

**Survey Guidance**  
**European Research Paediatric Emergency Medicine**  
**Network REPEM**



Surveys are an essential part of the development of some research concepts, studies, and grant applications; this guidance aims to optimise the quality and response rates for REPEM surveys while minimising the burden to members and sites.

Survey proposals must include at least one REPEM member in the study team, and may be submitted twice a year on the standard REPEM survey proposal form. These will be discussed at Steering Committee meetings and open REPEM meetings as appropriate during their development – this step is necessary to approve the concept, which requires a majority positive vote. Survey content and quality will be reviewed by a representative number of the Steering Committee (SC) to ensure high methodologic rigour as described by Burns et al. CMAJ, 2008: 179(3); 245-252 (<http://www.cmaj.ca/cgi/reprint/179/3/245>). These SC members will be identified through voluntary contribution, and this is the final approval step.

Proposals can be submitted using the survey proposal submission form as present on the website, and should be sent to: [repem.secretary@gmail.com](mailto:repem.secretary@gmail.com).

Survey proposals will be evaluated using the following criteria (Appendix 1):

- Survey aims
- Survey development methodology
- Congruent with the current REPEM research agenda (see *Research priorities for European Paediatric emergency medicine*, Bressan et al. *ADC* 2019, doi:10.1136)
- Importance to pediatric emergency medicine
- Quality of the survey including clarity, length, and flow
- Acquisition plan for respondents (In general, participation at a site level with surveys is voluntary, though exceptions may be made to this by the Executive Committee where a whole network response is felt to be essential).
- Future plans based on results of survey
- Reasonable timeline

The review phase will contain one feedback round on these criteria. Proposals are not limited to the REPEM research agenda topics, but it is one of the criteria. Projects should be judged *sufficient* or higher for *'relevance'* and *'overall quality'* to enter a resubmission phase for final decisions.

**Timeline evaluation proposals:**

Date submission first draft	Feedback to Chief Investigator	Date submission revised project	Final decision	Presentation to REPEM
Dec year	Februar year+1	May year+1	June year +1	At EUSEM
June year	Sept year	Oct year	Dec year+1	Email in Jan year+1

Distribution of surveys will be planned after approval, by taking into account other ongoing surveys/research activities. The make-up of the distributed survey portfolio should follow the lay-out of REPEM. will be at the discretion of the Executive Committee. The Chief Investigator is responsible

to distribute the survey and invite respondents. Participation will always be voluntary for individuals. All surveys will be accompanied by an introductory explanatory note, which explains the reason for the survey, how long it will take to complete, the deadline for completion, and that it has been adopted by REPEM.

The Chief Investigator is obliged to inform REPEM members on the results of the survey (at least one year after the survey at the annual REPEM meeting, a short summary of results on the REPEM website and by distributing e.g. published article, congresspresentation/abstract). Response rates must be provided to the Steering Committee as soon after completion as possible as a minimum. Feedback may also be sought from the survey team to establish how sites and members interacted with the study, and from participants – these data will be used to further refine the general approach and specific content of survey studies distributed in the future.

A balance must be struck on anonymity in surveys, and this will be reviewed during the approvals process. Anonymity provides a greater degree of freedom in answering questions, but on occasion responses require further clarification – this can only be achieved where the respondent is known. Wherever possible, personal identifiers should only be provided through the freewill of the respondent. Any identifiable personal information (including names and email addresses) should be maintained by the administrator distributing the survey and not shared with the study survey team unless explicit approval is given by the participant. Any resulting outputs must not name individual participants, and should not link participating institutions to results by name unless this is specified in the survey proposal.

Authorship of any resulting publications must be “on behalf of REPEM”, and the REPEM logo must appear in any scientific oral or poster presentations. Authorship for individuals should follow authorship guidelines laid out in the REPEM operational policy. It is not mandatory but recommended to one of the REPEM Steering Committee members as co-author in order to ensure high quality research and procedures endorsed by REPEM are followed. Otherwise, Chief investigators are encouraged to include other REPEM members outside their institution with specific expertise for the study added to the expertise of their own research group. Those who provide significant contribution at a site level should be recognized through inclusion in the acknowledgements or contributors section, depending on the journal.