

Table 1 Weighted criteria and definitions used to evaluate health research priorities

Criteria	Definition	Weight (%)
Effective	Potential to generate or improve effective health interventions	10
Deliverable	Likelihood of producing interventions that are deliverable within the GCC context	10
Fills key gaps	Potential to address critical gaps in knowledge required for translation and implementation	20
Maximum potential impact on burden	Potential to reduce a substantial proportion of the current disease burden	20
Potential for translation	Likelihood to generate knowledge that will be translated into health intervention	20
Feasible	Feasibility in terms of resources, funding, workforce, and data availability	10
Alignment with priorities	Consistency with regional and national health priorities	10
Total		100

642

Policy and practice

EMHJ – Vol. 31 No. 11 – 2025

Table 2 Summary of the 3-round Delphi consensus process used to establish priorities

Round	1	2	3
Method	The research generated topics are rated using 7 assessment criteria. We measure these on a 9-point scale to capture its relevance, applicability, deliverability, and impact. We calculate whether the selected research topic applies to the seven criteria as to being Highly applicable, Moderate, to Poorly applicable, and end up calculating the mean score of all 7 criteria.	More topics are discussed and added as recommendations.	Further recommendations are taken. This round works as a refining stage for the previous results, as we ask participants to re-rank the highest scored research topics from the previous, based on relevance, applicability, deliverability, and impact, and the average rank is taken.
Venue	In-person, through an interactive forum	In-person, through an interactive forum	An online survey
Participants	22 individuals from research and academia.	22 individuals from research and academia	20 experts in (NCD, or communicable diseases or environmental health)

Note: Each expert performed a separate survey depending on his field.