



iHTS - I2GG - Prioritization System Manual

This manual gives a simple overview of the four developed parts of the prioritization system and explains how each role should use them. The system follows the logic of structured prioritization, predefined criteria, weighting, expert input, and transparent documentation described in the uploaded BRIDGE and PriTec guidance.

System overview

The full workflow is built around four parts that move from setup to expert input and then to final aggregation. This follows the methodological idea that prioritization should be transparent, criteria-based, and supported by organized expert judgement rather than ad hoc decisions.

Part	Purpose	Main output
Part 1	Set up the prioritization process	Process ID, title, scope, workflow settings
Part 2	Build and edit the question framework	Domains, tiers, detailed questions, weights
Part 3	Expert questionnaire use	Completed XML questionnaire files
Part 4	Aggregate results and export outputs	Summary tables, participant list, Word and CSV exports

Part 1

Part 1 is the process setup area. It defines the process ID, title, and main administrative settings that are needed before expert scoring starts. This reflects the guidance that prioritization should start with a clear and predefined process instead of informal topic selection.

Part 1 checklist

- Create a unique process ID.
- Add a clear process title.
- Define the technology or topic under review.
- Confirm the intended prioritization round.



- Save the base process structure.
- Make sure the process ID will be used consistently in later XML files.

Part 1 tips

- Use short and stable process IDs.
- Avoid changing the process ID once expert work has started.
- Keep the title understandable for both administrators and experts.

Part 2

Part 2 is the question and domain builder. It organizes the prioritization framework into the main tiers of technology, healthcare system, and society, and it allows detailed questions to be added below each domain. This matches the uploaded guidance, which supports structured criteria, domain-based review, and weighted scoring across multiple dimensions such as disease burden, clinical impact, economics, safety, ethics, legal aspects, and implementation issues.

Domain structure used in the tool

- Technology tier: technology name, alternate name, development level, indication, PICO-style description, target population, burden of disease, and impact on guidelines.
- Healthcare system tier: legal aspects, clinical and organizational impact, infrastructure, direct and indirect costs, secondary implementation or disinvestment costs, and safety for patients, professionals, and relatives or social partners.
- Society tier: ethical and moral impact, sex and gender issues, underprivileged populations, minorities, social and financial impact, environmental impact, industry impact, wealth aspects, and policy implications.

Part 2 checklist

- Confirm all needed tiers are present.
- Confirm each tier contains the right domains.
- Add or edit detailed questions under each domain.



- Check that wording is simple and answerable.
- Set a weight for each domain with the slider.
- Review whether the question list is complete before expert distribution.
- Export the configured structure as XML.

Part 2 tips

- Keep each question focused on one idea.
- Avoid overlap between questions from different domains.
- Use weights carefully, because they influence the final prioritization pattern.
- Review society questions with a broader systems perspective, including possible system dynamics effects, feedback loops, and unintended consequences.

Part 3

Part 3 is the expert questionnaire part. Experts use the configured questionnaire, complete their scoring, and export their answers as XML files linked to the correct process ID. This reflects the PriTec logic that structured expert scoring supports prioritization while still leaving room for final deliberation and decision-making.

Part 3 checklist

- Open the correct questionnaire.
- Confirm the process ID matches the invitation.
- Review the full set of domains and questions.
- Score each question carefully.
- Add comments when needed.
- Record the final expert recommendation.
- Export the completed questionnaire as XML.
- Send or upload the XML file to the owner or administrator.

Part 3 tips



- Complete all questions where possible.
- Use comments when evidence is uncertain.
- Do not change the process ID in the XML output.
- Keep personal participant details complete if they should appear in the participation list.

Part 4

Part 4 is the owner aggregation and reporting area. It accepts multiple XML files linked to the same process ID, summarizes the questionnaires, lists participants, and exports final outputs in Word-compatible and CSV formats. This follows the uploaded guidance on transparency, structured scoring, expert participation, and traceable reporting across prioritization and post-launch review processes.

Part 4 outputs

- Final summary table by domain.
- Final summary table by question.
- Separate participant table.
- Word-compatible summary document.
- Word-compatible participant document.
- CSV export of answers for Excel.
- CSV export of participants for Excel.

Statistical outputs included in Part 4

The final summary includes descriptive statistics at domain and question level, including number of responses, mean, median, standard deviation, minimum, maximum, and weighted mean contribution where weight data are available. These statistics support interpretation of strength, variation, and completeness of scoring, which is consistent with the methodological need to understand whether prioritization results are stable, heterogeneous, or limited by incomplete evidence.

Part 4 checklist

- Open the aggregation page.



- Enter the selected process ID, or leave it blank to review all uploaded XML files.
- Upload all relevant XML files.
- Review accepted and rejected files.
- Check the participant list.
- Check whether the expert recommendation is shown for each participant.
- Review domain statistics.
- Review question statistics.
- Download the summary document.
- Download the participant document.
- Export CSV answers if Excel analysis is needed.
- Export CSV participants if Excel reporting is needed.

Part 4 tips

- Use the participant debug section when participant information is missing.
- If files are rejected, first check the process ID and XML structure.
- Use the CSV exports for additional filtering, pivot tables, and charts in Excel.

Full workflow

The four parts work best when used in a fixed order. This reduces errors and makes the prioritization process easier to document and explain.

Full workflow checklist

1. Create the process in Part 1.
2. Build and review the questions in Part 2.
3. Send the questionnaire to experts in Part 3.
4. Collect XML files from experts.
5. Upload the XML files into Part 4.



6. Review statistics, recommendations, and participant data.
7. Export final outputs for reporting and archiving.

Admin or owner one-pager

The admin or owner manages the process, controls the question framework, gathers completed XML files, checks data quality, and prepares the final outputs. This role is responsible for transparency, consistency of process IDs, and quality control of the final prioritization package.

Main tasks

- Set up the process.
- Maintain the question framework.
- Make sure experts receive the correct version.
- Collect and validate XML files.
- Review summary statistics and participant data.
- Export final documents and tables.

Admin or owner quick checklist

- Create a process ID.
- Confirm the topic and title.
- Finalize the domains and questions.
- Finalize weights.
- Share the correct questionnaire with experts.
- Collect all XML files.
- Check accepted and rejected files.
- Confirm participant details are visible.
- Confirm expert recommendations are visible.
- Export summary and participant documents.



- Export CSV tables for Excel if needed.
- Archive outputs under the correct process ID.

Common admin or owner mistakes

- Changing the process ID too late.
- Sending different questionnaire versions to different experts.
- Forgetting to review rejected files.
- Exporting reports before checking missing participant data.

Expert one-pager

The expert role is to review the questionnaire carefully, provide scores and comments, and return a correct XML file linked to the selected process ID. The expert input supports structured prioritization, but it does not replace the final group interpretation and decision process.

Main tasks

- Open the correct questionnaire.
- Review the topic and process ID.
- Score the questions carefully.
- Add comments where needed.
- State the final recommendation.
- Export the XML file.
- Return the XML file to the owner.

Expert quick checklist

- Confirm the process ID.
- Read the questionnaire instructions.
- Complete all possible questions.
- Add comments where evidence is limited or uncertain.



- Record a clear final recommendation.
- Check that name and role are correct if participation tracking is required.
- Export the XML file.
- Send the file back without renaming internal fields.

Common expert mistakes

- Using the wrong process ID.
- Leaving the recommendation blank.
- Exporting an incomplete questionnaire.
- Editing the XML structure manually after export.

Simple quality checks

These checks help keep the whole process clean and easy to defend in meetings, reporting, or audits.[file:7][file:2]

Quality checklist

- The process ID is the same across all parts.
- The questions reflect the final agreed framework.
- Domain weights were reviewed before expert scoring started.
- XML files were exported from the correct version.
- All expert files were uploaded into Part 4.
- Participant details were checked.
- Recommendations were checked.
- Summary statistics were reviewed before reporting.
- Final Word and CSV outputs were downloaded and archived.

Practical note



The current developed tools are front-end HTML tools designed for WordPress embedding and local browser use. Word exports are Word-compatible document files, and CSV exports are available for Excel-oriented analysis and reporting.

Final use note

This system is useful for creating a structured and transparent prioritization workflow, but the final result should still be interpreted with expert judgement, especially where evidence is incomplete, scoring variability is high, or ethical and organizational implications are complex.