

Identifying Research Priorities in Eating Disorders: A Delphi Study Building Consensus Across Clinicians, Researchers, Consumers, and Carers in Australia

Hart & Wade (2020)
<https://doi.org/10.1002/eat.23172>

For which topic were research priorities identified?

eating disorders

In which location was the research priority setting conducted?

Australia - Australia

Why was it conducted at all?

Eating disorders are underrepresented among successful applications for medical research funding. Developing agreement on the top research priorities may assist in fostering collaborations, innovation, and meaningful consumer and carer involvement.

What was the objective?

to develop consensus among Australian clinicians, researchers, consumers, carers, and interested members of affiliated industries, on the priorities for eating disorders research

What was the outcome?

a ranking list of 6 research areas

How long did the research prioritization take?

No information provided.

Which methods were used to identify research priorities?

Delphi

How were the priorities for research identified exactly?

Step 1: Delphi round 1: NEDC steering committee was asked to provide areas of research they considered priorities for the eating disorder field, additionally literature reviewed. Step 2: Delphi round 2: list of 29 items, participants were asked to rate importance of specific research areas and to rank broad research domains in order of priority.

Which stakeholders took part?

Australian members of the two preeminent eating disorder professional and advocacy organizations; the Australia and New Zealand Academy for Eating Disorders (ANZAED) and the National Collaboration for Eating Disorders (NEDC): clinicians, researchers, consumers, carers, and interested members of affiliated industries. Delphi round 1: 201 participants. Delphi round 2: 82 participants.

How were stakeholders recruited?

Participants were recruited via ANZAED and NEDC listservs.

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.