

Developing a Research Agenda for Adult Palliative Care: A Modified Delphi Study

Sullivan et al. (2019)

<https://doi.org/10.1089/jpm.2018.0462>

For which topic were research priorities identified?

adult palliative care

In which location was the research priority setting conducted?

Australia - Australia

Why was it conducted at all?

Little is known about research priorities in adult palliative care. Identifying research priorities for adult palliative care will help in increasing research quality and translation.

What was the objective?

to identify the views of health professionals' research priorities in adult palliative care that lead to development of a palliative care research agenda in Australia

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?

Delphi

How were the priorities for research identified exactly?

Step 1: Delphi round 1: participants were asked to provide their top five priority areas for adult palliative care research in Australia, 125 priorities submitted. Step 2: data processing. Step 3: Delphi round 2: participants were asked to rate each of the 90 items. Step 4: Delphi round 3: participants were asked to rank their top 10 research priorities from those 19 achieving consensus in round 2

Which stakeholders took part?

Palliative care researchers, clinicians. Delphi round 1: 25 participants. Delphi round 2: 14 participants. Delphi round 3: 13 participants.

How were stakeholders recruited?

Panelists were identified as current experts in palliative care research and/or practice in Australia. The research team identified potential panelists (N= 146), purposively selected as experts, 17 from websites of national and state palliative care associations, university profiles, and lists of presenters at recent palliative care conferences. Several palliative care organizations also advertised the study to members. Potential panelists were invited with an individual link to the round 1 questionnaire, and only those panelists who completed each round received invitations for subsequent rounds.

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.