

# Structured expert elicitation for healthcare decision making: An overview

James Horscroft, Lumanity; Dawn Lee, PenTAG, The University of Exeter; Dina Jankovic, The University of York; Marta Soares, The University of York; Laura Bojke, The University of York.

# Contents

What is structured expert elicitation?	3
Why perform SEE?	4
Key principles of SEE	5
How is SEE conducted?	6
Time required to conduct SEE	6
Checklist of things to consider	8
References	9

# This document

This document is based on the protocol for structured expert elicitation (SEE) funded by the Medical Research Council (MRC) written by Bojke et al.<sup>1</sup> and aims to provide an overview to SEE in the context of healthcare decision making. It was written as a collaboration between Lumanity, which regularly conducts SEE to support health technology assessment (HTA) and market access strategic planning, and the Centre for Health Economics at the University of York, which authored the original MRC protocol. The MRC protocol was developed based on a systematic review of elicitation methods and the practical challenges of implementing them in a healthcare decision making setting.



#### Introduction

#### What is structured expert elicitation?

SEE is a method of obtaining expert judgements in a quantitative or statistical form, for example, as probability distributions for uncertain quantities (see Figure 1).<sup>1,2</sup> It is used in a broad range of industries and research fields, including oil and gas, ecology, and meteorology. There are several publicly available protocols for conducting SEE, including the MRC protocol produced by York University<sup>1</sup>, Sheffield Elicitation Framework (SHELF, which emphasizes live interaction to reach consensus)<sup>3</sup>, Cooke's classical method<sup>4</sup> (which emphasizes weighting expert judgements based on performance in seed questions, and the Delphi method (which emphasizes quasi-anonymity to minimize bias).<sup>5</sup>

#### Figure 1

Comparison of structured expert elicitation with other methods to gather expert opinion



Key: HRQL, health-related quality of life; ICER, incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; SHELF, Sheffield Elicitation Framework. References: Bojke et al. 2021; Peel et al. 2018.<sup>2</sup>

3

## Why perform SEE?

("I used to just ring a clinician or run an ad-board")

"Evidence generated by expert elicitation, either using structured or unstructured methods, is subject to risk of bias and high uncertainty. Structured methods are preferred because they attempt to minimise biases and provide some indication of the uncertainty."

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)<sup>6</sup>

Global trends towards accelerated access and treatment earlier in the course of disease are leading to increased uncertainty at the point of decision making.

Expert judgement is often deemed useful to support decision making. Such judgements can, via SEE:

1. be elicited in a formal way to minimize biases

2. be elicited in a way that captures the experts' uncertainty for key parameters

An example output of an SEE exercise is shown in Figure 2, with probability distributions representing experts' assessments of the level of uncertainty alongside the available empirical evidence.





Undertaking an SEE exercise does take longer than ringing a clinician and, in some instances, only a limited number of questions can be covered. This means that the use of SEE should be prioritized according to the expected impact of parameters on decision making.

As highlighted in the quote from NICE simply asking a clinician for a number to input for a critical model parameter or showing clinicians survival curves to select from has a high risk of bias and high uncertainty and is unlikely to be accepted when you come to present your analyses to HTA decision makers. Some of the key biases that SEE attempts to minimize are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Common sources of bias

Bias	Description	How is this addressed in SEE?
Cognitive biases		
Anchoring bias	<ul> <li>Fixing on an initial value and failing to sufficiently adjust estimates away from it</li> </ul>	Asking for plausible limits before the median
		Training in biases and heuristics
<ul> <li>Basing judgement about the probability of an on how easily examples of an outcome come mind</li> <li>Availability bias</li> <li>Judgement may be biased towards more reception prominent experiences</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Basing judgement about the probability of an event on how easily examples of an outcome come to mind</li> </ul>	Providing an evidence brief, which summarizes key evidence
	<ul> <li>Judgement may be biased towards more recent or prominent experiences</li> </ul>	Training in biases and heuristics
Motivation biases		
Confirmation bias	<ul> <li>Focus on and being less critical of information that is consistent with existing beliefs and preferences</li> </ul>	Seeking diversity of opinion in recruitment
		Training in biases and heuristics
(Un)desirability bias	<ul> <li>Overestimating the likelihood of positive outcomes (wishful thinking) or negative outcomes (precautionary thinking)</li> </ul>	Seeking diversity of opinion in recruitment
· / ·		Training in biases and heuristics

### Key principles of SEE

Bojke et al. 2021<sup>1</sup> outlines nine key principles that should underpin SEE for healthcare decision making. The approach to an SEE project should strive to follow these principles:

- 1. SEE should be transparent and reproducible
- 2. Elicited information should be fit-for-purpose to be used as an input to further analysis
- The SEE needs to adapt to the practical and logistic constraints faced by different contexts/decision-making bodies, but maintain a level of consistency in methods used across evaluations
- 4. SEE must seek to elicit uncertainty in experts' judgements
- 5. SEE must recognize common expert **biases** and employ strategies to minimize these
- 6. SEE must utilize methods that are appropriate for experts with lower levels of normative skills
- 7. When required, SEE must employ methods that incorporate or promote the adaptive skills of experts
- 8. SEE must attempt to capture any **between-expert variation**, understand the reasons why it exists, and explore its potential impact on the decision
- 9. SEE must motivate experts to best express their beliefs about a quantity of interest

# How is SEE conducted?

A standard example of project flow is shown in Figure 3, with detail provided in our practical guide, available here.



#### Time required to conduct SEE

The time required to conduct an SEE varies based upon several factors including:

- The number and complexity of quantities to be elicited and how clear these are at project outset
- How well experts are known to the project team, whether identification needs to be conducted from scratch, and how difficult recruitment is likely to be (e.g. rare diseases)
- Whether a pilot exercise with external experts is needed or whether an internal pilot with medical colleagues is sufficient
- Mode of administration (meeting in person has benefits but requires careful scheduling, which may add time)
- Whether a group consensus step is planned, the timing of this, and the feasibility of securing expert time
- Internal requirements for compliance and sign off
- Complexity of incorporation in the economic analysis

The suggested timelines in Figure 4 are based upon a simple case where a pool of experts is already available to the company to recruit from, and mathematical aggregation is chosen.

#### Figure 4





A more detailed example of an expert elicitation exercise undertaken during the writing of the MRC protocol took place over a 7-month period (equivalent to 4–5 months FTE). The areas which took the most time were:

- Design of the Microsoft Excel<sup>®</sup>-based elicitation exercise (this represented around 50% of the time taken; time can be saved here through use of standardized packages although some degree of tailoring will always be required)
- Design of the training sessions (again time can be saved here through use of standardized materials)
- Development and piloting of the protocol (this can however be staged in order to reduce the impact on timelines)

From the point of expert recruitment up to write up of the exercise prior to distribution fitting and aggregation the exercise took 2 months to complete, which is similar to the timeline provided in our example. Note that time for developing, submitting and publishing a manuscript of the study is not including in the above timelines.



### Checklist of things to consider

There are several key choices that must be made regarding the methods for SEE. The checklist below is designed to ensure you have considered the key issues surrounding your methodological choices. More detailed guidance is provided in our practical guide, which is available here.

a     Head Identified the key drivers of model uncertainty?     a       b     Head plastified the need for eliciting these quantities, in light of the model quantities or expers? Example: as relative risk is not obsenvable quantities or expers? Example: as relative risk is not obsenvable quantities or expers? Example: as relative risk is not obsenvable quantities or experses and as reasonably observable quantities to experse? Example: as relative risk is not obsenvable quantities or experses and as reasonable quantities or experses and quantities or experses and quantities or experses and quantities in way that independence can reasonably be as a reasonable quantities or experses and quantities in way that independence and reasonable quantities or experses and quantities in the quantities defined for the elicitation are coherent among themselves and fi-for purpose for inclusion in the decision of a reasonable quantities or experses and experses or experses and experses or experses and quantities or experses and quantities or experses and experses or experses and experses or experses and quantities or experses and quantities or experses and experses or experses and experses or experses and experses or experses and experses or expers	1. Q	uantities of interest	
b       Here Justified the need for eliciting these quantities, in light of the amount, quality and relevance of existing empirical evidence?       c         c       Can the quantities of interest be expressed as reasonably obsechances and the neature the relative risk.       c         d       A the quantities of interest be expressed as reasonably obsechances and the neature the relative risk.       c         d       Isolation and the neature obsechances is to hose chances and the neature the relative risk.       c         d       Isolation and the quantities of interest be expressed as reasonably obsechances and the neature the relative risk.       c         d       Isolation and the quantities of interest be expressed as reasonably obsechances and the neature the relative risk.       c         d       Isolation expressed claim expressed in a simple terms as possible?       c         d       Isolation expresse claim expressed in a simple terms as possible?       c         d       Isolation expresse claim expressed in a simple terms as possible?       c         d       Isolation expresse claim expressed in a simple terms as possible?       c         d       Isolation expresse pressed as reasonably obsechances and the claim expressed pressed	а	Have I identified the key drivers of model uncertainty?	
c       and the quantities of interest be expressed as resonably observable quantities to experts? Example: as relative fisk is not observable quantities of interest expressed in a simple terms as possible?       iiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiii	b	Have I justified the need for eliciting these quantities, in light of the amount, quality and relevance of existing empirical evidence?	
dAre the quantities of interest expressed in a simple terms as possible?ndIreliciting multiple quantities, consider eliciting dependencies or ne-expressing quantities in way that independence can reasonably be a finance?ndIreliciting multiple quantities, consider eliciting dependencies or ne-expressing quantities in way that independence can reasonably be a finance?ndIreliciting multiple quantities, consider elicitation are coherent among themselves and fit-for purpose for inclusion in the decision of mode?ndIreliciting exercise clearly worded in a way that experts understand? Note: consider the terminology/units that experts will be one?ndIreliciting exercise clearly worded in a way that experts understand? Note: consider the terminology/units that experts will be one?ndIreliciting exercise clearly worded in a way that experts understand? Note: consider the terminology/units that experts will be one?ndIreliciting exercise clearly worded in a way that experts understand? Note: consider the terminology/units that experts the mode of the experts the experssion of the experssion of the expersion of the expersion of the experses of the expersion of the expers	С	Can the quantities of interest be expressed as reasonably observable quantities to experts? Example: as relative risk is not observable you could instead ask for the absolute risk in both scenarios and then calculate the relative risk	
e         Ileitating multiple quantities, consider eliciting dependencies or ne-expressing quantities in wy that independence can reasonably be gendencies or ne-expressing quantities in wy that independence can reasonably be gendencies or ne-expressing quantities in wy that independencies or ne-expressing quantities in which independencies or ne-expressing quantities or ne-expressing quantin quanting duantities or ne-expressing quantities or ne-expressin	d	Are the quantities of interest expressed in as simple terms as possible?	
f         kew lensured that the quantities defined for the elicitation are coherent among themselves and fit-for purpose for inclusion in the decision is node?         i           g         kew leicitation exercise clearly worded in a way that experts understand? Note: consider the terminology/units that experts will be most in the decision exercise clearly worded in a way that experts understand? Note: consider the terminology/units that experts will be most in the decision exercise clearly worded in a way that experts understand? Note: consider the terminology/units that experts will be most in the decision exercise clearly worded to participate?         i           d         Down inclusion exercise clearly worded in a way that experts understand? Note: consider the quantities of interest?         i           d         Down inclusion exercise clearly worded in a way that experts understand? Note: consider the quantities of interest?         i           d         May functional provide to participate?         i           d         May experts be motivated to participate?         i           d         Not experts be motivated participate?         i           d         Not experts be abland on ormative skills, blases, and heuristics?         i         i           d         Not experts be motivated participate?         i         i           d         Not experts be motivated participate?         i         i           d         Not experts be motivated participate for experis?         i         i     <	е	If eliciting multiple quantities, consider eliciting dependencies or re-expressing quantities in way that independence can reasonably be assumed	
g       Is the elicitation exercise clearly worded in a way that experts understand? Note: consider the terminolog/lunits that experts will be most in a main with       g         z       zervitnem       initial with       g         z       be my inclusion/exclusion criteria identify the individuals with expertise or skills most relevant to the quantities of interest?       g         z       Will the experts be motivated to participate?       g         d       Have Iminimized and recorded any conflicts of interest?       g         d       Can lachieve a sample of five or more experts? If not, can I justify this?       g         d       Will the experts be trained on normative skills, blases, and heuristics?       g         a       Will the experts be trained on normative skills, blases, and heuristics?       g         a       How will the elicitation approach be piloted?       g         a       How will the elicitation approach be piloted?       g         a       Mult experts the autonale for the elicitation method an Lusing?       g         a       How will upgements and/or probability distributions be fed back to the experts?       g         a       How will cellect and record rationales for judgements?       g         a       How will upgements and/or probability distributions be fed back to the experts?       g         a       How will cellect and record r	f	Have I ensured that the quantities defined for the elicitation are coherent among themselves and fit-for purpose for inclusion in the decision model?	
2       Porture intervent       Image: Construct on the intervent on the expertise or skills most relevant to the quantities of interest?       Image: Construct on the experts be motivated to participate?       Image: Construct on the experts be motivated to participate?       Image: Construct on the experts be motivated to participate?       Image: Construct on the experts be motivated to participate?       Image: Construct on the experts be motivated to participate?       Image: Construct on the experts be motivated to participate?       Image: Construct on the experts be motivated to participate?       Image: Construct on the experts be motivated to participate?       Image: Construct on the experts be motivated to participate?       Image: Construct on the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics?       Image: Construct on the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics?       Image: Construct on the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics?       Image: Construct on the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics?       Image: Construct on the experts individually firs?       Image: Construct on the experts individually firs?       Image: Construct on the experts individually firs?       Image: Construct on the experts on the experts?       Image: Construct on the experts on the experts on the experts?       Image: Construct on the experts on the experts?       Image: Construct on the expert on the expert on the experts?       Image: Construct on the expert on the expert on the experts?       Image: Construct on the expert on the ex	g	Is the elicitation exercise clearly worded in a way that experts understand? Note: consider the terminology/units that experts will be most familiar with	
aDomy inclusion/exclusion criteria identify the individuals with expertise or skills most relevant to the quantities of interest?IbHave I pursued diversity and broad representation as far as possible?IcWill the experts be motivated to participate?IdHave I minimized and recorded any conflicts of interest?IeCan lachieve a sample of five or more experts? If not, can I justify this?IsWill the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics?IfI what setting will the training session be delivered? Note: face-to-face is preferable but not always feasibleIfI what setting will the elicitation approach be plioted?IfHow will the elicitation approach be plioted?Iwilch capproach will be used (e.g. bisection, chips and bins etc)?IbAm eliciting judgements from experts individually first? If not, can I justify this?IgHow will collect and record rationales for judgements?IgHow will not plote between experts viation?IgHow will use an apoportunity to refine their judgements?IgHow will use an apoportunity to refine their judgements?IgHow will use an apoportunity to refine their judgements?IgHow will use an apoportunity to refine their judgements and why? <td< td=""><td>2. F</td><td>Recruitment</td><td></td></td<>	2. F	Recruitment	
b       Have I pursued diversity and broad representation as far as possible?       □         c       Will the experts be motivated to participate?       □         d       Have I minimized and recorded any conflicts of interest?       □         e       Can lachieve a sample of five or more experts? If not, can I justify this?       □         d       Will the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics?       □         a       Will the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics?       □         b       In what setting will the training session be delivered? <i>Note: face-to-face is preferable but not always feasible</i> □         c       How will the elicitation approach be piloted?       □         e       How will the elicitation approach be piloted?       □         e       Which hool will be used?       □         o       Which hool will be used?       □         o       Which tool will be used?       □         o       Mult collect and record rationales for judgements?       □         d       How will collect and record rationales for judgements?       □         g       How will collect and record rationales for judgements?       □         g       How will collect and record rationales for judgements?       □         g       How will collect a	а	Do my inclusion/exclusion criteria identify the individuals with expertise or skills most relevant to the quantities of interest?	
cImage: Note of the experts be motivated to participate?Image: Image: Note of the experts and necorded any conflicts of interest?Image: Image: Note of the experts of the experts? If not, can I justify this?Image: Note of the experts of the experts?Image: Note of the experts?Image: Note of the experts of the experts?Image: Note of the experts of the experts of the experts of the experts of the experts?Image: Note of the experts of the experts of the experts of the experts?Image: Note of the experts of the experts of the experts?Image: Note of the ex	b	Have I pursued diversity and broad representation as far as possible?	
dHave I minimized and recorded any conflicts of interest?IcCan I achieve a sample of five or more experts? If not, can I justify this?IstringStringI will the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics?II will the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics?II will the training session be delivered? Note: face-to-face is preferable but not always feasibleII will the training session be delivered? Note: face-to-face is preferable but not always feasibleII will the elicitation approach be piloted?II will the facing judgements from experts individually first? If not, can I justify this?II will is the rationale for the elicitation method an I using?II will appearent and/or probability distributions be fed back to the experts?II will appearent and cord rationales for judgements?II will appearent and record rationales for judgements?II will appearent apportunity to refine their judgements following feedback?II will appearent apportunity to refine their judgements and why?II will appearent app	С	Will the experts be motivated to participate?	
eCan lachieve a sample of five or more experts? If not, can l justify this?I3Value or sample of five or more experts? If not, can l justify this?I4Will the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics?IbIn what setting will the training session be delivered? Note: face-to-face is preferable but not always feasibleIcValue or sample of five or more experts?IcHow will the elicitation approach be piloted?IaMovial the elicitation approach be piloted?IaMovial proach will be used (e.g. bisection, chips and bins etc)?IbAn leliciting judgements from experts individually first? If not, can l justify this?IcWalt is the rationale for the elicitation method am l using?IcHow will lougements and/or probability distributions be fed back to the experts?IcNavial schare an opportunity to refine their judgements following feedback?IcWalt experts have an opportunity to refine their judgements following feedback?IcNovini I exporte between-expert variation? If no exploration will be performed, can l justify this?IcWich statistical distribution(s) will be fitted to expert judgements and why?IcWich statistical distribution (e.g. agroup workshop) or mathematical aggregation (e.g. agroup workshop) or mathematical	d	Have I minimized and recorded any conflicts of interest?	
Similar Si	е	Can I achieve a sample of five or more experts? If not, can I justify this?	
a       Will be experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics?       I         b       Invalue secting will the training session be delivered? Note: face-to-face is preferable but not always feasible       I         c       Invalue secting will the elicitation approach be piloted?       Invalues       Invalues         b       Invalue secting updgements from expects individually first? In not, can 1 justify this?       Invalues       Invalues         c       Invalues and/or probability distributions be feasible but not always feasible       Invalues       Invalues         d       Invalues and/or probability distributions be feasible but not always feasible       Invalues       Invalues         d       Invalues and/or probability distributions be feasible back to the experts?       Invalues       Invalues         d       Invalues and or probability distributions be feasible back to the experts?       Invalues       Invalues         d       Invalues and/or probability distributions feasible back to the experts?       Invalues       Invalues         d       Invalues and proper duration?       Invalues       Invalues         d       Invalues and proper duration?       Invalues       Invalues         d       Invalues and proper duration?       Invalues       Invalues         d       Invalues and proper duratinde for proper duratinde feasible back to the e			
bIn what setting will the training session be delivered? Note: face-to-face is preferable but not always feasibleIJJJHow will the elicitation approach be piloted? - Which tool will be used? - Which tool will be used? - Which approach approach approach used? - Which approach approac	3. T	raining	
AEvicationaHow will the elicitation approach be piloted? • Which tool will be used? • Which approach will be used (e.g. bisection, chips and bins etc)?abAm 1 eliciting judgements from experts individually first? If not, can 1 justify this?acWhat is the rationale for the elicitation method am 1 using?adHow will judgements and/or probability distributions be fed back to the experts?aeHow will collect and record rationales for judgements?agWill experts have an opportunity to refine their judgements following feedback?aaHow will Lexplore between-expert variation? If no exploration will be performed, can 1 justify this?abWhich statistical distribution(s) will be fitted to expert judgements and why?acWill be using behavioural aggregation (e.g. a group workshop) or mathematical aggregation (e.g. linear opinion pooling)? What weighting will use within any mathematical aggregation (e.g. equal weights)? What is the rationale?a	<b>3.</b> Т а	raining Will the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics?	
aHow will the elicitation approach be piloted? • Which tool will be used? • Which approach will be used (e.g. bisection, chips and bins etc)?abAm eliciting judgements from experts individually first? If not, can I justify this? • Main state atomale for the elicitation method am I using?acWhat is the rationale for the elicitation method am I using? • Mow will judgements and/or probability distributions be fed back to the experts?acHow will collect and record rationales for judgements?agWill experts have an opportunity to refine their judgements following feedback?afHow will explore between-expert variation? If no explore the preformed, can I justify this?agWich statistical distribution(s) will be fitted to expert judgements?agWich statistical distribution(s) will be fitted to expert judgements?agWill be using behavioural aggregation (e.g. equal weights)? What is the rationale?a	3. Т а b	raining Will the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics? In what setting will the training session be delivered? <i>Note: face-to-face is preferable but not always feasible</i>	
Number of the state of the s	3. T a b 4. E	raining Will the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics? In what setting will the training session be delivered? <i>Note: face-to-face is preferable but not always feasible</i> Slicitation	
Image: a Which approach will be used (e.g. bisection, chips and bins etc)?b Am 1 eliciting judgements from experts individually first? If not, can 1 justify this?cWhat is the rationale for the elicitation method am 1 using?dHow will judgements and/or probability distributions be fed back to the experts?eHow will 1 collect and record rationales for judgements?gWill experts have an opportunity to refine their judgements following feedback?aHow will 1 explore between-expert variation? If no exploration will be performed, can 1 justify this?abWhich statistical distribution(s) will be fitted to expert judgements and why?cwill 1 be using behavioural aggregation (e.g. a group workshop) or mathematical aggregation (e.g. linear opinion pooling)? What weighting will becwithin any mathematical aggregation (e.g. equal weights)? What is the rationale?	3. T a b 4. E a	raining Will the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics? In what setting will the training session be delivered? <i>Note: face-to-face is preferable but not always feasible</i> <b>Clicitation</b> How will the elicitation approach be piloted?	
bAm leliciting judgements from experts individually first? If not, can I justify this?cWhat is the rationale for the elicitation method am I using?cdHow will judgements and/or probability distributions be fed back to the experts?ceHow will collect and record rationales for judgements?cgWill experts have an opportunity to refine their judgements following feedback?csHow will I explore between-expert variation? If no exploration will be performed, can I justify this?caMoha statistical distribution(s) will be fitted to expert judgements and why?ccWill I be using behavioural aggregation (e.g. a group workshop) or mathematical aggregation (e.g. linear opinion pooling)? What weighting will be rationale?c	3. T a b 4. E a	raining         Will the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics?         In what setting will the training session be delivered? Note: face-to-face is preferable but not always feasible         Sticitation         How will the elicitation approach be piloted?         • Which tool will be used?	
cWhat is the rationale for the elicitation method am l using?IdHow will judgements and/or probability distributions be fed back to the experts?IeHow will collect and record rationales for judgements?IgWill experts have an opportunity to refine their judgements following feedback?IsstreationaHow will I explore between-expert variation? If no exploration will be performed, can l justify this?IbWhich statistical distribution(s) will be fitted to expert judgements and why?IcWill I be using behavioural aggregation (e.g. equal weights)? What is the rationale?I	3. T a b 4. E a	<ul> <li>raining</li> <li>Will the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics?</li> <li>In what setting will the training session be delivered? <i>Note: face-to-face is preferable but not always feasible</i></li> <li>citation</li> <li>How will the elicitation approach be piloted?</li> <li>Which tool will be used?</li> <li>Which approach will be used (e.g. bisection, chips and bins etc)?</li> </ul>	
dHow will judgements and/or probability distributions be fed back to the experts?IeHow will collect and record rationales for judgements?IgWill experts have an opportunity to refine their judgements following feedback?I5. JegregationaHow will 1 explore between-expert variation? If no exploration will be performed, can I justify this?IaWhich statistical distribution(s) will be fitted to expert judgements and why?IcWill I be using behavioural aggregation (e.g. a group workshop) or mathematical aggregation (e.g. linear opinion pooling)? What weighting will isI	3. T a b 4. E a b	<ul> <li>raining</li> <li>Will the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics?</li> <li>In what setting will the training session be delivered? <i>Note: face-to-face is preferable but not always feasible</i></li> <li>clicitation</li> <li>How will the elicitation approach be piloted?</li> <li>Which tool will be used?</li> <li>Which approach will be used (e.g. bisection, chips and bins etc)?</li> <li>Am I eliciting judgements from experts individually first? If not, can I justify this?</li> </ul>	
eHow will collect and record rationales for judgements?IgWill experts have an opportunity to refine their judgements following feedback?I <b>5. Fersonal</b> aHow will explore between-expert variation? If no exploration will be performed, can I justify this?IbWhich statistical distribution(s) will be fitted to expert judgements and why?IcWill I be using behavioural aggregation (e.g. agroup workshop) or mathematical aggregation (e.g. equal weights)? What is the rationale?I	3. T a b 4. E a b c	<ul> <li>raining</li> <li>Will the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics?</li> <li>In what setting will the training session be delivered? Note: face-to-face is preferable but not always feasible</li> <li>Sticitation</li> <li>How will the elicitation approach be piloted?</li> <li>Which tool will be used?</li> <li>Which approach will be used (e.g. bisection, chips and bins etc)?</li> <li>Am Leliciting judgements from experts individually first? If not, can Ljustify this?</li> <li>What is the rationale for the elicitation method am Lusing?</li> </ul>	
g     Will experts have an opportunity to refine their judgements following feedback?     □ <b>5.</b> Function     □       a     How will explore between-expert variation? If no exploration will be performed, can I justify this?     □       b     Which statistical distribution(s) will be fitted to expert judgements and why?     □       c     Will be using behavioural aggregation (e.g. a group workshop) or mathematical aggregation (e.g. equal weights)? What is the rationale?     □	3. T a b 4. E a b c d	<ul> <li>raining</li> <li>Will the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics?</li> <li>In what setting will the training session be delivered? <i>Note: face-to-face is preferable but not always feasible</i></li> <li>citation</li> <li>How will the elicitation approach be piloted?</li> <li>Which tool will be used?</li> <li>Which approach will be used (e.g. bisection, chips and bins etc)?</li> <li>Am I eliciting judgements from experts individually first? If not, can I justify this?</li> <li>What is the rationale for the elicitation method am I using?</li> <li>How will judgements and/or probability distributions be fed back to the experts?</li> </ul>	
5. Agregation         a       How will explore between-expert variation? If no exploration will be performed, can I justify this?       □         b       Which statistical distribution(s) will be fitted to expert judgements and why?       □         c       Will I be using behavioural aggregation (e.g. a group workshop) or mathematical aggregation (e.g. equal weights)? What is the rationale?       □	3. T a b 4. E a b c d e	raining         Will the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics?         In what setting will the training session be delivered? Note: face-to-face is preferable but not always feasible         Elicitation         How will the elicitation approach be piloted?         • Which tool will be used?         • Which approach will be used (e.g. bisection, chips and bins etc)?         Am I eliciting judgements from experts individually first? If not, can I justify this?         What is the rationale for the elicitation method am I using?         How will judgements and/or probability distributions be fed back to the experts?         How will I collect and record rationales for judgements?	
a       How will explore between-expert variation? If no exploration will be performed, can I justify this?       □         b       Which statistical distribution(s) will be fitted to expert judgements and why?       □         c       Will be using behavioural aggregation (e.g. a group workshop) or mathematical aggregation (e.g. linear opinion pooling)? What weighting will be using behavioural aggregation (e.g. equal weights)? What is the rationale?       □	3. T a b 4. E a b c c d d g	raining         Will the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics?         In what setting will the training session be delivered? Note: face-to-face is preferable but not always feasible         icitation         How will the elicitation approach be piloted?         • Which tool will be used?         • Which approach will be used (e.g. bisection, chips and bins etc)?         Am I eliciting judgements from experts individually first? If not, can I justify this?         What is the rationale for the elicitation method am I using?         How will Judgements and/or probability distributions be fed back to the experts?         How will I collect and record rationales for judgements?         Will experts have an opportunity to refine their judgements following feedback?	
b       Which statistical distribution(s) will be fitted to expert judgements and why?       □         c       Will I be using behavioural aggregation (e.g. a group workshop) or mathematical aggregation (e.g. linear opinion pooling)? What weighting will luse within any mathematical aggregation (e.g. equal weights)? What is the rationale?       □	3. T a b 4. E a b c c d e g 5. A	raining         Will the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics?         In what setting will the training session be delivered? Note: face-to-face is preferable but not always feasible <b>clicitation</b> How will the elicitation approach be piloted?         • Which tool will be used?         • Which approach will be used (e.g. bisection, chips and bins etc)?         Arm I eliciting judgements from experts individually first? If not, can I justify this?         What is the rationale for the elicitation method am I using?         How will I collect and record rationales for judgements?         Will experts have an opportunity to refine their judgements following feedback?         oggregation	
c Will I be using behavioural aggregation (e.g. a group workshop) or mathematical aggregation (e.g. linear opinion pooling)? What weighting will I use within any mathematical aggregation (e.g. equal weights)? What is the rationale?	3. T a b 4. E a b c c d d e g g 5. A a	raining         Will the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics?         In what setting will the training session be delivered? Note: face-to-face is preferable but not always feasible         Sticitation         How will the elicitation approach be piloted?         Which tool will be used?         Which approach will be used (e.g. bisection, chips and bins etc)?         Arm I eliciting judgements from experts individually first? If not, can I justify this?         What is the rationale for the elicitation method arm I using?         How will I collect and record rationales for judgements?         Will experts have an opportunity to refine their judgements following feedback?         ggregation         How will I explore between-expert variation? If no exploration will be performed, can I justify this?	
	3. T a b 4. E a b c d d g g 5. A a b	raining         Will the experts be trained on normative skills, biases, and heuristics?         In what setting will the training session be delivered? Note: face-to-face is preferable but not always feasible         Sticitation         How will the elicitation approach be piloted?         • Which tool will be used?         • Which approach will be used (e.g. bisection, chips and bins etc)?         Am I eliciting judgements from experts individually first? If not, can I justify this?         What is the rationale for the elicitation method am I using?         How will I collect and record rationales for judgements?         Will experts have an opportunity to refine their judgements following feedback?         ggregation         How will I explore between-expert variation? If no exploration will be performed, can I justify this?         Which statistical distribution(s) will be fitted to expert judgements and why?	

#### References

- 1. Bojke L, Soares M, Claxton K, et al. Developing a reference protocol for structured expert elicitation in health-care decisionmaking: a mixed-methods study. *Health Technology Assessment* (Winchester, England). 2021; 25(37):1.
- 2. Peel A, Jenks M, Choudhury M, et al. Use of expert judgement across NICE guidance-making programmes: a review of current processes and suitability of existing tools to support the use of expert elicitation. *Applied Health Economics and Health Policy*. 2018; 16(6):819-36.
- 3. Oakley JOHA. The Sheffield Elicitation Framework (SHELF). 2022. Available at: http://www.jeremy-oakley.staff.shef.ac.uk/shelf/. Accessed: 2 June 2022.
- 4. Cooke R. Experts in uncertainty: opinion and subjective probability in science. Oxford University Press on Demand, 1991.
- 5. European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). Guidance on expert knowledge elicitation in food and feed safety risk assessment. *EFSA Journal*. 2014; 12(6):3734.
- 6. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). NICE health technology evaluations: the manual. 2022. Available at: https://www.nice.org.uk/process/pmg36/chapter/introduction-to-health-technology-evaluation. Accessed: 2 June 2022.



Lumanity applies incisive thinking and decisive action to cut through complex situations and deliver transformative outcomes to accelerate and optimize access to medical advances. With deep experience in medical, commercial, and regulatory affairs, Lumanity transforms data and information into real-world insights and evidence that powers successful commercialization and empowers patients, providers, payers, and regulators to take timely and decisive action.

Contact us to learn more about how Lumanity can support your unique challenge.

lumanity.com

The Centre for Health Economics (CHE) at the University of York is a world-renowned institute that produces policy relevant research and innovative methods that advance the use of health economics to improve population health.

york.ac.uk/che

