

Priority Issues for Pressure Injury Research: An Australian Consensus Study

Haesler et al. (2018)
<https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.21878>

For which topic were research priorities identified?

pressure injuries

In which location was the research priority setting conducted?

Australia - Australia

Why was it conducted at all?

Pressure injuries represent a major burden for health consumers and their caregivers (Galhardo, Magalhaes, Blanes, Juliano, & Ferreira, 2010; Gorecki, Nixon, Madill, Firth, & Brown, 2012). Increased morbidity and mortality associated with pressure injury development in hospitalized patients is well-documented (Degenholtz, Rosen, Castle, Mittal, & Liu, 2008; Essex, Clark, Sims, Warriner, & Cullum, 2009). Hospital lengths of stay, readmission rates, and healthcare costs are greater in individuals who develop a pressure injury (Lyder et al., 2012; Wilson, Arnold, Singh, Kalsi-Ryan, & Fehlings, 2012; Wu, Ning, Li, Feng, & Feng, 2013). Additionally, impact on quality of life and wellbeing associated with a chronic wound, including pain and discomfort (Gorecki, Closs, Nixon, & Briggs, 2011; Gorecki et al., 2012); stress, anxiety, and depression (Degenholtz et al., 2008; Essex et al., 2009; Galhardo et al., 2010); lowered autonomy and security; and impaired social functioning (Essex et al., 2009), is immeasurable. However, in Australia there was found to be no consensus among health consumers, health care agencies or research funders for determining research priorities to address these issues.

What was the objective?

to identify and prioritize pressure injury research issues

What was the outcome?

a ranking list of 26 research topics

How long did the research prioritization take?

No information provided.

Which methods were used to identify research priorities?

survey

How were the priorities for research identified exactly?

Step 1: reviewing literature. Step 2: identifying potential research issues: overarching evidence summaries were developed, based on summaries potential research issues were identified. Step 3: consensus process: voting platform using RAND/UCLA Appropriateness Method: online nominal group voting process: 3 rounds of voting, sharing opinion, reasoning summaries presented between rounds of voting, final round of voting: ranking items on priority list

Which stakeholders took part?

Australian pressure injury experts: academia, nursing, medicine, surgery, occupational therapy and dietetics. Voting participants: 13 experts in Delphi round 1, 15 experts in Delphi round 2, 13 experts in Delphi round 3.

How were stakeholders recruited?

Sixteen Australian pressure injury experts were invited to participate in the consensus process. Experts were selected based on their knowledge and clinical expertise in the field with consideration to interprofessional representation and, where possible, representation from each of the Australian States/Territories.

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.