Crowdsourcing Delphi Survey

Weiming Tang, MD, PhD, MS University of North Carolina Project-China Dermatology Hospital of Southern Medical University October, 2019







- Introduction
- Delphi Survey Results









- Introduction
- Delphi Survey Results





Introduction

- Aimed to to create guidance on methods for crowdsourcing in health and health research
- Invited crowdsourcing experts, or who have implemented crowdsourcing to solve different research problems
- Crowdsourcing Delphi Survey consisted of 7 sections: Considering, Organizing, Promoting, Assessing, Recognizing, Sharing and Evaluating



ES





- Introduction
- Delphi Survey Results





Socio-demographic Characteristics of Experts

• We received 21 submissions in total yesterday



SESH

SESH 更 赛思

- Statement a: Before starting a project, the organizer should consider the benefits and risks of crowdsourcing in order to understand if this is an appropriate method.
 - Agree 95.2% (20)
 - Neutral 5% (1)
 - Disagree 0%





Statement b: Crowdsourcing may be particularly useful in settings in which there are diverse networks (e.g., groups, professional societies, social media movements, in-person teams) to solicit contributions. *

- Agree 85.7% (18)
- Neutral 4.8% (1)
- Disagree 9.5 (2)





Statement c: Crowdsourcing may be particularly useful in settings where there are strong advocates (people living with the diseases, community organizers, physicians, or others) who champion the cause? *

- Agree 61.9% (13)
- Neutral 19%(4)
- Disagree 19% (4)





- Statement d: Crowdsourcing organizers should consider whether they are asking for something that would be feasible and realistic for an individual layperson to develop (Aside: We divided the questions into two parts: feasible and realistic)
 - Agree 85.7%(18)
 - Neutral 14.3% (3)
 - Disagree 0%
 - 1. Crowdsourcing organizers should consider whether they are asking for something that would be feasible for an individual layperson to develop. *
 - 2. Crowdsourcing organizers should ensure that they have selected an appropriate activity, based on feedback from community members and other stakeholders. *





- Statement e: Crowdsourcing organizers should ensure that they have selected an appropriate activity, based on the needs and feedback from community members and researchers-other stakeholders
 - Agree 95.2% (20)
 - Neutral 5% (1)
 - Disagree 0%



- Statement a: Before starting a project, the organizers should establish a steering committee to develop the call for entry and decide the format of submissions, and provide details
 - Agree 81% (17)
 - Neutral 14.3% (3)
 - Disagree 4.8% (1)



•

ESI

- Statement b: The steering committee should include representatives from civil society groups or advocacy groups related to the issue
 - Agree 85.7% (18)
 - Neutral 9.5% (2)
 - Disagree 4.8% (1)

Change to: The steering committee should include people from different disciplines, including the following:

- a) people who are living with disease, community leaders, civil society leaders, or other community stakeholders
- b) key opinion leaders and network leaders who can help to distribute the contest
- c) If focused on local implementation, a member of the government or public sector
- d) If focused on research, a leader of research studies
- e) In some cases, funders as non-voting observers
- f) In some cases, private sector leaders as non-voting observers



ESF

- Statement c: The steering committee should include key opinion leaders and network leaders who can help the steering committee to distribute the contest message widely
 - Agree 95.2% (20)
 - Neutral 5%(1)
 - Disagree



ESF

- Statement d: The steering committee should work together to decide the promotion process, judging the process, judging criteria, recognition plan, prize structure, and develop a sharing plan.
 - Agree 90.5% (19)
 - Neutral 4.8% (1)
 - Disagree4.8% (1)



ESI

- SESH 要思
- Statement e: The steering committee should provide an example of an entry that the contest wants to solicit in the call for entries
- Change to: We generally recommend not providing examples, in order to spur creativity. At the same time, the call for contributions could provide a case study to show the process of innovation and highlight how innovation can come from the bottom-up. *
 - Agree 47.6% (10)
 - Neutral 19.1% (4)
 - Disagree 33.3% (7)



4. Promoting Crowdsourcing Activities

- Statement a: A crowdsourcing activity should be promoted through in-person activities
- Change to: A crowdsourcing activity should build trust in the activity in a way that is appropriate to the local context (e.g. in-person activities). *
 - Agree 66.7% (14)
 - Neutral 28.6% (6)
 - Disagree 4.8% (1)



ESF

4. Promoting Crowdsourcing Activities

- SESH 要思
- Statement b: A crowdsourcing activity should be promoted through social media platforms
- Change to: A crowdsourcing activity should be promoted through social media platforms with acknowledge of limitations of social media (i.e., limitations on who will view and respond to social media calls).*
 - Agree 90.5% (19)
 - Neutral 9.5% (2)
 - Disagree 0%



4. Promoting Crowdsourcing Activities

- Statement c: A crowdsourcing activity should be only limited to a specific group of people
 - Agree 14.3% (3)
 - Neutral 33.3% (7)
 - Disagree 52.4% (11)

- Divide into two statements:
- 1. A crowdsourcing activity should be inclusive and allow contributions from diverse individuals.
- 2. A crowdsourcing activity should be promoted with groups and networks of interest identified by the steering committee. Accommodation for participation of people with disability should be considered based on the purpose of the crowdsourcing activity.*



ESI

4.Promoting Crowdsourcing Activities



- Statement d: A crowdsourcing activity should have a clear deadline. If needed, the steering committee can extend the deadline, but this should be updated in a timely and clear way
- Change to: A crowdsourcing activity should have a clear deadline. If needed, the steering committee can extend the deadline, but this should be updated in a clear way and allow for revision for those who already submitted. *
 - Agree 100% (21)
 - Neutral 0%
 - Disagree 0%



- Statement a: The judges should provide feedback independent of each other.
 - Agree 95.2%(20%)
 - Neutral 5% (1)
 - Disagree 0%



SESH

- Statement b: The judges should be only selected from one specific group of individuals
- Change to: Criteria for selecting judges are similar to the criteria for selecting steering committee members (see above), with the additional requirement of having sufficient time to undertake judging. *
 - Agree 9.5% (2)
 - Neutral 4.8% (1)
 - Disagree 85.7% (18)



ESI

- SESH 要思
- Statement c: The contest organizers should direct send out the submitted entries for judging without screening for eligibility.
 - Agree 14.3% (3)
 - Neutral 9.5% (2)
 - Disagree 76.2% (16)

Change to: The contest organizers should first assess eligibility and then provide eligible contributions to judges for them to evaluate. *



- Statement d: Judges should recuse themselves from evaluating entries where there is a potential conflict of interest
 - Agree 90.5% (19)
 - Neutral 4.8% (1)
 - Disagree 4.8% (1)



ESF

- Statement a: Once all entries have been scored, the entries should be ranked based on the mean score (REMOVE!)
 - Agree 47.6% (10)
 - Neutral 38.1% (8)
 - Disagree 14.3% (3)





- Statement a: Steering Committee will make the final selection of finalists and respective prizes based on their judgement and pre-specified criteria
 - Agree 90.5% (19)
 - Neutral 4.8% (1)
 - Disagree 4.8%(1)



ESI



- Statement b: Personalized announcement first: After deciding the final selection but before making a public announcement, each finalist participant-all participants should be contacted about the decision regarding their submission
 - Agree 71.4% (15)
 - Neutral 28.5% (6)
 - Disagree 0%



- Statement c: Crowdsourcing organizers should clearly explain how finalists were selected, and answer feedbacks from the people who submitted the entries
 - Agree 81% (17)
 - Neutral 14.3% (3)
 - Disagree 4.8% (1)



•

ESI

7.Sharing Contributions from Crowdsourcing Activities

- Statement a: The finalists should be shared with national or local agencies and should be implemented within communities (REMOVE)
 - Agree 57.9% (12)
 - Neutral 23.8% (5)
 - Disagree 19% (4)



SESH

審思

7.Sharing Contributions from Crowdsourcing Activities



- Statement a: Providing open access resources, images, and templates related to the outputs from a crowdsourcing activity is important
 - Agree 80.9% (17)
 - Neutral 14.2% (4)
 - Disagree 4.2% (1)



7.Sharing Contributions from Crowdsourcing Activities



- Statement b: When possible and after permission has been obtained from participants, use and/or adapt finalist contributions, seek permission from finalists to use their ideas and distribute them widely
 - Agree 80.9% (17)
 - Neutral 19% (4)
 - Disagree 0%



8. Evaluating Crowdsourcing Through Research

SESH 更 赛思

- Statement a: Research on crowdsourcing is important to demonstrate the value of crowdsourcing in health and health research
 - Agree 90.4% (19)
 - Neutral 9.5% (2)
 - Disagree 0%



8. Evaluating Crowdsourcing Through Research

 Statement b: A crowdsourcing activity can be evaluated by using qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods research

- Agree 95.2% (20)
- Neutral 4.7% (1)
- Disagree 0%



SESH

Evaluating Crowdsourcing Through Research

- Statement c: In some cases, finalists from crowdsourcing activities can be implemented and evaluated in randomized controlled trials
 - Agree 76.1% (16)
 - Neutral 19% (4)
 - Disagree 4.7% (1)



ESF





THANK YOU!





www.seshglobal.org seshchina@seshglobal.org