

Chronic Breathlessness Explanations and Research Priorities: Findings from an International Delphi Survey

Williams et al. (2020)

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2019.10.012>

For which topic were research priorities identified?

chronic breathlessness

In which location was the research priority setting conducted?

Australia - Australia

Why was it conducted at all?

More recently, the need for better education and research specific to chronic breathlessness has been identified by people living chronic breathlessness, informal carers and health professionals. While a 'breathlessness curriculum' may include a range of topics, one underexplored yet potentially impactful aspect of better breathlessness education is how chronic breathlessness is explained.

What was the objective?

to gather perspectives from health professionals with clinical/research expertise in chronic breathlessness on priority issues in chronic breathlessness explanations and research

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?

Delphi

How were the priorities for research identified exactly?

Step 1: Delphi round 1: survey asking participants: In your opinion, which three to five questions should be priorities for breathlessness research in the next 5 years?. Step 2: data processing. Step 3: Delphi round 2: participants were asked to rate importance of 82 topics. Step 4: Delphi round 3: participants were asked to re-rate

Which stakeholders took part?

International health professionals with clinical/research expertise in chronic breathlessness. Delphi round 1: 31 participants. Delphi round 2: 24 participants. Delphi round 3: 24 participants.

How were stakeholders recruited?

Potential participants were identified based on three criteria: 1) recognised expertise in chronic breathlessness (dyspnoea), evidenced by recent publications or involvement in key breathlessness-related consensus guidelines; 2) multi-professionality; and 3) broad geographic spread.

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.