such as a structured committee vote, nominal group technique, single-round survey, or standard committee drafting informed by evidence review, would be insufficient.

Possible overall recommendation: The proposal should be revised before approval to include a more complete and prospectively defined Delphi plan. Without these details, reviewers cannot determine whether the process is fit for purpose or whether the expected timeline is reasonable.