

Prioritised Research Areas within the Fields of Prevention, Diagnosis and Treatment of Maternal Birth Injuries

<https://www.sbu.se/en/publications/Prioritisation-of-scientific-evidence-gaps/prioritised-research-areas-within-the-fields-of-prevention-diagnosis-and-treatment-of-maternal-birth-injuries/>

For which topic were research priorities identified?

prevention, diagnosis and treatment of maternal birth injuries

In which location was the research priority setting conducted?

Europe - Sweden

Why was it conducted at all?

By highlighting the research questions prioritised by women suffering from birth injuries and clinicians caring for these women, we hope that relevant and well-designed clinical studies addressing these questions will be appropriately conducted.

What was the objective?

to emphasize areas within prevention, diagnosis and treatment of physical injuries associated with vaginal birth that require further research

What was the outcome?

a ranking list of 9 research areas

How long did the research prioritization take?

No information provided.

Which methods were used to identify research priorities?

survey; workshop

How were the priorities for research identified exactly?

Step 1: literature review: 21 areas were identified from the two SBU reports. Step 2: survey: participants were asked to choose their ten most important areas, the 15 evidence gaps that were assigned the highest priority moved forward to the workshop. Step 3: workshop: participants were divided into groups where both women with birth injuries and health care personnel, each group prioritized their top 10 evidence gaps, a discussion with all group members resulted in a definite prioritization of 10 evidence gaps

Which stakeholders took part?

18 participants: women suffering from birth injuries (patient experts) and those providing care to them, such as midwives, obstetricians, physiotherapists, gynaecologist surgeons, urologists and urotherapist. Survey: 18 participants. Workshop: 15 participants.

How were stakeholders recruited?

No information provided.

Were stakeholders actively involved or did they just participate?

Stakeholders were mere participants of the research prioritization process; they were not actively involved in the process.