

Prioritizing Chinese Medicine Clinical Research Questions in Cancer Palliative Care: International Delphi Survey

Wong et al. (2019)

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2019.08.002>

For which topic were research priorities identified?

cancer palliative care

In which location was the research priority setting conducted?

Asia; Australia; Europe; North America

Why was it conducted at all?

With scarce, research funding it is important to identify clinical research priorities where effectiveness of promising Chinese medicine interventions for cancer palliative care needs to be confirmed before dissemination and implementation.

What was the objective?

to prioritize Chinese medicine clinical research questions for cancer palliative care

What was the outcome?

a ranking list of 8 research questions

How long did the research prioritization take?

No information provided.

Which methods were used to identify research priorities?

consultation; Delphi; survey

How were the priorities for research identified exactly?

Step 1: collecting research questions: via literature review: research needs were first identified from overviews and reviews on Chinese medicine interventions for cancer palliative care, additionally, via stakeholder consultation: authors of these syntheses were asked to provide feedback and specify potential research needs, via qualitative interviews: among Chinese and international experts to collect comments and suggestions for further amendment on these potential research questions. Step 2: Delphi round 1: list of 25 research questions on Chinese medicine for cancer palliative care, participants were asked to rate the clinical importance of each question, participants were also invited to provide qualitative comments on why such a rating was given and were offered the opportunity to revise existing research questions or propose new questions, participants were requested to suggest outcome measures for each question. Step 3: Delphi round 2: list of 26 research questions including 22 questions listed in round 1 plus four new questions, participants asked to re-rate importance of each question

Which stakeholders took part?

Interviews: 10 experts. Delphi: 12 participants: 3 physicians, 3 Chinese medicine practitioners, 3 nurses, 3 clinical research methodologists.

How were stakeholders recruited?

Experts in their fields were identified.

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.