

Setting the Surgical Wound Care Agenda Across Two Healthcare Districts: A Priority Setting Approach

Gillespie et al. (2020)
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colegn.2020.02.011>

For which topic were research priorities identified?

surgical wound care

In which location was the research priority setting conducted?

Australia - Australia

Why was it conducted at all?

Surgical wounds are the most common wounds seen in hospitals and if not managed appropriately, are at increased risk of surgical site infection (SSI). Yet, their management remains an area with considerable variation in practice (Gillespie, Chaboyer, Kang, et al., 2014). A lack of robust evidence, confounded by a plethora of product choice (Gillespie, Chaboyer, Nieuwenhoven, & Rickard, 2012), complex patient needs and fragmentation of care, creates challenges in treating wounds (Gillespie, Chaboyer, St John, Nieuwenhoven, & Morley, 2014). The findings of previous research suggest that there are significant differences between recommended practices and what is actually observed in day-to-day surgical wound care (Ding, Lin, Marshall, & Gillespie, 2017; Chaboyer, St John et al., 2014; Gillespie et al., 2012). Further, busy health professionals are often unaware of the research evidence that exists (Gillespie, Chaboyer, Allen, Morely, & Nieuwenhoven, 2013), and the clinical challenges they identify represent important opportunities for research and implementation. Knowing what priorities are important to health providers as end-users, matters.

What was the objective?

to identify health professionals' perceived surgical wound care priorities that would inform future research and implementation efforts in wound care

What was the outcome?

a ranking list of 4 research questions

How long did the research prioritization take?

No information provided.

Which methods were used to identify research priorities?

workshop

How were the priorities for research identified exactly?

Step 1: workshop: with nominal group technique, presentation of workable list of ideas, followed by silent ranking: in each group participants ranked questions from 1 most important to 5 least important, overall two rounds of ranking within groups of questions and two rounds of ranking questions across groups of questions, lastly participants were asked to rank the top four priority questions overall

Which stakeholders took part?

38 health professionals who had at least one year of experience post qualification, regularly cared for patients with acute and/or complex wounds or were wound specialists or managed wound care services.

How were stakeholders recruited?

Participants were recruited via staff email, screensavers on hospital computers, senior nursing and allied health level meetings, and ward walk-arounds.

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.