

Identifying and prioritising outcomes in sexual health: using formal consensus development methods

Rebecca Rees

Summary

- A range of stakeholders participated in an advisory group for a systematic review of sexual health promotion for men who have sex with men (MSM).
- The group met three times. As well as advising on other aspects of the research¹, the group decided which outcomes were to be prioritised in the review.
- This was done through a structured process of listing and discussing potential outcomes and then voting to identify those favoured by most group members.

Who?

Service-user groups -Terrence Higgins Trust, Gay Men Fighting Aids

Policy makers/influencers - Department of Health (DH), National Aids Trust

Researchers - National HIV Prevention Service, Sigma Research, MRC Social and Public Health Sciences Unit Univ Glasgow

Why?

MSM - the group at greatest risk of acquiring HIV infection in the UK.

High quality research on effectiveness and acceptability of health promotion interventions for MSM is **scarce**.

Funder - DH wanted to take into account participants' views from ongoing collaborative work (Community AIDS Prevention Strategy CHAPS) partnership

How?

- A **systematic map** was presented to Advisory Group at their second meeting
Map was produced using comprehensive searches and systematic coding to address the broad question, 'What is known about the barriers to and facilitators of HIV health promotion for MSM?'
- The group was presented with a **flipchart list of all outcomes identified** from intervention evaluations
Asked to **discuss, add and refine outcomes**. Asked to stop only when they considered list exhaustive
Each group member **voted** (1st round) using 15 green stickers
Before voting in 2nd round (5 gold stickers), group **discussed results of 1st round**
- The **most popular outcomes and the outcome with greatest number of votes** were noted.

Outcomes (selection)	Round 1	Round 2	
Knowledge	*****	****	✓
Beliefs	*****	**	✓
Skills General Practical Interpersonal	*****	* ** ****	✓
Episodes of unprotected anal intercourse (UAI)	***		
Sero-discordant /unknown status unprotected anal intercourse (sdUAI)	*****	*****	✓✓✓
HIV incidence	*****	****	✓
Structural outcomes (e.g. new service, condom distribution)	*****	****	✓

✓✓✓ Priority outcome - received most emphasis in review write-up

Further details:

EPPI-Centre · Social Science Research Unit · Institute of Education · University of London · 18 Woburn Square · London · WC1H 0NR · UK
http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/
email: r.rees@ioe.ac.uk

References and acknowledgements

•Rees R, Oliver S (2007) User involvement in systematic reviews. In Carr S, Coren E. *Collection of examples of service user and carer participation in systematic reviews*. London: SCIE

This work was undertaken by the EPPI-Centre, which received funding from the Department of Health. The views expressed are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Department of Health.