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Background Different methodologies are used to achieve consensus on a subject. These can include the Delphi technique, the Expert panel, and more recent adaptions, both in content and in method for reaching respondents. During the PRACTISE-study we have sought 3 respondents per country/region evaluate the implementation of various pharmacist-led cognitive services.

Purpose The aim of this study is to describe the adapted consensus method used to achieve country/region consensus within PRACTISE- survey respondents.

Method This process involved two rounds: in the first round, the previously developed questionnaire was sent to selected participants (aiming at three per country/region). To achieve consensus within the country/region we classified them into 3 groups according to the number of respondents included in round one: Group A: countries/regions with 1 respondent; group B: countries/regions with 2 respondents; group C: countries/regions with 3 respondents. During the second round, different documents and procedures for validation purposes were used. In group A, the document was sent to a fourth person from the same country/region, who acted as a validator of the responses obtained by the sole responder obtained. In groups B and C, a consensus document was developed and resent to the same participants, informing them of previous responses and asking them to rethink their answers aiming for consensus.

Findings The first round lasted from November 2016 to March 2017 obtaining responses from 34 countries/regions (2.5 respondents per country/region). The first analysis was undertaken by two independent PRACTISE team members aiming to prepare the consensus documents (one per country/region). Round two was initiated in early July, when documents were sent to the 3 groups. A response rate of 91.1% (n=34) was obtained in round two. Group A included 7 countries/regions, and we were able to find validators to 5 of them (response rate=71.4%). Group B comprised 12 countries/regions and we obtained full response from 9 of them, representing 75%. Group C comprised 15 countries/regions and we obtained 66.6% full responses; a minority of responses were from two (20%) or only one participant of the initial respondents (13.3%). We didn?t have any response from 3 countries/regions: France, Georgia, Serbia.

Conclusion The adapted consensus technique (one round of consensus) shows that is possible to have a successful cross-check between different answers, whilst producing results with varying credibility. Future validation will be pursued by the PRACTISE team in the countries where fewer respondents were reached, using references provided by participants and/or documents publicly available.