

A Modified Delphi Consensus Study to Identify UK Osteopathic Profession Research Priorities

Rusthon et al. (2014)

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.math.2014.04.013>

For which topic were research priorities identified?

osteopathy

In which location was the research priority setting conducted?

Europe - United Kingdom

Why was it conducted at all?

There is an increasing emphasis to take an evidence-based approach to healthcare. To obtain evidence relevant to the osteopathic profession a clear research direction is required based on the views of stakeholders in the osteopathic profession.

What was the objective?

to explore the views of osteopaths and patients regarding research priorities for osteopathy

What was the outcome?

a ranking list of 20 research questions

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: participants were asked to identify up to 10 research priority areas and to give rationale behind choices, total of 610 research priority areas identified. Step 2: data processing: submissions collated and categorized. Step 3: Delphi round 2: list of research priority areas grouped as themes with supporting statements, participants were asked to rate importance of each area. Step 4: Delphi round 3: participants were asked to re-rate each research priority area

Which stakeholders took part?

Osteopaths, patients. Delphi round 1: 145 participants. Delphi round 2: 98 participants. Delphi round 3: 61 participants.

How were stakeholders recruited?

Osteopathic participants were invited to take part in the study by email circulation to the whole profession via the British Osteopathic Association and General Osteopathic Council email distribution lists. Advertisements were placed also on the website of these organizations and the website for the NCOR. The osteopathic participants included clinicians, researchers, and educators. Service users (patients) were invited to participate by information being communicated via participating osteopathic practices to potentially recruit a wide and diverse range of participants.

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.