

High Priority Future Research Needs for Obstructive Sleep Apnea Diagnosis and Treatment

Patel et al. (2013)
<https://doi.org/10.5664/jcsm.2600>

For which topic were research priorities identified?

obstructive sleep apnea

In which location was the research priority setting conducted?

North America - USA

Why was it conducted at all?

A 2011 comparative effectiveness review of obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) diagnosis and treatment, conducted for the Agency for Healthcare Quality and Research (AHRQ) found many gaps in the evidence resulting in frequent low strengths or insufficient evidence to answer key research questions. To identify and prioritize future research needs (FRN) topics for OSA management, we convened diverse panels of stakeholders with the goal of assisting researchers and funders of research to improve the body of comparative effectiveness evidence useful for decision-makers. The goal was to encourage researchers and their funders to address research topics that are of highest priority to a full range of health care stakeholders.

What was the objective?

to identify and prioritize future research needs topics for diagnosis and treatment of obstructive sleep apnea

What was the outcome?

a ranking list of 10 research topics

How long did the research prioritization take?

No information provided.

Which methods were used to identify research priorities?

consultation

How were the priorities for research identified exactly?

Step 1: literature review to identify FRN topics. Step 2: stakeholder consultation: stakeholders provided with starting list of topics based on literature review and asked to nominate additional topics. Step 3: prioritization: stakeholders asked to select 5 to 10 topics with highest priority out of a total of 37 FRN topics (18 for diagnosis and 19 for treatment)

Which stakeholders took part?

Patients and the public, providers, purchasers, payers, policymakers, principal investigators, and product makers. 21 participants.

How were stakeholders recruited?

The recruited stakeholders were from a variety of areas relevant to OSA, and included both clinicians and non-clinicians and were asked to participate in in one or both of two stakeholder panels for diagnosis and, separately, treatment of OSA.

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.