

Identifying Research Priorities for Patient Safety in Mental Health: An International Expert Delphi Study

Dewa et al. (2018)

<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2017-021361>

For which topic were research priorities identified?

patient safety in mental health

In which location was the research priority setting conducted?

Asia - Singapore; Australia - Australia; Australia - New Zealand; Europe - Denmark; Europe - Finland; Europe - Germany; Europe - Ireland; Europe - Netherlands; Europe - Sweden; Europe - Switzerland; Europe - United Kingdom; North America - USA

Why was it conducted at all?

Physical healthcare has dominated the patient safety field; research in mental healthcare is not as extensive but findings from physical healthcare cannot be applied to mental healthcare because it delivers specialised care that faces unique challenges. Therefore, a clearer focus and recognition of patient safety in mental health as a distinct research area is still needed.

What was the objective?

to identify future research priorities in the field of patient safety in mental health

What was the outcome?

a list of 79 research topics

How long did the research prioritization take?

No information provided.

Which methods were used to identify research priorities?

Delphi; interview

How were the priorities for research identified exactly?

Step 1: interviews: with academic experts and with service user experts to ascertain their views on research priorities in patient safety in mental health. Step 2: data processing: thematic analysis: 117 priority statements extracted. Step 3: Delphi round 1: participants were asked to rate each statement, 38 statements reached consensus. Step 4: Delphi round 2: 79 statements, summary of the collated statement scores that did not reach agreement was circulated, participants were asked to re-rate based on group scores of round 1, 34 statements reached consensus. Step 5: Delphi round 3: participants were asked to re-rate statements to gain consensus, 6 statements reached consensus in round 3, in total 79 statements reached consensus

Which stakeholders took part?

Academic experts, service user experts. Interview: 9 academic experts. Delphi: 42 participants.

How were stakeholders recruited?

Academic experts satisfied the following inclusion criteria: published at least six articles in patient safety in the mental health field; had at least 5 years experience in patient safety in mental health and established reputation in patient safety in mental health, defined as having a high number of citations, a role at a national level or having made a significant impact to the academic field. Service user experts were recruited through a UK-based independent third-sector group. Inclusion criteria included: personal experience of mental health services and an ability to comment on patient safety-related issues. Service users were excluded if they were unable to provide informed consent due to being too physically or mentally unwell or if they were non-English speaking. Delphi: Potential service user experts were approached by email by selected third-sector organizations. The inclusion criteria for service users was the same as the interview criteria. The survey was also advertised on Twitter and in a third-sector newsletter.

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.