

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Research Priorities for Pregnancy Hypertension: a UK Priority Setting Partnership with the James Lind Alliance

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-036347
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	11-Dec-2019
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Ho, Alison; King's College London, Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences Webster, Louise; King's College London, Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences Bowen, Liza; King's College London, School of Population Health and Environmental Sciences Creighton, Fiona; Lay member Findlay, Sarah; Lay member Gale, Chris; Imperial College London, Neonatal Medicine, School of Public Health Green, Marcus; Action on Pre-eclampsia Gronlund, Toto; James Lind Alliance, National Institute for Health Research Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre Magee, Laura; King's College London, Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences McManus, Richard; University of Oxford, Dept of Primary Care Health Sciences Mistry, Hiten; University of Nottingham, Division of Child Health, Obstetrics and Gynaecology, School of Medicine Singleton, Gemma; Lay member Thornton, Jim; University of Nottingham, Division of Child Health, Obstetrics and Gynaecology, School of Medicine Whybrow, rebecca; King's College London, Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences Chappell, Dr Lucy; King's College London, Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences</p>
Keywords:	OBSTETRICS, Hypertension < CARDIOLOGY, Maternal medicine < OBSTETRICS, PRIMARY CARE, NEONATOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1
2
3 **Research Priorities for Pregnancy Hypertension: a UK Priority Setting Partnership with the James**
4
5 **Lind Alliance**
6

7
8 Alison Ho¹, Louise M Webster¹, Liza Bowen², Fiona Creighton³, Sarah Findlay³, Chris Gale⁴, Marcus
9
10 Green⁵, Toto Gronlund⁶, Laura A Magee¹, Richard J McManus⁷, Hiten D Mistry⁸, Gemma Singleton³,
11
12 Jim G Thornton⁸, Rebecca Whybrow¹, Lucy C Chappell¹
13
14

- 15
16 1. Department of Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences, King's College
17
18 London, London, United Kingdom.
19
20 2. School of Population Health and Environmental Sciences, King's College London, London, UK
21
22 3. Lay member.
23
24 4. Neonatal Medicine, School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, Chelsea and Westminster
25
26 campus, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom.
27
28 5. Action on Pre-eclampsia, The Stables, Evesham, Worcestershire, United Kingdom.
29
30 6. James Lind Alliance, National Institute for Health Research Evaluation, Trials and Studies
31
32 Coordinating Centre, Southampton, United Kingdom.
33
34 7. Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, Radcliffe Primary
35
36 Care, Radcliffe Observatory Quarter, Woodstock Road, Oxford, United Kingdom
37
38 8. Division of Child Health, Obstetrics and Gynaecology, School of Medicine, University of
39
40 Nottingham, United Kingdom
41
42
43
44

45 **Keywords:** Pregnancy hypertension, James Lind Alliance, research priorities, patient and public
46
47 participation
48
49

50 **Corresponding author:** Alison Ho (alison.ho@kcl.ac.uk) +44 20 7188 7188 extension 83634
51

52
53 Department of Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences, King's College London,
54
55 10th Floor, North Wing, St Thomas' Hospital, Westminster Bridge Road, Lambeth, London, SE1 7EH.
56
57

58 **Word count:** 2886
59
60

Abstract

Objectives

To identify research priorities for hypertensive disorders of pregnancy from a lay and clinical perspective.

Design

Prospective surveys and consensus meetings using principles outlined by the James Lind Alliance.

Setting

United Kingdom.

Methods

A steering group was established and “uncertainties” were gathered using an online survey and literature search. An interim online survey ranked longlisted questions and the top 10 research questions were reached by consensus at a final prioritisation workshop.

Participants

Women, partners, relatives and friends of those with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension, researchers and healthcare professionals.

Results

The initial online survey was answered by 278 participants (180 women with lived experience, 9 partners/relatives/friends, 71 healthcare professionals and 18 researchers). Together with a literature search, this identified 764 questions which were refined into 50 summary questions. All

1
2
3 summary questions were presented in an interim prioritisation survey that was answered by 155
4 participants (87 women with lived experience, 4 partners/relatives/friends, 49 healthcare
5 professionals and 15 researchers). The top 25 highest ranked questions were considered by the final
6 prioritisation workshop. The top 10 uncertainties were identified by consensus and ranked as follows
7 in order of priority: long-term consequences of pregnancy hypertension (for the woman and baby),
8 short-term complications of pregnancy hypertension (for the woman and baby), screening tests for
9 pre-eclampsia, prevention of long-term problems (for the woman and baby), causes of pregnancy
10 hypertension, prevention of recurrent pregnancy hypertension, educational needs of healthcare
11 professionals, diagnosis of pre-eclampsia, management of pregnancy hypertension, provision of
12 support for women and families.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Conclusions

27
28
29
30 Research priorities shared by those with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension and healthcare
31 professionals have been identified. Researchers should use these to inform the choice of future
32 studies in this area.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Strengths and Limitations of the study

- 42
43
44 • A consensus on research priorities in pregnancy hypertension was reached by those with
45 lived experience and healthcare professionals.
- 46
47
48 • The approach utilised the James Lind Alliance methodology involving open access online
49 surveys and a final face-to-face prioritisation meeting.
- 50
51
52
53 • Those with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension and healthcare professionals were
54 involved at every stage of the priority setting partnership.
- 55
56
57
58 • The study may have been limited by an imbalance in ethnic diversity of those who
59 participated despite efforts to optimise inclusion.
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- The summary research questions are broad and may prove challenging for researchers to address within single studies.

For peer review only

Introduction

Hypertensive disorders occur in up to 10% of all pregnancies¹ and include pre-eclampsia, gestational hypertension, chronic hypertension, white-coat hypertension and masked hypertension.² There is considerable overlap between these disorders; however, they all share the characteristic of hypertension (≥ 140 mmHg systolic or ≥ 90 mmHg diastolic blood pressure) and are all associated with adverse pregnancy outcomes.³⁻⁷ Pre-eclampsia (hypertension accompanied by proteinuria and/or evidence of maternal acute kidney injury, liver dysfunction, neurological features, haemolysis or thrombocytopenia, and/or fetal growth restriction² has the most substantial impact on maternal and perinatal mortality and morbidity.⁸ Half of women with severe pre-eclampsia deliver preterm and one in twenty stillbirths without congenital abnormality occur in women with pre-eclampsia.⁹ Pre-eclampsia carries important health care implications for later life; women and their children are at increased risk of long-term cardiovascular and metabolic morbidity and mortality.^{10,11}

Current research within hypertensive disorders of pregnancy is broad, exploring epidemiology, prediction, prevention, diagnosis, management and long-term implications for maternal and perinatal health. However, there is often a mismatch between research priorities identified by patients, clinicians and researchers.^{12,13} The James Lind Alliance (JLA) facilitates priority setting partnerships (PSPs) so that an open dialogue amongst those with lived experience of a disorder, carers and clinician groups can occur in order to identify “uncertainties” (questions which cannot be answered by existing research) that are important to all groups in a particular area of health.¹⁴ Uncertainties are subsequently prioritised to ascertain the top 10 research questions, aiming to inform future research studies to address these questions. Since the establishment of the JLA in 2004, this methodology has been used to identify the top 10 research questions in areas such as

1
2
3 asthma ¹⁵, miscarriage ¹⁶ and hyperacusis. ¹⁷ The JLA infrastructure is funded by the National
4
5 Institute for Health Research (NIHR).
6
7
8

9 Objective

10
11
12
13 To identify uncertainties and research priorities for hypertensive disorders of pregnancy in the
14
15 United Kingdom from a lay and clinical perspective using JLA methodology. ¹⁴
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Methods

The core steering group (LC, AH and LW) submitted a readiness questionnaire which was approved by the JLA Secretariat, based at the National Institute for Health Research Evaluation and the Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre (NETSCC), University of Southampton. A JLA advisor (TG) was assigned to facilitate the process and ensure that the JLA methodology was followed. We sought advice from our JLA advisor regarding ethical review prior to starting and concluded that, in line with other JLA priority setting partnerships, it was not required.

The priority setting partnership stages

Initiation

Through peer knowledge and consultation, we formed a steering group for the priority setting partnership. Steering group meetings were chaired by TG and included lay members with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension (GS, FC, SF, MG), obstetrician (JT), an obstetric physician (LM), general practitioners (RM, LB), a midwife (RW), a neonatologist (CG), a research scientist (HM) and JLA advisor (TG), together with the Priority Setting Partnership lead (LC) and information specialists (LW, AH). Women with lived experience and clinicians were represented at every stage and TG was a neutral facilitator, ensuring a fair and transparent process with equal input from all. The pharmaceutical industry was excluded and steering group members completed a declaration of interests' form at the outset for transparency. At the initial steering group meeting, the scope of the priority setting partnership was confirmed to include research priorities related to the following topics in the context of women with pregnancy hypertension: hypertensive disorders (including pre-eclampsia, gestational hypertension, chronic hypertension and white coat hypertension), women, babies, their partners and families, time period related to pregnancy (i.e. pre-conception, antenatal, postnatal and long-term health outcomes), management related to pregnancy hypertension (i.e.

1
2
3 prevention, prediction, diagnosis and treatment), physical, social and emotional aspects, co-
4 morbidities such as renal disease or diabetes, genetics and information provision. Our scope was
5 intentionally broad as we acknowledged that we may not have identified all facets of pregnancy
6 hypertension felt to be important by those with lived experience or clinicians. The protocol was
7 agreed and published on the JLA website in July 2018 [http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-](http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/hypertension-in-pregnancy/downloads/Hypertension-in-Pregnancy-PSP-protocol.pdf)
8 [partnerships/hypertension-in-pregnancy/downloads/Hypertension-in-Pregnancy-PSP-protocol.pdf](http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/hypertension-in-pregnancy/downloads/Hypertension-in-Pregnancy-PSP-protocol.pdf).

17 Identifying clinical uncertainties

18
19
20 In October 2018, we launched an initial online survey to be answered by those with lived experience
21 of hypertension in pregnancy and healthcare professionals, using the
22 <http://www.onlinesurveys.ac.uk> platform. Survey participants were asked to write up to three
23 questions that they wanted answered by hypertension in pregnancy research. They were informed
24 that the order of the questions submitted would not be taken into account. Optional questions
25 included demographic details (gender, age range and ethnicity), name and preferred contact email.
26 Contact details were collected only for the purposes of inviting participation in future activities
27 related to the priority setting partnership and survey participants could remain anonymous. The
28 survey was promoted through social media (Facebook, Twitter), clinical networks known to steering
29 group members and the Action on Pre-eclampsia charity (APEC). In addition to potential
30 uncertainties submitted through the online survey, the steering group identified uncertainties that
31 had previously been reported by The American College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists (ACOG),
32 International Society for the study of Hypertension in Pregnancy (ISSHP) and the National Institute
33 for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) relevant to this topic.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Refining uncertainties

53
54
55 All questions submitted (from the online survey and reported from ACOG, ISSHP and NICE) were
56 assigned a unique question code. They were then reviewed by AH and LMW and thematically
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 grouped into nine categories: mechanisms, prediction, prenatal management, antenatal
4 management, postnatal management, maternal outcomes, perinatal and child outcomes, education
5 and out of scope. Submitted questions were assigned multiple themes, if applicable, and duplicate
6 questions were removed. Each steering group member was assigned a theme and reviewed all
7 questions within the theme to synthesise summary questions. A second steering group member
8 reviewed the summary questions to ensure they were representative of the original questions and
9 both members confirmed that the summary questions were not answered by existing research. All
10 members of the steering group agreed the 50 summary questions to be put forward for interim
11 prioritisation, based on being representative of the wider questions submitted, not answered by
12 existing research, and ensuring that all themes were included.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Interim Prioritisation Survey

27
28
29 A second survey was distributed in April 2019 using the same dissemination routes as the initial
30 survey. Individuals who had expressed an interest to be contacted from the initial survey were also
31 emailed directly. The platform used was supplied by <https://www.optimalworkshop.com/>. Survey
32 participants were asked to identify the top 10 questions they felt to be most important from a
33 randomly presented list of all summary questions. They were then asked to identify their top three
34 summary questions from within their top 10. Following closure of the survey in June 2019, the
35 resulting highly ranked (based on frequency chosen) 25 questions were taken forward for final
36 prioritisation. The source of each question was reviewed to ensure that questions from those with
37 lived experience and clinicians were represented. Incomplete surveys were not included in the
38 analysis as we could not ascertain whether a participant had attempted the survey on more than
39 one occasion.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Final prioritisation

The final prioritisation workshop took place in June 2019 and was chaired by three JLA advisors with oversight from some of the steering group. Participants who attended had previously expressed an interest in doing so by submitting their contact details in either the first survey or the interim prioritisation survey. Participants were representative of geographical diversity, and age, and included partners as well as those with lived experience. In the week prior, participants were sent the most highly ranked 25 questions from the interim survey, asked to review them and rank them from 1 to 25 (1 being most important to them and 25 the least). The 25 summary questions were assigned a randomised reference letter from A to Y.

Participants included 16 men and women with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension, 5 midwives, 4 obstetricians, 1 neonatologist, 1 GP, a representative from the Stillbirth and Neonatal Death Charity (SANDs) and a representative from Best Beginnings charity. Steering group members were present as observers only. On the day they were divided into three groups, with equal numbers of participants with lived experience and clinicians in each, each chaired by a JLA advisor. In the first round of ranking, within each group, participants ranked the questions collectively after reflecting and discussing their reviews of priorities. Groups were subsequently reallocated with a different group composition for a second round of ranking, based on the combined ranking in the first round. A third and final priority setting session followed the aggregate ranking from the second round, which was presented to the whole group. The whole group discussed the results and reached a consensus on the final ranking with a focus on the top 10 prioritised uncertainties.

Results

A summary of the priority setting partnership stages with a timeline are shown in Figure 1. The initial survey was answered by 278 participants, 65% of whom were women with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension and 26% of whom were healthcare professionals (Table 1).

The initial survey and literature search conducted by the steering group identified 764 questions. Thematic review resulted in the greatest number of 241 questions in 'education', followed by 191 questions in 'antenatal management', 120 in 'mechanism', 104 in 'maternal outcomes', 91 in 'perinatal and child outcomes', 71 in 'postnatal management', 65 in 'prediction', 57 in 'prenatal management' and 16 out-of-scope questions. These out-of-scope questions were removed from further analysis. Review by the steering group resulted in the development of 50 summary questions. These were verified as uncertainties and all included in the interim prioritisation survey (listed in Table 2).

The interim prioritisation survey was answered and completed by 155 people, 56% of whom were individuals with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension and 32% from healthcare professionals (Table 3). The top 25 summary questions ranked at the final prioritisation workshop are listed in Table 2. The results of the final top 10 prioritised and ranked uncertainties from the final prioritisation workshop are listed in Table 4.

Table 1: Characteristics of initial survey participants. Values given as a number (percentage)

	Survey participants (n=278)
	N(%)
Category selected	
Women with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension	180 (65)
Partner, relative or friend of someone with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension	9 (3)
Healthcare professional	71 (26)
Obstetrician	22 (8)
Midwife	27 (10)
General Practitioner	5 (2)
Paediatrician	4 (1)
Neonatologist	5 (2)
Physician	2 (1)
Other	6 (2)
Researcher	18 (7)
Demographic details	
Age	
Less than 30 years	27 (10)
30-39 years	105 (38)
40-49 years	75 (27)
50-59 years	54 (19)
60 years and above	15 (5)
No age selected	2 (1)
Gender	
Female	252 (91)
Male	21 (8)
No gender selected	5 (2)
Ethnicity	
White (British, Irish, other)	239 (86)
Mixed	5 (2)
Asian	16 (6)

Chinese	1 (<1)
Black	12 (4)
Other ethnicity	4 (1)
No ethnicity selected	1 (<1)

For peer review only

Table 2: Summary questions presented in second online survey for interim prioritisation (50 in total). The first 25 listed below were highly ranked in the survey and therefore brought forward to the final prioritisation workshop.

1.	How can we optimise information giving for those at risk of or affected by pregnancy hypertension?
2.	How can pregnancy hypertension (including pre-eclampsia) be prevented in a subsequent pregnancy?
3.	What is the cause of pregnancy hypertension (including pre-eclampsia)?
4.	What can be done prior to pregnancy to reduce the risk of pregnancy hypertension?
5.	What is the best way to manage pre-eclampsia?
6.	How can we provide better support for women with pregnancy hypertension and their families?
7.	What is the best way to diagnose pre-eclampsia promptly?
8.	What is the effectiveness and safety of antihypertensive agents at reducing blood pressure in women with pregnancy hypertension?
9.	What are the long-term consequences of pre-eclampsia for the woman and baby?
10.	What is the effectiveness and safety of pharmacological treatments once pre-eclampsia is diagnosed?
11.	How does the placenta contribute to pre-eclampsia?
12.	What is the optimal antihypertensive medication to use postnatally?
13.	What is the best screening test for pre-eclampsia?
14.	What are the optimum blood pressure thresholds (for initiation) and targets for antenatal antihypertensive treatment?
15.	Is there a hereditary link in pre-eclampsia and are the risks different for daughters and sons after an affected pregnancy?
16.	How can we predict complications of pregnancy hypertension (progression to pre-eclampsia)?
17.	What is the optimal timing of delivery in women with pregnancy hypertension?
18.	What interventions are effective and safe at reducing fetal growth restriction in women with pregnancy hypertension?
19.	What are the long-term effects of pre-eclampsia on mental health?
20.	Following pregnancy hypertension, what is the best way to prevent future long-term problems?
21.	What are the educational needs of healthcare professionals managing women with pregnancy hypertension?
22.	What are the fetal, infant and child outcomes in women taking antihypertensive agents?
23.	How can we better prevent stillbirth in pre-eclampsia?
24.	What are the optimum blood pressure thresholds (for initiation) and targets for postnatal antihypertensive treatment?
25.	What pre-pregnancy management of women with chronic hypertension optimises pregnancy outcomes?
26.	What is the optimal monitoring strategy for women before, during and after pregnancy hypertension (including in subsequent pregnancies)?
27.	What are the risk factors for developing pregnancy hypertension and pre-eclampsia?
28.	How can pregnancy hypertension (including pre-eclampsia) be prevented during a pregnancy?
29.	What is the risk of pregnancy hypertension in a subsequent pregnancy?
30.	What is the best test to predict pregnancy hypertension?
31.	What methods are effective at measuring blood pressure in women with pregnancy hypertension (including self-monitoring, ambulatory, automated, manual)?

32.	What is the paternal contribution to pre-eclampsia?
33.	What are the characteristics of postpartum pre-eclampsia?
34.	What is the safety of treatments for pregnancy hypertension for the fetus and infant?
35.	What are the long-term effects of pre-eclampsia on cardiovascular disease for the woman and baby?
36.	What are the long-term effects of pregnancy hypertension on subsequent maternal blood pressure?
37.	What are the consequences of pregnancy hypertension on pre-eclampsia, birthweight and prematurity in that pregnancy?
38.	What is the relationship between blood pressure in pregnancy and development of pregnancy hypertension?
39.	What are the mechanisms for increased cardiovascular risk for a woman and her child?
40.	What are the effects of lifestyle interventions (e.g. diet, exercise) in reducing high blood pressure in pregnancy?
41.	What are the short- and long-term health implications for infants of women with pregnancy hypertension and can these be modified?
42.	What are the long-term neurodevelopmental implications of pregnancy hypertension for the child?
43.	How does pregnancy hypertension affect the growth of the baby?
44.	What is the best way to follow up women who experience pregnancy hypertension?
45.	Do pregnancy characteristics predict infant and child morbidity?
46.	What is the effectiveness and safety of aspirin for prevention of pre-eclampsia?
47.	What are the links between maternal emotional wellbeing and pregnancy hypertension?
48.	What non-pharmacological treatments are effective in treating high blood pressure following pregnancy hypertension?
49.	How do sleep disorders affect pregnancy hypertension?
50.	What are patient reported outcomes of interest related to hypertension in pregnancy?

Table 3: Characteristics of interim prioritisation survey participants. Values given as a number (percentage).

	Survey participants (n=155)
	N(%)
Category	
Women with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension	87 (56)
Partner, relative or friend of someone with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension	4 (3)
Healthcare professional	49 (32)
Obstetrician	21 (14)
Midwife	14 (9)
General practitioner	3 (2)
Paediatrician or neonatologist	2 (1)
Physician	4 (3)
Neonatal nurse	2 (1)
Other	3 (2)
Researcher	15 (10)
Demographic details	
Age	
Less than 30 years	10 (6)
30-39 years	63 (41)
40-49 years	45 (29)
50-59 years	21 (14)
60 years and above	9 (6)
No age selected	7 (5)
Gender	
Female	133 (86)
Male	14 (9)
No gender selected	8 (5)
Ethnicity	
White (British, Irish, other)	130 (84)
Mixed	3 (2)
Asian	7 (5)

Chinese	1 (<1)
Black	4 (3)
No ethnicity selected	10 (7)

Table 4: Final top 10 prioritised and ranked uncertainties

Priority	Research question
1.	What are the long-term physical and mental health consequences of pregnancy hypertension (including pre-eclampsia) for the woman, baby and family?
2.	How can we predict and prevent shorter term complications of pregnancy hypertension (including stillbirth, fetal growth restriction, neonatal death, progression to pre-eclampsia)?
3.	What is the best screening test for pre-eclampsia?
4.	Following pregnancy hypertension, what is the best way to prevent future long-term problems?
5.	What is the cause of pregnancy hypertension (including pre-eclampsia)?
6.	How can pregnancy hypertension (including pre-eclampsia) be prevented in a subsequent pregnancy?
7.	What are the educational needs of healthcare professionals managing women with pregnancy hypertension?
8.	What is the best way to diagnose pre-eclampsia promptly?
9.	What is the best way to manage pregnancy hypertension (including optimal antenatal and postnatal antihypertensive medication and optimal timing of delivery)?
10.	How can we provide better support for women with pregnancy hypertension and their families?

Discussion

Statement of principal findings

In this priority setting partnership we have identified uncertainties and the top ten research priorities for hypertensive disorders of pregnancy incorporating the views of those with lived experience and healthcare professionals. The final priorities chosen included research questions around understanding both short- and long-term complications of pregnancy hypertension for the woman, baby and wider family, together with improving screening, prevention and management. Summary questions relating to education and information giving were highly prioritised throughout the process and their presence in the top ten research priorities reflects this.

Strengths and weaknesses of the study

To our knowledge, this is the first national priority setting partnership for hypertensive disorders of pregnancy to inform the direction of future research in this area. We have adhered to the JLA methodology, including prospective publication of our protocol <http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/hypertension-in-pregnancy/>. Discussions at the final prioritisation workshop were facilitated by experienced JLA advisors to ensure that no group or individual dominated the decision making. However, it is possible that participants may prioritise based on different criteria, such as either considering that existing research may answer the question (and therefore giving a lower rating), or that further research was still needed (and therefore giving a higher priority). The priority setting partnership has illustrated a need for a multidisciplinary and holistic approach when caring for women with pregnancy hypertension. Women and partners with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension were included from the outset and at every stage (GS, FC, SF and MG), so that our approach to the priority setting partnership optimised their participation. The large

1
2
3 proportion of survey responses from those with lived experience and participation in the final
4
5 workshop reflects this.
6
7

8 The initial survey and interim prioritisation survey were only available online; this may have been a
9
10 barrier to participation, but women with recent lived experience of pregnancy hypertension (of
11
12 reproductive age) have high rates of access to such survey methods. Despite efforts to reach an
13
14 ethnically diverse population for survey responses, the number of participants from Black and Asian
15
16 minority ethnic groups was low. The priorities are broad and thus translation into high quality
17
18 quantitative and qualitative studies to answer them may require further work.
19
20
21

22 23 Strengths and weaknesses in relation to other studies 24 25

26 The final top 10 prioritised and ranked uncertainties encompass all uncertainties reported by ACOG,
27
28 ISSHP and NICE and thus reflect the overlapping uncertainties important to those with lived
29
30 experience of pregnancy hypertension and healthcare professionals. The preterm birth priority
31
32 setting partnership ¹⁸ had an overlapping uncertainty of, 'Which treatments are most effective to
33
34 prevent early onset pre-eclampsia.' Despite the lifelong impact of pregnancy hypertension on
35
36 cardiovascular disease, there were no pregnancy hypertension questions in the final top 10
37
38 hypertension Canada priority setting partnership ¹⁹ and thus this priority setting partnership reflects
39
40 a set of research priorities specific to pregnancy hypertension. As seen with other priority setting
41
42 partnerships, ^{16,20,21} we have highlighted education and support as prioritised areas for further
43
44 research, strongly endorsed by the lay participants.
45
46
47
48

49 Our final prioritisation workshop required participants to attend in person and this may have been a
50
51 barrier to some of those with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension. We minimised attrition
52
53 due to the requirement for childcare by welcoming babies in arms and making childcare
54
55 reimbursable. Further inclusion through video conferencing may have enabled more participants to
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 attend including those as hospital inpatients; ²² however, remote working may have impacted on the
4
5 dynamics of the final workshop.
6
7

8 9 **Meaning of the study with possible implications for clinicians and policymakers**

10
11
12 The list of research priorities provides guidance for researchers for future study topic choice within
13
14 hypertensive disorders of pregnancy and should inform funding body decisions. The study has
15
16 highlighted a continuing need to optimise public information giving and education for hypertensive
17
18 disorders of pregnancy.
19
20

21 22 **Unanswered questions and future research**

23
24
25 All uncertainties listed remain unanswered by existing research, reflecting gaps in our knowledge of
26
27 pregnancy hypertension. Further work to refine each research priority into formatted research
28
29 questions (for example using the Population, Intervention, Comparator, Outcome framework) would
30
31 enable researchers to answer them effectively. We anticipate that our findings will encourage
32
33 researchers to address these priorities important to both those with lived experience of pregnancy
34
35 hypertension and healthcare professionals.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgements

We thank all those who participated in the initial survey, interim prioritisation survey and final prioritisation workshop.

Contributors

LC, AH and LW made the application to the James Lind Alliance for a pregnancy hypertension priority setting partnership. AH and LW reviewed and coded all submissions from the initial survey. AH, LW, GS, MG, FC, SF, RW, JT, CG, RM, LB, HM, LAM, TG and LC contributed to the protocol design, production of both the initial survey and interim prioritisation survey, promotion and dissemination of surveys to partner organisations and formation of summary questions. AH, LW and LC drafted the manuscript. All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript before submission.

Patient and public involvement

Patient and public involvement was a core part of the study from design, through all stages, to conclusion. From the outset, steering group lay members included those with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension (GS, FC, SF, MG). Both the initial survey and the interim prioritisation survey were answered by the public, the majority of whom had lived experience of pregnancy hypertension. Participants at the final prioritisation workshop included equal proportions of lay members (women with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension and their partners) and all others, including a representative from the Stillbirth and Neonatal Death Charity (SANDs) and a representative from Best Beginnings charity.

Disclosures

The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the UK National Health Service, the National Institute for Health Research, or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Funding statement

This work was funded by the national Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Research Professorship (Chappell; RP-2014-05-019).

Competing interests

LCC reports grants from the National Institute for Health Research during the conduct of the study. CG reports grants from Medical Research Council during the conduct of the study; grants from National Institute for Health Research, Mason Medical Research foundation, Canadian Institute for Health Research, Rosetrees Foundation, grants and personal fees from Chiesi Pharmaceuticals, outside the submitted work. HM reports grants from the British Heart Foundation. RJM reports grants from NIHR, grants from Stroke Association, outside the submitted work; and has received BP monitors for research from Omron. He occasionally receives travel expenses/honoraria for speaking at conferences. The latter are paid to Green Templeton College Oxford. All additional interests are outside the direct remit of the submitted work. All other authors declare no competing interests.

Data sharing statement

Further data regarding the source of all summary questions (including the top 10 research priorities) are available from <http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/hypertension-in-pregnancy/>

Bibliography

1. Hutcheon JA, Lisonkova S, Joseph KS. Epidemiology of pre-eclampsia and the other hypertensive disorders of pregnancy. *Best Pract Res Clin Obstet Gynaecol*. 2011 Aug;25(4):391–403.
2. Brown MA, Magee LA, Kenny LC, Karumanchi SA, McCarthy FP, Saito S, et al. The hypertensive disorders of pregnancy: ISSHP classification, diagnosis & management recommendations for international practice. *Pregnancy Hypertens*. 2018 Jul;13:291–310.

3. Bramham K, Parnell B, Nelson-Piercy C, Seed PT, Poston L, Chappell LC. Chronic hypertension and pregnancy outcomes: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2014 Apr 15;348(apr157):g2301–g2301.
4. Barton JR, O'Brien JM, Bergauer NK, Jacques DL, Sibai BM. Mild gestational hypertension remote from term: Progression and outcome. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2001 Apr;184(5):979–83.
5. Sibai B, Dekker G, Kupferminc M. Pre-eclampsia. *The Lancet*. 2005;365(9461):785–799.
6. Bellomo G, Narducci PL, Rondoni F, Pastorelli G, Stangoni G, Angeli G, et al. Prognostic Value of 24-Hour Blood Pressure in Pregnancy. :7.
7. Salazar MR, Espeche WG, Leiva Sisniegues BC, Balbín E, Leiva Sisniegues CE, Stavile RN, et al. Significance of masked and nocturnal hypertension in normotensive women coursing a high-risk pregnancy: *J Hypertens*. 2016 Nov;34(11):2248–52.
8. Steegers EA, von Dadelszen P, Duvekot JJ, Pijnenborg R. Pre-eclampsia. *The Lancet*. 2010 Aug 21;376(9741):631–44.
9. Cantwell R, Clutton-Brock T, Cooper G, Dawson A, Drife J, Garrod D, et al. Saving Mothers' Lives: Reviewing maternal deaths to make motherhood safer: 2006–2008. The Eighth Report of the Confidential Enquiries into Maternal Deaths in the United Kingdom. *BJOG Int J Obstet Gynaecol*. 2011 Mar;118 Suppl 1:1–203.
10. Irgens HU, Roberts JM, Reisaeter L, Irgens LM, Lie RT. Long term mortality of mothers and fathers after pre-eclampsia: population based cohort studyPre-eclampsia and cardiovascular disease later in life: who is at risk? *BMJ*. 2001;323(7323):1213–1217.
11. Kajantie E, Eriksson JG, Osmond C, Thornburg K, Barker DJP. Pre-Eclampsia Is Associated With Increased Risk of Stroke in the Adult Offspring: The Helsinki Birth Cohort Study. *Stroke*. 2009 Apr 1;40(4):1176–80.
12. Crowe S, Fenton M, Hall M, Cowan K, Chalmers I. Patients', clinicians' and the research communities' priorities for treatment research: there is an important mismatch. *Res Involv Engagem*. 2015 Dec;1(1):2.
13. Partridge N, Scadding J. The James Lind Alliance: patients and clinicians should jointly identify their priorities for clinical trials. *The Lancet*. 2004 Nov 27;364(9449):1923–4.
14. Alliance J. The James Lind Alliance Guidebook. Version 8 [Internet]. Available from: <http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/jla-guidebook/downloads/Version-8-JLA-Guidebook-for-download-from-website.pdf>
15. Elwyn G, Crowe S, Fenton M, Firkins L, Versnel J, Walker S, et al. Identifying and prioritizing uncertainties: patient and clinician engagement in the identification of research questions. *J Eval Clin Pract*. 2010;16(3):627–31.
16. Prior M, Bagness C, Brewin J, Coomarasamy A, Easthope L, Hepworth-Jones B, et al. Priorities for research in miscarriage: a priority setting partnership between people affected by miscarriage and professionals following the James Lind Alliance methodology. *BMJ Open*. 2017 Aug;7(8):e016571.

17. Fackrell K, Stratmann L, Gronlund TA, Hoare DJ. Top ten hyperacusis research priorities in the UK. *The Lancet*. 2019 Feb 2;393(10170):404–5.
18. Duley L, Uhm S, Oliver S. Top 15 UK research priorities for preterm birth. *The Lancet*. 2014 Jun 14;383(9934):2041–2.
19. Khan N, Bacon SL, Khan S, Perlmutter S, Gerlinsky C, Dermer M, et al. Hypertension management research priorities from patients, caregivers, and healthcare providers: A report from the Hypertension Canada Priority Setting Partnership Group. *J Clin Hypertens*. 2017;19(11):1063–9.
20. Lough K, Hagen S, McClurg D, Pollock A. Shared research priorities for pessary use in women with prolapse: results from a James Lind Alliance Priority Setting Partnership. *BMJ Open*. 2018 Apr;8(4):e021276.
21. Thomas RH, Hammond CL, Bodger OG, Rees MI, Smith PEM, on behalf of the members of WERN & James Lind Alliance. Identifying and prioritising epilepsy treatment uncertainties. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2010 Aug 1;81(8):918–21.
22. Rowbotham NJ, Smith SJ, Elliott ZC, Leighton PA, Rayner OC, Morley R, et al. Adapting the James Lind Alliance priority setting process to better support patient participation: an example from cystic fibrosis. *Res Involv Engagem* [Internet]. 2019 Aug 20 [cited 2019 Oct 29];5. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6701046/>

Figure and table legends

Figure 1: Summary of the priority setting partnership stages. Number of questions at each stage illustrated in black circle.

Table 5: Characteristics of initial survey participants. Values given as a number (percentage)

Table 6: Summary questions presented in second online survey for interim prioritisation (50 in total). The first 25 listed below were highly ranked in the survey and therefore brought forward to the final prioritisation workshop.

Table 7: Characteristics of interim prioritisation survey participants. Values given as a number (percentage).

Table 8: Final top 10 prioritised and ranked uncertainties

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



BMJ Open

Research Priorities for Pregnancy Hypertension: a UK Priority Setting Partnership with the James Lind Alliance

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-036347.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	21-Apr-2020
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Ho, Alison; King's College London, Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences Webster, Louise; King's College London, Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences Bowen, Liza; King's College London, School of Population Health and Environmental Sciences Creighton, Fiona; Lay member Findlay, Sarah; Lay member Gale, Chris; Imperial College London, Neonatal Medicine, School of Public Health Green, Marcus; Action on Pre-eclampsia Gronlund, Toto; James Lind Alliance, National Institute for Health Research Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre Magee, Laura; King's College London, Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences McManus, Richard; University of Oxford, Dept of Primary Care Health Sciences Mistry, Hiten; University of Nottingham, Division of Child Health, Obstetrics and Gynaecology, School of Medicine Singleton, Gemma; Lay member Thornton, Jim; University of Nottingham, Division of Child Health, Obstetrics and Gynaecology, School of Medicine Whybrow, rebecca; King's College London, Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences Chappell, Dr Lucy; King's College London, Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences</p>
Primary Subject Heading:	Obstetrics and gynaecology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Cardiovascular medicine, Communication, General practice / Family practice
Keywords:	OBSTETRICS, Hypertension < CARDIOLOGY, Maternal medicine < OBSTETRICS, PRIMARY CARE, NEONATOLOGY

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1
2
3 **1 Research Priorities for Pregnancy Hypertension: a UK Priority Setting Partnership with the James**

4
5 **2 Lind Alliance**

6
7
8 **3** Alison Ho¹, Louise M Webster¹, Liza Bowen², Fiona Creighton³, Sarah Findlay³, Chris Gale⁴, Marcus
9
10 **4** Green⁵, Toto Gronlund⁶, Laura A Magee¹, Richard J McManus⁷, Hiten D Mistry⁸, Gemma Singleton³,
11
12 **5** Jim G Thornton⁸, Rebecca Whybrow¹, Lucy C Chappell¹

13
14 **6** 1. Department of Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences, King's College
15
16 **7** London, London, United Kingdom.

17
18 **8** 2. School of Population Health and Environmental Sciences, King's College London, London, UK

19
20 **9** 3. Lay member.

21
22
23 **10** 4. Neonatal Medicine, School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, Chelsea and Westminster
24
25 **11** campus, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom.

26
27 **12** 5. Action on Pre-eclampsia, The Stables, Evesham, Worcestershire, United Kingdom.

28
29
30 **13** 6. James Lind Alliance, National Institute for Health Research Evaluation, Trials and Studies
31
32 **14** Coordinating Centre, Southampton, United Kingdom.

33
34
35 **15** 7. Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, Radcliffe Primary
36
37 **16** Care, Radcliffe Observatory Quarter, Woodstock Road, Oxford, United Kingdom

38
39
40 **17** 8. Division of Child Health, Obstetrics and Gynaecology, School of Medicine, University of
41
42 **18** Nottingham, United Kingdom

43
44 **19** **Keywords:** Pregnancy hypertension, James Lind Alliance, research priorities, patient and public
45
46 **20** participation

47
48 **21** **Corresponding author:** Alison Ho (alison.ho@kcl.ac.uk) +44 20 7188 7188 extension 83634

49
50 **22** Department of Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences, King's College London,
51
52 **23** 10th Floor, North Wing, St Thomas' Hospital, Westminster Bridge Road, Lambeth, London, SE1 7EH.

53
54 **24** **Word count:** 2384

1
2
3
4 25 **Abstract**
5
6
7

8 26 **Objectives**
9

10
11 27 To identify research priorities for hypertensive disorders of pregnancy from individuals with lived
12
13
14 28 experience and healthcare professionals.
15

16 29 **Design**
17

18
19
20 30 Prospective surveys and consensus meetings using principles outlined by the James Lind Alliance.
21

22 31 **Setting**
23

24
25
26 32 United Kingdom.
27

28 33 **Methods**
29

30
31
32 34 A steering group was established and “uncertainties” were gathered using an online survey and
33
34 35 literature search. An interim online survey ranked longlisted questions and the top 10 research
35
36 36 questions were reached by consensus at a final prioritisation workshop.
37
38

39 37 **Participants**
40

41
42 38 Women, partners, relatives and friends of those with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension,
43
44 39 researchers and healthcare professionals.
45
46

47 40 **Results**
48

49
50 41 The initial online survey was answered by 278 participants (180 women with lived experience, 9
51
52 42 partners/relatives/friends, 71 healthcare professionals and 18 researchers). Together with a
53
54 43 literature search, this identified 764 questions which were refined into 50 summary questions. All
55
56 44 summary questions were presented in an interim prioritisation survey that was answered by 155
57
58 45 participants (87 women with lived experience, 4 partners/relatives/friends, 49 healthcare
59
60

1
2
3 46 professionals and 15 researchers). The top 25 highest ranked questions were considered by the final
4
5 47 prioritisation workshop. The top 10 uncertainties were identified by consensus and ranked as follows
6
7 48 in order of priority: long-term consequences of pregnancy hypertension (for the woman and baby),
8
9 49 short-term complications of pregnancy hypertension (for the woman and baby), screening tests for
10
11 50 pre-eclampsia, prevention of long-term problems (for the woman and baby), causes of pregnancy
12
13 51 hypertension, prevention of recurrent pregnancy hypertension, educational needs of healthcare
14
15 52 professionals, diagnosis of pre-eclampsia, management of pregnancy hypertension, provision of
16
17 53 support for women and families.
18
19
20

21 54 Conclusions

22
23
24
25 55 Research priorities shared by those with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension and healthcare
26
27 56 professionals have been identified. Researchers should use these to inform the choice of future
28
29 57 studies in this area.
30
31

32 58

33 59 Strengths and Limitations of the study

- 34
35
36
37 60 • A consensus on research priorities in pregnancy hypertension was reached by those with
38
39 61 lived experience and healthcare professionals.
- 40
41
42 62 • The approach utilised the James Lind Alliance methodology involving open access online
43
44 63 surveys and a final face-to-face prioritisation meeting.
- 45
46 64 • Those with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension and healthcare professionals were
47
48 65 involved at every stage of the priority setting partnership.
- 49
50
51 66 • The study may have been limited by an imbalance in ethnic diversity of those who
52
53 67 participated despite efforts to optimise inclusion.
- 54
55 68 • The summary research questions are broad and may prove challenging for researchers to
56
57 69 address within single studies.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

70

For peer review only

71 Introduction

72 Hypertensive disorders occur in up to 10% of all pregnancies¹ and include pre-eclampsia, gestational
73 hypertension, chronic hypertension.² The pathophysiology differs to hypertension that occurs
74 outside pregnancy and hypertensive disorders of pregnancy are all associated with adverse
75 pregnancy outcomes,³⁻⁷ but pre-eclampsia (hypertension and one or more of: proteinuria, acute
76 kidney injury, liver dysfunction, neurological features, haemolysis, thrombocytopenia, fetal growth
77 restriction²) has the most substantial impact on maternal and perinatal mortality and morbidity.⁸
78 Half of women with pre-eclampsia deliver preterm and one in twenty stillbirths (without congenital
79 abnormality) occur in women with pre-eclampsia.⁹ Importantly, hypertensive disorders of pregnancy
80 are also associated with an increased risk of long-term cardiovascular and metabolic morbidity and
81 mortality for woman and child.¹⁰⁻¹²

82
83 Current research within hypertensive disorders of pregnancy is broad, exploring epidemiology,
84 prediction, prevention, diagnosis, management and long-term implications for maternal and
85 perinatal health. However, there is often a mismatch between research priorities identified by
86 patients, clinicians and researchers.^{13,14} The James Lind Alliance (JLA) facilitates priority setting
87 partnerships (PSPs) so that an open dialogue amongst those with lived experience of a disorder,
88 carers and clinician groups can occur in order to identify “uncertainties” (questions which cannot be
89 answered by existing research) that are important to all groups in a particular area of health.¹⁵

90 Uncertainties are subsequently prioritised to ascertain the top 10 research questions, aiming to
91 inform future research studies to address these questions. Since the establishment of the JLA in
92 2004, this methodology has been used to identify the top 10 research questions in areas such as
93 asthma¹⁶, miscarriage¹⁷ and hyperacusis.¹⁸ Other JLAs have addressed research priorities in
94 pregnancy complications such as preterm birth¹⁹ and stillbirth²⁰ but these did not have a focus on
95 hypertensive disorders of pregnancy. A Canadian priority setting partnership focussed on

1
2
3 96 hypertension, but pregnancy did not feature in their top 25 questions.²¹ The JLA infrastructure is
4
5 97 funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR).
6
7

8 98 Objective

9
10
11
12 99 To identify uncertainties and research priorities for hypertensive disorders of pregnancy in the
13
14 100 United Kingdom from individuals with lived experience and healthcare professionals using the JLA
15
16 101 methodology.¹⁵
17
18
19 102
20
21
22 103
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

104 Methods

105 The core steering group (LC, AH and LW) submitted a readiness questionnaire which was approved
106 by the JLA Secretariat, based at the National Institute for Health Research Evaluation and the Trials
107 and Studies Coordinating Centre (NETSCC), University of Southampton. A JLA advisor (TG) was
108 assigned to facilitate the process and ensure that the JLA methodology was followed. We sought
109 advice from our JLA advisor regarding ethical review prior to starting and concluded that, in line with
110 other JLA priority setting partnerships, it was not required.

111 The priority setting partnership stages

112 Initiation

113 Through peer knowledge and consultation, we formed a steering group for the priority setting
114 partnership. Steering group meetings were chaired by TG (JLA advisor) and included lay members
115 with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension and the CEO of a stake holding charity (GS, FC, SF,
116 MG), obstetricians (JT, LC, LW and AH), an obstetric physician (LM), general practitioners (RM, LB), a
117 midwife (RW), a neonatologist (CG), and a research scientist (HM). The Priority Setting Partnership
118 lead was LC and information specialists were LW and AH. Women with lived experience and
119 clinicians were represented at every stage and TG was a neutral facilitator, ensuring a fair and
120 transparent process with equal input from all. At the initial steering group meeting, the scope of the
121 priority setting partnership was confirmed to include research priorities related to the following
122 topics in the context of women with pregnancy hypertension: hypertensive disorders (including pre-
123 eclampsia, gestational hypertension, chronic hypertension and white coat hypertension), women,
124 babies, their partners and families, time period related to pregnancy (i.e. pre-conception, antenatal,
125 postnatal and long-term health outcomes), management related to pregnancy hypertension (i.e.
126 prevention, prediction, diagnosis and treatment), physical, social and emotional aspects, co-
127 morbidities such as renal disease or diabetes, genetics and information provision. The protocol was a

1
2
3 128 published on the JLA website in July 2018 [http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-](http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/hypertension-in-pregnancy/downloads/Hypertension-in-Pregnancy-PSP-protocol.pdf)
4
5 129 [partnerships/hypertension-in-pregnancy/downloads/Hypertension-in-Pregnancy-PSP-protocol.pdf](http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/hypertension-in-pregnancy/downloads/Hypertension-in-Pregnancy-PSP-protocol.pdf).

8 130 Identifying clinical uncertainties

9
10
11 131 In October 2018, we launched an initial online survey to be answered by those with lived experience
12
13 132 of hypertension in pregnancy and healthcare professionals (though we did not exclude the small
14
15 133 number of responses submitted by researchers), using the Online Surveys platform.²² Survey
16
17 134 participants were asked to write up to three questions that they wanted answered by hypertension
18
19 135 in pregnancy research. Additional optional questions included demographic details (gender, age
20
21 136 range and ethnicity), name and preferred contact email. Contact details were collected only for the
22
23 137 purposes of inviting participation in future activities related to the priority setting partnership and
24
25 138 survey participants could remain anonymous. The survey was promoted through social media
26
27 139 (Facebook, Twitter), clinical networks known to steering group members (targeting BAME and non-
28
29 140 English speaking women) and the Action on Pre-eclampsia charity (APEC). In addition to potential
30
31 141 uncertainties submitted through the online survey, the steering group identified uncertainties that
32
33 142 had previously been reported by The American College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists (ACOG),
34
35 143 International Society for the study of Hypertension in Pregnancy (ISSHP) and the National Institute
36
37 144 for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) relevant to this topic.

42 145 Refining uncertainties

43
44
45 146 All questions submitted (from the online survey and reported from ACOG, ISSHP and NICE) were
46
47 147 assigned a unique question code. They were then reviewed by AH and LMW and thematically
48
49 148 grouped into nine categories: mechanisms, prediction, prenatal management, antenatal
50
51 149 management, postnatal management, maternal outcomes, perinatal and child outcomes, education
52
53 150 and out of scope. Submitted questions were assigned multiple themes, if applicable, and duplicate
54
55 151 questions were removed. Each steering group member was assigned a theme and reviewed all
56
57 152 questions within the theme to synthesise summary questions. A second steering group member
58
59
60

1
2
3 153 reviewed the summary questions to ensure they were representative of the original questions and
4
5 154 both members confirmed that the summary questions were not answered by existing research. All
6
7 155 members of the steering group agreed the 50 summary questions to be put forward for interim
8
9 156 prioritisation, based on being representative of the wider questions submitted, not answered by
10
11 157 existing research, and ensuring that all themes were included.
12
13

14 158 Interim Prioritisation Survey

15
16
17 159 A second survey was distributed in April 2019 using the same dissemination routes as the initial
18
19 160 survey. The platform used was supplied by Optimal Workshop.²³ Survey participants were asked to
20
21 161 identify the top 10 questions they felt to be most important from a randomly presented list of all
22
23 162 summary questions. They were then asked to identify their top three summary questions from
24
25 163 within their top 10 so that further weighting could be applied to each question to identify the top 25
26
27 164 questions. Following closure of the survey in June 2019, the resulting highly ranked (based on
28
29 165 frequency chosen) 25 questions were taken forward for final prioritisation. The source of each
30
31 166 question was reviewed to ensure that questions from those with lived experience and clinicians
32
33 167 were represented.
34
35
36
37

38 168 Final prioritisation

39
40
41 169 The final prioritisation workshop took place in June 2019 and was chaired by three JLA advisors with
42
43 170 oversight from some of the steering group. Participants had previously expressed their interest in
44
45 171 taking part by submitting their contact details in either survey. Participants were representative of
46
47 172 geographical diversity, and age, and included partners as well as those with lived experience.
48
49 173 Participants included 16 men and women with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension, 5
50
51 174 midwives, 4 obstetricians, 1 neonatologist, 1 GP, a representative from the Stillbirth and Neonatal
52
53 175 Death Charity (SANDs) and a representative from Best Beginnings charity. On the day they were
54
55 176 divided into three groups, with equal numbers of participants with lived experience and clinicians in
56
57 177 each, each chaired by a JLA advisor to ensure all participants were able to voice their opinions. In the
58
59
60

1
2
3 178 first round of ranking, within each group, participants ranked the questions collectively after
4
5 179 reflecting and discussing their reviews of priorities. Groups were subsequently reallocated with a
6
7 180 different group composition for a second round of ranking, based on the combined ranking in the
8
9 181 first round. A third and final priority setting session followed the aggregate ranking from the second
10
11 182 round, which was presented to the whole group. The whole group discussed the results and reached
12
13
14 183 a consensus on the final ranking with a focus on the top 10 prioritised uncertainties.
15
16

17 184
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

185 Results

186 A summary of the priority setting partnership stages with a timeline are shown in Figure 1. The initial
187 survey was answered by 278 participants, 65% of whom were women with lived experience of
188 pregnancy hypertension and 26% of whom were healthcare professionals (Table 1).

189 The initial survey and literature search conducted by the steering group identified 764 questions.

190 Thematic review resulted in the greatest number of 241 questions in 'education', followed by 191

191 questions in 'antenatal management', 120 in 'mechanism', 104 in 'maternal outcomes', 91 in

192 'perinatal and child outcomes', 71 in 'postnatal management', 65 in 'prediction', 57 in 'prenatal

193 management' and 16 out-of-scope questions. These out-of-scope questions were removed from

194 further analysis. Review by the steering group resulted in the development of 50 summary

195 questions. These were verified as uncertainties and all included in the interim prioritisation survey

196 (listed in Table 2).

197 The interim prioritisation survey was answered and completed by 155 people, 56% of whom were

198 individuals with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension and 32% from healthcare professionals

199 (Table 3). The top 25 summary questions ranked at the final prioritisation workshop are listed in

200 Table 2. The results of the final top 10 prioritised and ranked uncertainties from the final

201 prioritisation workshop are listed in Table 4.

202 *Table 1: Characteristics of initial survey participants. Values given as a number (percentage)*

	Survey participants (n=278)
	N(%)
Category selected	
Women with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension	180 (65)
Partner, relative or friend of someone with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension	9 (3)
Healthcare professional	71 (26)
Obstetrician	22 (8)
Midwife	27 (10)
General Practitioner	5 (2)
Paediatrician	4 (1)
Neonatologist	5 (2)
Physician	2 (1)
Other	6 (2)
Researcher	18 (7)
Demographic details	
Age	
Less than 30 years	27 (10)
30-39 years	105 (38)
40-49 years	75 (27)
50-59 years	54 (19)
60 years and above	15 (5)
No age selected	2 (1)

Gender	
Female	252 (91)
Male	21 (8)
No gender selected	5 (2)
Ethnicity	
White (British, Irish, other)	239 (86)
Mixed	5 (2)
Asian	16 (6)
Chinese	1 (<1)
Black	12 (4)
Other ethnicity	4 (1)
No ethnicity selected	1 (<1)

203

204 *Table 2: Summary questions presented in second online survey for interim prioritisation (50 in total). The first 25 listed*
 205 *below were highly ranked in the survey and therefore brought forward to the final prioritisation workshop.*

1.	How can we optimise information giving for those at risk of or affected by pregnancy hypertension?
2.	How can pregnancy hypertension (including pre-eclampsia) be prevented in a subsequent pregnancy?
3.	What is the cause of pregnancy hypertension (including pre-eclampsia)?
4.	What can be done prior to pregnancy to reduce the risk of pregnancy hypertension?
5.	What is the best way to manage pre-eclampsia?
6.	How can we provide better support for women with pregnancy hypertension and their families?
7.	What is the best way to diagnose pre-eclampsia promptly?
8.	What is the effectiveness and safety of antihypertensive agents at reducing blood pressure in women with pregnancy hypertension?
9.	What are the long-term consequences of pre-eclampsia for the woman and baby?
10.	What is the effectiveness and safety of pharmacological treatments once pre-eclampsia is diagnosed?
11.	How does the placenta contribute to pre-eclampsia?
12.	What is the optimal antihypertensive medication to use postnatally?
13.	What is the best screening test for pre-eclampsia?
14.	What are the optimum blood pressure thresholds (for initiation) and targets for antenatal antihypertensive treatment?
15.	Is there a hereditary link in pre-eclampsia and are the risks different for daughters and sons after an affected pregnancy?
16.	How can we predict complications of pregnancy hypertension (progression to pre-eclampsia)?
17.	What is the optimal timing of delivery in women with pregnancy hypertension?

18.	What interventions are effective and safe at reducing fetal growth restriction in women with pregnancy hypertension?
19.	What are the long-term effects of pre-eclampsia on mental health?
20.	Following pregnancy hypertension, what is the best way to prevent future long-term problems?
21.	What are the educational needs of healthcare professionals managing women with pregnancy hypertension?
22.	What are the fetal, infant and child outcomes in women taking antihypertensive agents?
23.	How can we better prevent stillbirth in pre-eclampsia?
24.	What are the optimum blood pressure thresholds (for initiation) and targets for postnatal antihypertensive treatment?
25.	What pre-pregnancy management of women with chronic hypertension optimises pregnancy outcomes?
26.	What is the optimal monitoring strategy for women before, during and after pregnancy hypertension (including in subsequent pregnancies)?
27.	What are the risk factors for developing pregnancy hypertension and pre-eclampsia?
28.	How can pregnancy hypertension (including pre-eclampsia) be prevented during a pregnancy?
29.	What is the risk of pregnancy hypertension in a subsequent pregnancy?
30.	What is the best test to predict pregnancy hypertension?
31.	What methods are effective at measuring blood pressure in women with pregnancy hypertension (including self-monitoring, ambulatory, automated, manual)?
32.	What is the paternal contribution to pre-eclampsia?
33.	What are the characteristics of postpartum pre-eclampsia?
34.	What is the safety of treatments for pregnancy hypertension for the fetus and infant?

35.	What are the long-term effects of pre-eclampsia on cardiovascular disease for the woman and baby?
36.	What are the long-term effects of pregnancy hypertension on subsequent maternal blood pressure?
37.	What are the consequences of pregnancy hypertension on pre-eclampsia, birthweight and prematurity in that pregnancy?
38.	What is the relationship between blood pressure in pregnancy and development of pregnancy hypertension?
39.	What are the mechanisms for increased cardiovascular risk for a woman and her child?
40.	What are the effects of lifestyle interventions (e.g. diet, exercise) in reducing high blood pressure in pregnancy?
41.	What are the short- and long-term health implications for infants of women with pregnancy hypertension and can these be modified?
42.	What are the long-term neurodevelopmental implications of pregnancy hypertension for the child?
43.	How does pregnancy hypertension affect the growth of the baby?
44.	What is the best way to follow up women who experience pregnancy hypertension?
45.	Do pregnancy characteristics predict infant and child morbidity?
46.	What is the effectiveness and safety of aspirin for prevention of pre-eclampsia?
47.	What are the links between maternal emotional wellbeing and pregnancy hypertension?
48.	What non-pharmacological treatments are effective in treating high blood pressure following pregnancy hypertension?
49.	How do sleep disorders affect pregnancy hypertension?
50.	What are patient reported outcomes of interest related to hypertension in pregnancy?

207 Table 3: Characteristics of interim prioritisation survey participants. Values given as a number (percentage).

	Survey participants (n=155)
	N(%)
Category	
Women with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension	87 (56)
Partner, relative or friend of someone with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension	4 (3)
Healthcare professional	49 (32)
Obstetrician	21 (14)
Midwife	14 (9)
General practitioner	3 (2)
Paediatrician or neonatologist	2 (1)
Physician	4 (3)
Neonatal nurse	2 (1)
Other	3 (2)
Researcher	15 (10)
Demographic details	
Age	
Less than 30 years	10 (6)
30-39 years	63 (41)
40-49 years	45 (29)
50-59 years	21 (14)
60 years and above	9 (6)
No age selected	7 (5)

Gender	
Female	133 (86)
Male	14 (9)
No gender selected	8 (5)
Ethnicity	
White (British, Irish, other)	130 (84)
Mixed	3 (2)
Asian	7 (5)
Chinese	1 (<1)
Black	4 (3)
No ethnicity selected	10 (7)

208

209

210

211 *Table 4: Final top 10 prioritised and ranked uncertainties*

Priority	Research question
1.	What are the long-term physical and mental health consequences of pregnancy hypertension (including pre-eclampsia) for the woman, baby and family?
2.	How can we predict and prevent shorter term complications of pregnancy hypertension (including stillbirth, fetal growth restriction, neonatal death, progression to pre-eclampsia)?
3.	What is the best screening test for pre-eclampsia?
4.	Following pregnancy hypertension, what is the best way to prevent future long-term problems?
5.	What is the cause of pregnancy hypertension (including pre-eclampsia)?
6.	How can pregnancy hypertension (including pre-eclampsia) be prevented in a subsequent pregnancy?
7.	What are the educational needs of healthcare professionals managing women with pregnancy hypertension?
8.	What is the best way to diagnose pre-eclampsia promptly?
9.	What is the best way to manage pregnancy hypertension (including optimal antenatal and postnatal antihypertensive medication and optimal timing of delivery)?
10.	How can we provide better support for women with pregnancy hypertension and their families?

212

213 Discussion

214 Statement of principal findings

215 In this priority setting partnership we have identified the top ten research priorities for hypertensive
216 disorders of pregnancy incorporating the views of those with lived experience and healthcare
217 professionals. Addressing these priorities will optimise understanding of short- and long-term
218 complications of pregnancy hypertension for woman, their babies and wider families. It is noted that
219 the top ten priorities encompass the range of outstanding challenges in this field, including
220 improving screening, prevention and management, addressing both short and long-term
221 complications, and the mental health consequences (as well as the physical health consequences).
222 Summary questions relating to education and information giving, and provision of support, were
223 highly prioritised throughout the process and their presence in the top ten research priorities
224 reflects this. These research priorities provide a clear steer to funding bodies for the future awards.

225 Strengths and weaknesses of the study

226 To our knowledge, this is the first national priority setting partnership for hypertensive disorders of
227 pregnancy to inform the direction of future research in this area. We have adhered to the JLA
228 methodology, including prospective publication of our protocol [http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-](http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/hypertension-in-pregnancy/)
229 [setting-partnerships/hypertension-in-pregnancy/](http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/hypertension-in-pregnancy/). Discussions at the final prioritisation workshop
230 were facilitated by experienced JLA advisors to ensure that no group or individual dominated the
231 decision making. However, it is possible that participants may have been biased in their
232 prioritisation, for example knowledge of existing research projects that may answer certain
233 questions (and therefore giving a lower rating), or that further research was still needed (and
234 therefore giving a higher priority). The priority setting partnership has illustrated a need for a
235 multidisciplinary and holistic approach when caring for women with pregnancy hypertension.
236 Women and partners with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension were included from the

1
2
3 237 outset and at every stage (GS, FC, SF and MG), so that our approach to the priority setting
4
5 238 partnership optimised their participation. The large proportion of survey responses from those with
6
7 239 lived experience and participation in the final workshop reflects this.

8
9
10 240 The initial survey and interim prioritisation survey were only available online; this may have been a
11
12 241 barrier to participation, but women with recent lived experience of pregnancy hypertension (of
13
14 242 reproductive age) have high rates of access to such survey methods. Despite efforts to reach an
15
16 243 ethnically diverse population for survey responses, the number of participants from Black and Asian
17
18 244 minority ethnic groups was low. The priorities are broad and thus translation into high quality
19
20 245 quantitative and qualitative studies to answer them may require further work.

23 246 **Strengths and weaknesses in relation to other studies**

24
25
26
27 247 The final top 10 prioritised and ranked uncertainties encompass all uncertainties reported by ACOG,
28
29 248 ISSHP and NICE and thus reflect the overlapping uncertainties important to those with lived
30
31 249 experience of pregnancy hypertension and healthcare professionals. The preterm birth priority
32
33 250 setting partnership²⁴ had an overlapping uncertainty of, 'Which treatments are most effective to
34
35 251 prevent early onset pre-eclampsia.' Despite the lifelong impact of pregnancy hypertension on
36
37 252 cardiovascular disease, there were no pregnancy hypertension questions in the final top 10
38
39 253 hypertension Canada priority setting partnership²¹ and thus this priority setting partnership reflects
40
41 254 a set of research priorities specific to pregnancy hypertension. As seen with other priority setting
42
43 255 partnerships,^{17,25,26} the need for improved education and support has been highlighted for further
44
45 256 research, strongly endorsed by the lay participants. All of the final questions posed were derived
46
47 257 from both lay and healthcare professionals as the JLA chair ensured even contribution throughout.
48
49 258 No substantial mismatch in questions posed by those with lived experience and
50
51 259 clinicians/researchers was identified in this priority setting partnership.

52
53
54 260 Our final prioritisation workshop required participants to attend in person and this may have been a
55
56 261 barrier to some of those with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension. We minimised attrition
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 262 due to the requirement for childcare by welcoming babies in arms and making childcare
4
5 263 reimbursable. Further inclusion through video conferencing may have enabled more participants to
6
7 264 attend including those as hospital inpatients;²⁷ however, remote working may have impacted on the
8
9 265 dynamics of the final workshop.

12 266 **Meaning of the study with possible implications for clinicians and policymakers**

16 267 The list of research priorities provides guidance for researchers for future study topic choice within
17
18 268 hypertensive disorders of pregnancy and should inform funding body decisions. Whilst most of the
19
20 269 identified areas for research overlap with current broad research themes, the study has highlighted
21
22 270 a specific need to optimise public information giving and education for hypertensive disorders of
23
24 271 pregnancy that might not otherwise have been so clearly recognised as a priority particular from
25
26 272 those with lived experience.

30 273 **Unanswered questions and future research**

33 274 All uncertainties listed remain unanswered by existing research, reflecting gaps in our knowledge of
34
35 275 pregnancy hypertension. Further work to refine each research priority into formatted research
36
37 276 questions (for example using the Population, Intervention, Comparator, Outcome framework) would
38
39 277 enable researchers to answer them effectively. We anticipate that our findings will encourage
40
41 278 researchers to address these priorities important to both those with lived experience of pregnancy
42
43 279 hypertension and healthcare professionals.

47 280
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

281 Acknowledgements

282 We thank all those who participated in the initial survey, interim prioritisation survey and final
283 prioritisation workshop.

284 Contributors

285 LC, AH and LW made the application to the James Lind Alliance for a pregnancy hypertension priority
286 setting partnership. AH and LW reviewed and coded all submissions from the initial survey. AH, LW,
287 GS, MG, FC, SF, RW, JT, CG, RM, LB, HM, LAM, TG and LC contributed to the protocol design,
288 production of both the initial survey and interim prioritisation survey, promotion and dissemination
289 of surveys to partner organisations and formation of summary questions. AH, LW and LC drafted the
290 manuscript. All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript before submission.

291 Patient and public involvement

292 Patient and public involvement was a core part of the study from design, through all stages, to
293 conclusion. From the outset, steering group lay members included those with lived experience of
294 pregnancy hypertension (GS, FC, SF, MG). Both the initial survey and the interim prioritisation survey
295 were answered by the public, the majority of whom had lived experience of pregnancy
296 hypertension. Participants at the final prioritisation workshop included equal proportions of lay
297 members (women with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension and their partners) and all
298 others, including a representative from the Stillbirth and Neonatal Death Charity (SANDs) and a
299 representative from Best Beginnings charity.

300 Disclosures

301 The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the UK National Health
302 Service, the National Institute for Health Research, or the Department of Health and Social Care.

303 Funding statement

304 This work was funded by the national Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Research Professorship
305 (Chappell; RP-2014-05-019). Funds supporting this project were used for JLA fees and to support
306 the running costs of the project (including childcare costs for PPIE members, travel expenses). No
307 salaries were provided to the research team for this project.

308

309 Competing interests

310 LCC reports grants from the National Institute for Health Research during the conduct of the study.
311 CG reports grants from Medical Research Council during the conduct of the study; grants from
312 National Institute for Health Research, Mason Medical Research foundation, Canadian Institute for
313 Health Research, Rosetrees Foundation, grants and personal fees from Chiesi Pharmaceuticals,
314 outside the submitted work. HM reports grants from the British Heart Foundation. RJM reports
315 grants from NIHR, grants from Stroke Association, outside the submitted work; and has received BP
316 monitors for research from Omron. He occasionally receives travel expenses/honoraria for speaking
317 at conferences. The latter are paid to Green Templeton College Oxford. All additional interests are
318 outside the direct remit of the submitted work. All other authors declare no competing interests.

319 Data sharing statement

320 Further data regarding the source of all summary questions (including the top 10 research priorities)
321 are available from [http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/hypertension-in-](http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/hypertension-in-pregnancy/)
322 pregnancy/

323 Bibliography

- 324 1. Hutcheon JA, Lisonkova S, Joseph KS. Epidemiology of pre-eclampsia and the other
325 hypertensive disorders of pregnancy. *Best Pract Res Clin Obstet Gynaecol.* 2011
326 Aug;25(4):391–403.
- 327 2. Brown MA, Magee LA, Kenny LC, Karumanchi SA, McCarthy FP, Saito S, et al. The hypertensive
328 disorders of pregnancy: ISSHP classification, diagnosis & management recommendations for
329 international practice. *Pregnancy Hypertens.* 2018 Jul;13:291–310.
- 330 3. Bramham K, Parnell B, Nelson-Piercy C, Seed PT, Poston L, Chappell LC. Chronic hypertension
331 and pregnancy outcomes: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ.* 2014 Apr 15;348(apr15
332 7):g2301–g2301.
- 333 4. Barton JR, O'Brien JM, Bergauer NK, Jacques DL, Sibai BM. Mild gestational hypertension
334 remote from term: Progression and outcome. *Am J Obstet Gynecol.* 2001 Apr;184(5):979–83.
- 335 5. Sibai B, Dekker G, Kupferminc M. Pre-eclampsia. *The Lancet.* 2005;365(9461):785–799.
- 336 6. Bellomo G, Narducci PL, Rondoni F, Pastorelli G, Stangoni G, Angeli G, et al. Prognostic Value of
337 24-Hour Blood Pressure in Pregnancy. *JAMA.* 1999;283(17):2241
- 338 7. Salazar MR, Espeche WG, Leiva Sisniegues BC, Balbín E, Leiva Sisniegues CE, Stavile RN, et al.
339 Significance of masked and nocturnal hypertension in normotensive women coursing a high-
340 risk pregnancy: *J Hypertens.* 2016 Nov;34(11):2248–52.
- 341 8. Steegers EA, von Dadelszen P, Duvekot JJ, Pijnenborg R. Pre-eclampsia. *The Lancet.* 2010 Aug
342 21;376(9741):631–44.
- 343 9. Cantwell R, Clutton-Brock T, Cooper G, Dawson A, Drife J, Garrod D, et al. Saving Mothers'
344 Lives: Reviewing maternal deaths to make motherhood safer: 2006–2008. The Eighth Report of
345 the Confidential Enquiries into Maternal Deaths in the United Kingdom. *BJOG Int J Obstet
346 Gynaecol.* 2011 Mar;118 Suppl 1:1–203.

- 1
2
3 347 10. Irgens HU, Roberts JM, Reisaeter L, Irgens LM, Lie RT. Long term mortality of mothers and
4
5 348 fathers after pre-eclampsia: population based cohort study. Pre-eclampsia and cardiovascular
6
7 349 disease later in life: who is at risk? *BMJ*. 2001;323(7323):1213–1217.
8
9
10 350 11. Kajantie E, Eriksson JG, Osmond C, Thornburg K, Barker DJP. Pre-Eclampsia Is Associated With
11
12 351 Increased Risk of Stroke in the Adult Offspring: The Helsinki Birth Cohort Study. *Stroke*. 2009
13
14 352 Apr 1;40(4):1176–80.
15
16 353 12. Cirillo PM, Cohn BA. Pregnancy complications and cardiovascular disease death: 50-year
17
18 354 follow-up of the Child Health and Development Studies pregnancy cohort. *Circulation*. 2015
19
20 355 Sep 29;132(13):1234–42.
21
22
23 356 13. Crowe S, Fenton M, Hall M, Cowan K, Chalmers I. Patients', clinicians' and the research
24
25 357 communities' priorities for treatment research: there is an important mismatch. *Res Involv*
26
27 358 *Engagem*. 2015 Dec;1(1):2.
28
29
30 359 14. Partridge N, Scadding J. The James Lind Alliance: patients and clinicians should jointly identify
31
32 360 their priorities for clinical trials. *The Lancet*. 2004 Nov 27;364(9449):1923–4.
33
34 361 15. Alliance J. The James Lind Alliance Guidebook. Version 8 [Internet]. Available from:
35
36 362 [http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/jla-guidebook/downloads/Version-8-JLA-Guidebook-for-download-](http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/jla-guidebook/downloads/Version-8-JLA-Guidebook-for-download-from-website.pdf)
37
38 363 [from-website.pdf](http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/jla-guidebook/downloads/Version-8-JLA-Guidebook-for-download-from-website.pdf)
39
40
41 364 16. Elwyn G, Crowe S, Fenton M, Firkins L, Versnel J, Walker S, et al. Identifying and prioritizing
42
43 365 uncertainties: patient and clinician engagement in the identification of research questions. *J*
44
45 366 *Eval Clin Pract*. 2010;16(3):627–31.
46
47
48 367 17. Prior M, Bagness C, Brewin J, Coomarasamy A, Easthope L, Hepworth-Jones B, et al. Priorities
49
50 368 for research in miscarriage: a priority setting partnership between people affected by
51
52 369 miscarriage and professionals following the James Lind Alliance methodology. *BMJ Open*. 2017
53
54 370 Aug;7(8):e016571.
55
56
57 371 18. Fackrell K, Stratmann L, Gronlund TA, Hoare DJ. Top ten hyperacusis research priorities in the
58
59 372 UK. *The Lancet*. 2019 Feb 2;393(10170):404–5.
60

- 1
2
3 373 19. Oliver S, Uhm S, Duley L, Crowe S, David AL, James CP, et al. Top research priorities for preterm
4
5 374 birth: results of a prioritisation partnership between people affected by preterm birth and
6
7 375 healthcare professionals. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2019 Dec 30;19(1):528.
- 8
9
10 376 20. Heazell AEP, Whitworth MK, Whitcombe J, Glover SW, Bevan C, Brewin J, et al. Research
11
12 377 priorities for stillbirth: process overview and results from UK Stillbirth Priority Setting
13
14 378 Partnership. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol Off J Int Soc Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. 2015
15
16 379 Dec;46(6):641–7.
- 17
18
19 380 21. Khan N, Bacon SL, Khan S, Perlmutter S, Gerlinsky C, Dermer M, et al. Hypertension
20
21 381 management research priorities from patients, caregivers, and healthcare providers: A report
22
23 382 from the Hypertension Canada Priority Setting Partnership Group. *J Clin Hypertens*.
24
25 383 2017;19(11):1063–9.
- 26
27
28 384 22. Online surveys [Internet]. Available from: <https://www.onlinesurveys.ac.uk/>
- 29
30 385 23. Optimal Workshop [Internet]. Optimal Workshop. Available from:
31
32 386 <https://www.optimalworkshop.com/>
- 33
34 387 24. Duley L, Uhm S, Oliver S. Top 15 UK research priorities for preterm birth. *The Lancet*. 2014 Jun
35
36 388 14;383(9934):2041–2.
- 37
38
39 389 25. Lough K, Hagen S, McClurg D, Pollock A. Shared research priorities for pessary use in women
40
41 390 with prolapse: results from a James Lind Alliance Priority Setting Partnership. *BMJ Open*. 2018
42
43 391 Apr;8(4):e021276.
- 44
45
46 392 26. Thomas RH, Hammond CL, Bodger OG, Rees MI, Smith PEM, on behalf of the members of
47
48 393 WERN & James Lind Alliance. Identifying and prioritising epilepsy treatment uncertainties. *J*
49
50 394 *Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2010 Aug 1;81(8):918–21.
- 51
52
53 395 27. Rowbotham NJ, Smith SJ, Elliott ZC, Leighton PA, Rayner OC, Morley R, et al. Adapting the
54
55 396 James Lind Alliance priority setting process to better support patient participation: an example
56
57 397 from cystic fibrosis. *Res Involv Engagem*. 2019 Aug 20;5.
- 58
59 398
60

399 Figure and table legends

400 Figure 1: Summary of the priority setting partnership stages. Number of questions at each stage
401 illustrated in black circle.

402 Table 1: Characteristics of initial survey participants. Values given as a number (percentage)

403 Table 2: Summary questions presented in second online survey for interim prioritisation (50 in total).

404 The first 25 listed below were highly ranked in the survey and therefore brought forward to the final
405 prioritisation workshop.

406 Table 3: Characteristics of interim prioritisation survey participants. Values given as a number
407 (percentage).

408 Table 4: Final top 10 prioritised and ranked uncertainties

409

410

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Priority Setting Partnership and steering group established

Scope and protocol agreed (July 2018)



Identifying clinical uncertainties

Initial survey online and literature search (October 2018 - January 2019)



Refining uncertainties

Out-of-scope removed, remaining questions grouped into themes:

241 in education	91 in perinatal and child outcomes
191 in antenatal management	71 in postnatal management
120 in mechanism	65 in prediction
104 in maternal outcomes	57 in prenatal management

Summary questions formed and verified as uncertainties by steering group (February 2019 - March 2019)



Interim prioritisation

Interim prioritisation survey online to rank summary questions (April 2019 - May 2019)



Final prioritisation workshop

Small group discussions, two rounds of small group ranking followed by whole group review (June 2019)



Top 10 research priorities

BMJ Open

Research Priorities for Pregnancy Hypertension: a UK Priority Setting Partnership with the James Lind Alliance

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-036347.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	01-Jun-2020
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Ho, Alison; King's College London, Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences Webster, Louise; King's College London, Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences Bowen, Liza; King's College London, School of Population Health and Environmental Sciences Creighton, Fiona; Lay member Findlay, Sarah; Lay member Gale, Chris; Imperial College London, Neonatal Medicine, School of Public Health Green, Marcus; Action on Pre-eclampsia Gronlund, Toto; James Lind Alliance, National Institute for Health Research Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre Magee, Laura; King's College London, Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences McManus, Richard; University of Oxford, Dept of Primary Care Health Sciences Mistry, Hiten; University of Nottingham, Division of Child Health, Obstetrics and Gynaecology, School of Medicine Singleton, Gemma; Lay member Thornton, Jim; University of Nottingham, Division of Child Health, Obstetrics and Gynaecology, School of Medicine Whybrow, rebecca; King's College London, Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences Chappell, Dr Lucy; King's College London, Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences</p>
Primary Subject Heading:	Obstetrics and gynaecology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Cardiovascular medicine, Communication, General practice / Family practice
Keywords:	OBSTETRICS, Hypertension < CARDIOLOGY, Maternal medicine < OBSTETRICS, PRIMARY CARE, NEONATOLOGY

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1
2
3 **1 Research Priorities for Pregnancy Hypertension: a UK Priority Setting Partnership with the James**

4
5 **2 Lind Alliance**

6
7
8 **3** Alison Ho¹, Louise M Webster¹, Liza Bowen², Fiona Creighton³, Sarah Findlay³, Chris Gale⁴, Marcus
9
10 **4** Green⁵, Toto Gronlund⁶, Laura A Magee¹, Richard J McManus⁷, Hiten D Mistry⁸, Gemma Singleton³,
11
12 **5** Jim G Thornton⁸, Rebecca Whybrow¹, Lucy C Chappell¹

13
14 **6** 1. Department of Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences, King's College
15
16 **7** London, London, United Kingdom.

17
18 **8** 2. School of Population Health and Environmental Sciences, King's College London, London, UK

19
20 **9** 3. Lay member.

21
22
23 **10** 4. Neonatal Medicine, School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, Chelsea and Westminster
24
25 **11** campus, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom.

26
27 **12** 5. Action on Pre-eclampsia, The Stables, Evesham, Worcestershire, United Kingdom.

28
29
30 **13** 6. James Lind Alliance, National Institute for Health Research Evaluation, Trials and Studies
31
32 **14** Coordinating Centre, Southampton, United Kingdom.

33
34
35 **15** 7. Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, Radcliffe Primary
36
37 **16** Care, Radcliffe Observatory Quarter, Woodstock Road, Oxford, United Kingdom

38
39 **17** 8. Division of Child Health, Obstetrics and Gynaecology, School of Medicine, University of
40
41 **18** Nottingham, United Kingdom

42
43 **19** **Keywords:** Pregnancy hypertension, James Lind Alliance, research priorities, patient and public
44
45 participation

46
47
48 **21** **Corresponding author:** Alison Ho (alison.ho@kcl.ac.uk) +44 20 7188 7188 extension 83634

49
50 **22** Department of Women and Children's Health, School of Life Course Sciences, King's College London,
51
52 **23** 10th Floor, North Wing, St Thomas' Hospital, Westminster Bridge Road, Lambeth, London, SE1 7EH.

53
54 **24** **Word count:** 2384

1
2
3
4 25 **Abstract**

5
6
7
8 26 **Objectives**

9
10
11 27 To identify research priorities for hypertensive disorders of pregnancy from individuals with lived
12
13
14 28 experience and healthcare professionals.

15
16 29 **Design**

17
18
19
20 30 Prospective surveys and consensus meetings using principles outlined by the James Lind Alliance.

21
22 31 **Setting**

23
24
25
26 32 United Kingdom.

27
28 33 **Methods**

29
30
31
32 34 A steering group was established and “uncertainties” were gathered using an online survey and
33
34 35 literature search. An interim online survey ranked longlisted questions and the top 10 research
35
36 36 questions were reached by consensus at a final prioritisation workshop.

37
38 39 **Participants**

39
40
41
42 40 Women, partners, relatives and friends of those with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension,
43
44 41 researchers and healthcare professionals.

42
43 42 **Results**

44
45
46
47 43 The initial online survey was answered by 278 participants (180 women with lived experience, 9
48
49 44 partners/relatives/friends, 71 healthcare professionals and 18 researchers). Together with a
50
51 45 literature search, this identified 764 questions which were refined into 50 summary questions. All
52
53 46 summary questions were presented in an interim prioritisation survey that was answered by 155
54
55 47 participants (87 women with lived experience, 4 partners/relatives/friends, 49 healthcare
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 46 professionals and 15 researchers). The top 25 highest ranked questions were considered by the final
4
5 47 prioritisation workshop. The top 10 uncertainties were identified by consensus and ranked as follows
6
7 48 in order of priority: long-term consequences of pregnancy hypertension (for the woman and baby),
8
9 49 short-term complications of pregnancy hypertension (for the woman and baby), screening tests for
10
11 50 pre-eclampsia, prevention of long-term problems (for the woman and baby), causes of pregnancy
12
13 51 hypertension, prevention of recurrent pregnancy hypertension, educational needs of healthcare
14
15 52 professionals, diagnosis of pre-eclampsia, management of pregnancy hypertension, provision of
16
17 53 support for women and families.
18
19
20

21 54 Conclusions

22
23
24
25 55 Research priorities shared by those with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension and healthcare
26
27 56 professionals have been identified. Researchers should use these to inform the choice of future
28
29 57 studies in this area.
30
31
32

33 58 34 59 Strengths and Limitations of the study

- 35
36
37 60
- 38 • A consensus on research priorities in pregnancy hypertension was reached by those with
39 lived experience and healthcare professionals.
 - 40 61
 - 41 62 • The approach utilised the James Lind Alliance methodology involving open access online
42 63 surveys and a final face-to-face prioritisation meeting.
 - 43 64
 - 44 65 • Those with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension and healthcare professionals were
45 66 involved at every stage of the priority setting partnership.
 - 46 67
 - 47 68 • The study may have been limited by an imbalance in ethnic diversity of those who
48 69 participated despite efforts to optimise inclusion.
 - 49 70
 - 50 71 • The summary research questions are broad and may prove challenging for researchers to
51 72 address within single studies.
 - 52 73
 - 53 74
 - 54 75
 - 55 76
 - 56 77
 - 57 78
 - 58 79
 - 59 80
 - 60 81

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

70

For peer review only

71 Introduction

72 Hypertensive disorders occur in up to 10% of all pregnancies¹ and include pre-eclampsia, gestational
73 hypertension, chronic hypertension.² The pathophysiology differs to hypertension that occurs
74 outside pregnancy and hypertensive disorders of pregnancy are all associated with adverse
75 pregnancy outcomes,³⁻⁷ but pre-eclampsia (hypertension and one or more of: proteinuria, acute
76 kidney injury, liver dysfunction, neurological features, haemolysis, thrombocytopenia, fetal growth
77 restriction²) has the most substantial impact on maternal and perinatal mortality and morbidity.⁸
78 Half of women with pre-eclampsia deliver preterm and one in twenty stillbirths (without congenital
79 abnormality) occur in women with pre-eclampsia.⁹ Importantly, hypertensive disorders of pregnancy
80 are also associated with an increased risk of long-term cardiovascular and metabolic morbidity and
81 mortality for woman and child.¹⁰⁻¹²

82
83 Current research within hypertensive disorders of pregnancy is broad, exploring epidemiology,
84 prediction, prevention, diagnosis, management and long-term implications for maternal and
85 perinatal health. However, there is often a mismatch between research priorities identified by
86 patients, clinicians and researchers.^{13,14} Areas for research prioritised by The American College of
87 Obstetricians and Gynaecologists (ACOG)¹⁵, International Society for the study of Hypertension in
88 Pregnancy (ISSHP)² and the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)¹⁶ focus on
89 different aspects, and the involvement of lay voices in these is often unclear.

90 The James Lind Alliance (JLA) facilitates priority setting partnerships (PSPs) so that an open dialogue
91 amongst those with lived experience of a disorder, carers and clinician groups can occur in order to
92 identify “uncertainties” (questions which cannot be answered by existing research) that are
93 important to all groups in a particular area of health.¹⁷ Uncertainties are subsequently prioritised to
94 ascertain the top 10 research questions, aiming to inform future research studies to address these
95 questions. Since the establishment of the JLA in 2004, this methodology has been used to identify

1
2
3 96 the top 10 research questions in areas such as asthma¹⁸, miscarriage¹⁹ and hyperacusis.²⁰ Other JLAs
4
5 97 have addressed research priorities in pregnancy complications such as preterm birth²¹ and stillbirth²²
6
7 98 but these did not have a focus on hypertensive disorders of pregnancy. A Canadian priority setting
8
9 99 partnership focussed on hypertension, but pregnancy did not feature in their top 25 questions.²³ The
10
11
12 100 JLA infrastructure is funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR).
13
14

101 Objective

15
16
17
18
19 102 To identify uncertainties and research priorities for hypertensive disorders of pregnancy in the
20
21 103 United Kingdom from individuals with lived experience and healthcare professionals using the JLA
22
23 104 methodology.¹⁷
24
25
26 105
27
28
29 106
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

107 Methods

108 The core steering group (LC, AH and LW) submitted a readiness questionnaire which was approved
109 by the JLA Secretariat, based at the National Institute for Health Research Evaluation and the Trials
110 and Studies Coordinating Centre (NETSCC), University of Southampton. A JLA advisor (TG) was
111 assigned to facilitate the process and ensure that the JLA methodology was followed. We sought
112 advice from our JLA advisor regarding ethical review prior to starting and concluded that, in line with
113 other JLA priority setting partnerships, it was not required. Participants provided informed consent
114 (indicated by completion of the survey and agreement to workshop attendance); it was made clear
115 at each stage of the priority setting partnership that participation was voluntary, what participation
116 involved, the purpose of the study and the use of data.

117 The priority setting partnership stages

118 Initiation

119 Through peer knowledge and consultation, we formed a steering group for the priority setting
120 partnership. Steering group meetings were chaired by TG (JLA advisor) and included lay members
121 with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension and the CEO of a stake holding charity (GS, FC, SF,
122 MG), obstetricians (JT, LC, LW and AH), an obstetric physician (LM), general practitioners (RM, LB), a
123 midwife (RW), a neonatologist (CG), and a research scientist (HM). The Priority Setting Partnership
124 lead was LC and information specialists were LW and AH. Women with lived experience and
125 clinicians were represented at every stage and TG (as chair) was a neutral facilitator, ensuring a fair
126 and transparent process with equal input from all groups. At the initial steering group meeting, the
127 scope of the priority setting partnership was confirmed to include research priorities related to the
128 following topics in the context of women with pregnancy hypertension: hypertensive disorders
129 (including pre-eclampsia, gestational hypertension, chronic hypertension and white coat
130 hypertension), women, babies, their partners and families, time period related to pregnancy (i.e.

1
2
3 131 pre-conception, antenatal, postnatal and long-term health outcomes), management related to
4
5 132 pregnancy hypertension (i.e. prevention, prediction, diagnosis and treatment), physical, social and
6
7 133 emotional aspects, co-morbidities such as renal disease or diabetes, genetics and information
8
9
10 134 provision. The protocol was published on the JLA website in July 2018
11
12 135 [http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/hypertension-in-](http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/hypertension-in-pregnancy/downloads/Hypertension-in-Pregnancy-PSP-protocol.pdf)
13
14 136 [pregnancy/downloads/Hypertension-in-Pregnancy-PSP-protocol.pdf](http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/hypertension-in-pregnancy/downloads/Hypertension-in-Pregnancy-PSP-protocol.pdf).

17 137 Identifying clinical uncertainties

18
19
20 138 In October 2018, we launched an initial online survey to be answered by those with lived experience
21
22 139 of hypertension in pregnancy and healthcare professionals (though we did not exclude the small
23
24 140 number of responses submitted by researchers), using the Online Surveys platform.²⁴ Survey
25
26 141 participants were asked to write up to three questions that they wanted answered by hypertension
27
28 142 in pregnancy research. Additional optional questions included demographic details (gender, age
29
30 143 range and ethnicity), name and preferred contact email. Contact details were collected only for the
31
32 144 purposes of inviting participation in future activities related to the priority setting partnership and
33
34 145 survey participants could remain anonymous. The survey was promoted through social media
35
36 146 (Facebook, Twitter), clinical networks known to steering group members (targeting BAME and non-
37
38 147 English speaking women) and the Action on Pre-eclampsia charity (APEC). In addition to potential
39
40 148 uncertainties submitted through the online survey, the steering group identified uncertainties that
41
42 149 had previously been reported by The American College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists (ACOG),
43
44 150 International Society for the study of Hypertension in Pregnancy (ISSHP) and the National Institute
45
46 151 for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) relevant to this topic.

51 152 Refining uncertainties

52
53
54 153 All questions submitted (from the online survey and reported from ACOG, ISSHP and NICE) were
55
56 154 assigned a unique question code. They were then reviewed by AH and LMW and thematically
57
58 155 grouped into nine categories: mechanisms, prediction, prenatal management, antenatal
59
60

1
2
3 156 management, postnatal management, maternal outcomes, perinatal and child outcomes, education
4
5 157 and out of scope. Submitted questions were assigned multiple themes, if applicable, and duplicate
6
7 158 questions were removed. Each steering group member was assigned a theme and reviewed all
8
9 159 questions within the theme to synthesise summary questions. A second steering group member
10
11 160 reviewed the summary questions to ensure they were representative of the original questions and
12
13 161 both members confirmed that the summary questions were not answered by existing research. All
14
15 162 members of the steering group agreed the 50 summary questions to be put forward for interim
16
17 163 prioritisation, based on being representative of the wider questions submitted, not answered by
18
19 164 existing research, and ensuring that all themes were included.
20
21
22

23 165 Interim Prioritisation Survey

24
25
26 166 A second survey was distributed in April 2019 using the same dissemination routes as the initial
27
28 167 survey. The platform used was supplied by Optimal Workshop.²⁵ Survey participants were asked to
29
30 168 identify the top 10 questions they felt to be most important from a randomly presented list of all
31
32 169 summary questions. They were then asked to identify their top three summary questions from
33
34 170 within their top 10 so that further weighting could be applied to each question to identify the top 25
35
36 171 questions. Following closure of the survey in June 2019, the resulting highly ranked (based on
37
38 172 frequency chosen) 25 questions were taken forward for final prioritisation. The source of each
39
40 173 question was reviewed to ensure that questions from those with lived experience and clinicians
41
42 174 were represented.
43
44
45
46

47 175 Final prioritisation

48
49
50 176 The final prioritisation workshop took place in June 2019 and was chaired by three JLA advisors with
51
52 177 oversight from some of the steering group. Participants had previously expressed their interest in
53
54 178 taking part by submitting their contact details in either survey. Participants were representative of
55
56 179 geographical diversity, and age, and included partners as well as those with lived experience.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 180 Participants included 16 men and women with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension, 5
4
5 181 midwives, 4 obstetricians, 1 neonatologist, 1 GP, a representative from the Stillbirth and Neonatal
6
7 182 Death Charity (SANDs) and a representative from Best Beginnings charity. On the day they were
8
9
10 183 divided into three groups, with equal numbers of participants with lived experience and clinicians in
11
12 184 each, each chaired by a JLA advisor to ensure all participants were able to voice their opinions. In the
13
14 185 first round of ranking, within each group, participants ranked the questions collectively after
15
16 186 reflecting and discussing their reviews of priorities. Groups were subsequently reallocated with a
17
18 187 different group composition for a second round of ranking, based on the combined ranking in the
19
20 188 first round. A third and final priority setting session followed the aggregate ranking from the second
21
22 189 round, which was presented to the whole group. The whole group discussed the results and reached
23
24 190 a consensus on the final ranking with a focus on the top 10 prioritised uncertainties.

28 191 Patient and public involvement

31 192 Patient and public involvement was a core part of the study from design, through all stages, to
32
33 193 conclusion. From the outset, steering group lay members included those with lived experience of
34
35 194 pregnancy hypertension (GS, FC, SF, MG). Both the initial survey and the interim prioritisation survey
36
37 195 were answered by the public, the majority of whom had lived experience of pregnancy
38
39 196 hypertension. Participants at the final prioritisation workshop included equal proportions of lay
40
41 197 members (women with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension and their partners) and all
42
43 198 others, including a representative from the Stillbirth and Neonatal Death Charity (SANDs) and a
44
45 199 representative from Best Beginnings charity.

50 200

201 Results

202 A summary of the priority setting partnership stages with a timeline are shown in Figure 1. The initial
203 survey was answered by 278 participants, 65% of whom were women with lived experience of
204 pregnancy hypertension and 26% of whom were healthcare professionals (Table 1).

205 The initial survey and literature search conducted by the steering group identified 764 questions.

206 Thematic review resulted in the greatest number of 241 questions in 'education', followed by 191

207 questions in 'antenatal management', 120 in 'mechanism', 104 in 'maternal outcomes', 91 in

208 'perinatal and child outcomes', 71 in 'postnatal management', 65 in 'prediction', 57 in 'prenatal

209 management' and 16 out-of-scope questions. These out-of-scope questions were removed from

210 further analysis. Review by the steering group resulted in the development of 50 summary

211 questions. These were verified as uncertainties and all included in the interim prioritisation survey

212 (listed in Table 2).

213 The interim prioritisation survey was answered and completed by 155 people, 56% of whom were

214 individuals with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension and 32% from healthcare professionals

215 (Table 3). The top 25 summary questions ranked at the final prioritisation workshop are listed in

216 Table 2. The results of the final top 10 prioritised and ranked uncertainties from the final

217 prioritisation workshop are listed in Table 4.

218 Table 1: Characteristics of initial survey participants. Values given as a number (percentage)

	Survey participants (n=278)
	N(%)
Category selected	
Women with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension	180 (65)
Partner, relative or friend of someone with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension	9 (3)
Healthcare professional	71 (26)
Obstetrician	22 (8)
Midwife	27 (10)
General Practitioner	5 (2)
Paediatrician	4 (1)
Neonatologist	5 (2)
Physician	2 (1)
Other	6 (2)
Researcher	18 (7)
Demographic details	
Age	
Less than 30 years	27 (10)
30-39 years	105 (38)
40-49 years	75 (27)
50-59 years	54 (19)
60 years and above	15 (5)
No age selected	2 (1)

Gender	
Female	252 (91)
Male	21 (8)
No gender selected	5 (2)
Ethnicity	
White (British, Irish, other)	239 (86)
Mixed	5 (2)
Asian	16 (6)
Chinese	1 (<1)
Black	12 (4)
Other ethnicity	4 (1)
No ethnicity selected	1 (<1)

219

220 *Table 2: Summary questions presented in second online survey for interim prioritisation (50 in total). The first 25 listed*
 221 *below were highly ranked in the survey and therefore brought forward to the final prioritisation workshop.*

1.	How can we optimise information giving for those at risk of or affected by pregnancy hypertension?
2.	How can pregnancy hypertension (including pre-eclampsia) be prevented in a subsequent pregnancy?
3.	What is the cause of pregnancy hypertension (including pre-eclampsia)?
4.	What can be done prior to pregnancy to reduce the risk of pregnancy hypertension?
5.	What is the best way to manage pre-eclampsia?
6.	How can we provide better support for women with pregnancy hypertension and their families?
7.	What is the best way to diagnose pre-eclampsia promptly?
8.	What is the effectiveness and safety of antihypertensive agents at reducing blood pressure in women with pregnancy hypertension?
9.	What are the long-term consequences of pre-eclampsia for the woman and baby?
10.	What is the effectiveness and safety of pharmacological treatments once pre-eclampsia is diagnosed?
11.	How does the placenta contribute to pre-eclampsia?
12.	What is the optimal antihypertensive medication to use postnatally?
13.	What is the best screening test for pre-eclampsia?
14.	What are the optimum blood pressure thresholds (for initiation) and targets for antenatal antihypertensive treatment?
15.	Is there a hereditary link in pre-eclampsia and are the risks different for daughters and sons after an affected pregnancy?
16.	How can we predict complications of pregnancy hypertension (progression to pre-eclampsia)?
17.	What is the optimal timing of delivery in women with pregnancy hypertension?

18.	What interventions are effective and safe at reducing fetal growth restriction in women with pregnancy hypertension?
19.	What are the long-term effects of pre-eclampsia on mental health?
20.	Following pregnancy hypertension, what is the best way to prevent future long-term problems?
21.	What are the educational needs of healthcare professionals managing women with pregnancy hypertension?
22.	What are the fetal, infant and child outcomes in women taking antihypertensive agents?
23.	How can we better prevent stillbirth in pre-eclampsia?
24.	What are the optimum blood pressure thresholds (for initiation) and targets for postnatal antihypertensive treatment?
25.	What pre-pregnancy management of women with chronic hypertension optimises pregnancy outcomes?
26.	What is the optimal monitoring strategy for women before, during and after pregnancy hypertension (including in subsequent pregnancies)?
27.	What are the risk factors for developing pregnancy hypertension and pre-eclampsia?
28.	How can pregnancy hypertension (including pre-eclampsia) be prevented during a pregnancy?
29.	What is the risk of pregnancy hypertension in a subsequent pregnancy?
30.	What is the best test to predict pregnancy hypertension?
31.	What methods are effective at measuring blood pressure in women with pregnancy hypertension (including self-monitoring, ambulatory, automated, manual)?
32.	What is the paternal contribution to pre-eclampsia?
33.	What are the characteristics of postpartum pre-eclampsia?
34.	What is the safety of treatments for pregnancy hypertension for the fetus and infant?

35.	What are the long-term effects of pre-eclampsia on cardiovascular disease for the woman and baby?
36.	What are the long-term effects of pregnancy hypertension on subsequent maternal blood pressure?
37.	What are the consequences of pregnancy hypertension on pre-eclampsia, birthweight and prematurity in that pregnancy?
38.	What is the relationship between blood pressure in pregnancy and development of pregnancy hypertension?
39.	What are the mechanisms for increased cardiovascular risk for a woman and her child?
40.	What are the effects of lifestyle interventions (e.g. diet, exercise) in reducing high blood pressure in pregnancy?
41.	What are the short- and long-term health implications for infants of women with pregnancy hypertension and can these be modified?
42.	What are the long-term neurodevelopmental implications of pregnancy hypertension for the child?
43.	How does pregnancy hypertension affect the growth of the baby?
44.	What is the best way to follow up women who experience pregnancy hypertension?
45.	Do pregnancy characteristics predict infant and child morbidity?
46.	What is the effectiveness and safety of aspirin for prevention of pre-eclampsia?
47.	What are the links between maternal emotional wellbeing and pregnancy hypertension?
48.	What non-pharmacological treatments are effective in treating high blood pressure following pregnancy hypertension?
49.	How do sleep disorders affect pregnancy hypertension?
50.	What are patient reported outcomes of interest related to hypertension in pregnancy?

223 Table 3: Characteristics of interim prioritisation survey participants. Values given as a number (percentage).

	Survey participants (n=155)
	N(%)
Category	
Women with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension	87 (56)
Partner, relative or friend of someone with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension	4 (3)
Healthcare professional	49 (32)
Obstetrician	21 (14)
Midwife	14 (9)
General practitioner	3 (2)
Paediatrician or neonatologist	2 (1)
Physician	4 (3)
Neonatal nurse	2 (1)
Other	3 (2)
Researcher	15 (10)
Demographic details	
Age	
Less than 30 years	10 (6)
30-39 years	63 (41)
40-49 years	45 (29)
50-59 years	21 (14)
60 years and above	9 (6)
No age selected	7 (5)

Gender	
Female	133 (86)
Male	14 (9)
No gender selected	8 (5)
Ethnicity	
White (British, Irish, other)	130 (84)
Mixed	3 (2)
Asian	7 (5)
Chinese	1 (<1)
Black	4 (3)
No ethnicity selected	10 (7)

224

225

226

227 *Table 4: Final top 10 prioritised and ranked uncertainties*

Priority	Research question
1.	What are the long-term physical and mental health consequences of pregnancy hypertension (including pre-eclampsia) for the woman, baby and family?
2.	How can we predict and prevent shorter term complications of pregnancy hypertension (including stillbirth, fetal growth restriction, neonatal death, progression to pre-eclampsia)?
3.	What is the best screening test for pre-eclampsia?
4.	Following pregnancy hypertension, what is the best way to prevent future long-term problems?
5.	What is the cause of pregnancy hypertension (including pre-eclampsia)?
6.	How can pregnancy hypertension (including pre-eclampsia) be prevented in a subsequent pregnancy?
7.	What are the educational needs of healthcare professionals managing women with pregnancy hypertension?
8.	What is the best way to diagnose pre-eclampsia promptly?
9.	What is the best way to manage pregnancy hypertension (including optimal antenatal and postnatal antihypertensive medication and optimal timing of delivery)?
10.	How can we provide better support for women with pregnancy hypertension and their families?

228

229 Discussion

230 Statement of principal findings

231 In this priority setting partnership we have identified the top ten research priorities for hypertensive
232 disorders of pregnancy incorporating the views of those with lived experience and healthcare
233 professionals. Addressing these priorities will optimise understanding of short- and long-term
234 complications of pregnancy hypertension for woman, their babies and wider families. It is noted that
235 the top ten priorities encompass the range of outstanding challenges in this field, including
236 improving screening, prevention and management, addressing both short and long-term
237 complications, and the mental health consequences (as well as the physical health consequences).
238 Summary questions relating to education and information giving, and provision of support, were
239 highly prioritised throughout the process and their presence in the top ten research priorities
240 reflects this. These research priorities provide a clear steer to funding bodies for the future awards.

241 Strengths and weaknesses of the study

242 To our knowledge, this is the first national priority setting partnership for hypertensive disorders of
243 pregnancy to inform the direction of future research in this area. We have adhered to the JLA
244 methodology, including prospective publication of our protocol [http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-](http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/hypertension-in-pregnancy/)
245 [setting-partnerships/hypertension-in-pregnancy/](http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/hypertension-in-pregnancy/). Discussions at the final prioritisation workshop
246 were facilitated by experienced JLA advisors to ensure that no group or individual dominated the
247 decision making. However, it is possible that participants may have been biased in their
248 prioritisation, for example knowledge of existing research projects that may answer certain
249 questions (and therefore giving a lower rating), or that further research was still needed (and
250 therefore giving a higher priority). The priority setting partnership has illustrated a need for a
251 multidisciplinary and holistic approach when caring for women with pregnancy hypertension.
252 Women and partners with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension were included from the

1
2
3 253 outset and at every stage (GS, FC, SF and MG), so that our approach to the priority setting
4
5 254 partnership optimised their participation. The large proportion of survey responses from those with
6
7
8 255 lived experience and participation in the final workshop reflects this.

9
10 256 The initial survey and interim prioritisation survey were only available online; this may have been a
11
12 257 barrier to participation, but women with recent lived experience of pregnancy hypertension (of
13
14 258 reproductive age) have high rates of access to such survey methods. Despite efforts to reach an
15
16 259 ethnically diverse population for survey responses, the number of participants from Black and Asian
17
18 260 minority ethnic groups was low. The priorities are broad and thus translation into high quality
19
20
21 261 quantitative and qualitative studies to answer them may require further work.

22 23 24 262 **Strengths and weaknesses in relation to other studies**

25
26
27 263 The final top 10 prioritised and ranked uncertainties encompass all uncertainties reported by ACOG,
28
29 264 ISSHP and NICE and thus reflect the overlapping uncertainties important to those with lived
30
31 265 experience of pregnancy hypertension and healthcare professionals. The preterm birth priority
32
33 266 setting partnership²⁶ had an overlapping uncertainty of, 'Which treatments are most effective to
34
35 267 prevent early onset pre-eclampsia.' Despite the lifelong impact of pregnancy hypertension on
36
37 268 cardiovascular disease, there were no pregnancy hypertension questions in the final top 10
38
39
40 269 hypertension Canada priority setting partnership²³ and thus this priority setting partnership reflects
41
42 270 a set of research priorities specific to pregnancy hypertension. As seen with other priority setting
43
44 271 partnerships,^{19,27,28} the need for improved education and support has been highlighted for further
45
46 272 research, strongly endorsed by the lay participants. All of the final questions posed were derived
47
48
49 273 from both lay and healthcare professionals as the JLA chair ensured even contribution throughout.
50
51 274 No substantial mismatch in questions posed by those with lived experience and
52
53 275 clinicians/researchers was identified in this priority setting partnership.

54
55
56 276 Our final prioritisation workshop required participants to attend in person and this may have been a
57
58 277 barrier to some of those with lived experience of pregnancy hypertension. We minimised attrition
59
60

1
2
3 278 due to the requirement for childcare by welcoming babies in arms and making childcare
4
5 279 reimbursable. Further inclusion through video conferencing may have enabled more participants to
6
7 280 attend including those as hospital inpatients;²⁹ however, remote working may have impacted on the
8
9
10 281 dynamics of the final workshop.

11 12 282 **Meaning of the study with possible implications for clinicians and policymakers**

13
14
15
16 283 The list of research priorities provides guidance for researchers for future study topic choice within
17
18 284 hypertensive disorders of pregnancy and should inform funding body decisions. Whilst most of the
19
20 285 identified areas for research overlap with current broad research themes, the study has highlighted
21
22 286 a specific need to optimise public information giving and education for hypertensive disorders of
23
24 287 pregnancy that might not otherwise have been so clearly recognised as a priority particular from
25
26 288 those with lived experience.

27 28 29 289 **Unanswered questions and future research**

30
31
32
33 290 All uncertainties listed remain unanswered by existing research, reflecting gaps in our knowledge of
34
35 291 pregnancy hypertension. Further work to refine each research priority into formatted research
36
37 292 questions (for example using the Population, Intervention, Comparator, Outcome framework) would
38
39 293 enable researchers to answer them effectively. We anticipate that our findings will encourage
40
41 294 researchers to address these priorities important to both those with lived experience of pregnancy
42
43 295 hypertension and healthcare professionals.

44
45
46
47 296
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

297 Acknowledgements

298 We thank all those who participated in the initial survey, interim prioritisation survey and final
299 prioritisation workshop.

300 Contributors

301 LC, AH and LW made the application to the James Lind Alliance for a pregnancy hypertension priority
302 setting partnership. AH and LW reviewed and coded all submissions from the initial survey. AH, LW,
303 GS, MG, FC, SF, RW, JT, CG, RM, LB, HM, LAM, TG and LC contributed to the protocol design,
304 production of both the initial survey and interim prioritisation survey, promotion and dissemination
305 of surveys to partner organisations and formation of summary questions. AH, LW and LC drafted the
306 manuscript. All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript before submission.

307 Disclosures

308 The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the UK National Health
309 Service, the National Institute for Health Research, or the Department of Health and Social Care.

310 Funding statement

311 This work was funded by the national Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Research Professorship
312 (Chappell; RP-2014-05-019). Funds supporting this project were used for JLA fees and to support
313 the running costs of the project (including childcare costs for PPIE members, travel expenses). No
314 salaries were provided to the research team for this project.

316 Competing interests

317 LCC reports grants from the National Institute for Health Research during the conduct of the study.
318 CG reports grants from Medical Research Council during the conduct of the study; grants from

1
2
3 319 National Institute for Health Research, Mason Medical Research foundation, Canadian Institute for
4
5 320 Health Research, Rosetrees Foundation, grants and personal fees from Chiesi Pharmaceuticals,
6
7 321 outside the submitted work. HM reports grants from the British Heart Foundation. RJM reports
8
9 322 grants from NIHR, grants from Stroke Association, outside the submitted work; and has received BP
10
11 323 monitors for research from Omron. He occasionally receives travel expenses/honoraria for speaking
12
13 324 at conferences. The latter are paid to Green Templeton College Oxford. All additional interests are
14
15 325 outside the direct remit of the submitted work. All other authors declare no competing interests.
16
17
18

19 326 Data sharing statement

20
21
22 327 Further data regarding the source of all summary questions (including the top 10 research priorities)
23
24 328 are available from [http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/hypertension-in-](http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/hypertension-in-pregnancy/)
25
26 329 pregnancy/
27
28
29

30 330 Bibliography

- 31
32
33
34 331 1. Hutcheon JA, Lisonkova S, Joseph KS. Epidemiology of pre-eclampsia and the other
35
36 332 hypertensive disorders of pregnancy. *Best Pract Res Clin Obstet Gynaecol*. 2011
37
38 333 Aug;25(4):391–403.
39
40
41 334 2. Brown MA, Magee LA, Kenny LC, Karumanchi SA, McCarthy FP, Saito S, et al. The hypertensive
42
43 335 disorders of pregnancy: ISSHP classification, diagnosis & management recommendations for
44
45 336 international practice. *Pregnancy Hypertens*. 2018 Jul;13:291–310.
46
47
48
49 337 3. Bramham K, Parnell B, Nelson-Piercy C, Seed PT, Poston L, Chappell LC. Chronic hypertension
50
51 338 and pregnancy outcomes: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2014 Apr 15;348(apr15
52
53 339 7):g2301–g2301.
54
55
56
57 340 4. Barton JR, O'Brien JM, Bergauer NK, Jacques DL, Sibai BM. Mild gestational hypertension
58
59 341 remote from term: Progression and outcome. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2001 Apr;184(5):979–83.
60

- 1
2
3 342 5. Sibai B, Dekker G, Kupferminc M. Pre-eclampsia. *The Lancet*. 2005;365(9461):785–799.
4
5
6 343 6. Bellomo G, Narducci PL, Rondoni F, Pastorelli G, Stangoni G, Angeli G, et al. Prognostic Value of
7
8 344 24-Hour Blood Pressure in Pregnancy. :7.
9
10
11
12 345 7. Salazar MR, Espeche WG, Leiva Sisniegues BC, Balbín E, Leiva Sisniegues CE, Stavile RN, et al.
13
14 346 Significance of masked and nocturnal hypertension in normotensive women coursing a high-
15
16 347 risk pregnancy: *J Hypertens*. 2016 Nov;34(11):2248–52.
17
18
19 348 8. Steegers EA, von Dadelszen P, Duvekot JJ, Pijnenborg R. Pre-eclampsia. *The Lancet*. 2010 Aug
20
21 349 21;376(9741):631–44.
22
23
24
25 350 9. Cantwell R, Clutton-Brock T, Cooper G, Dawson A, Drife J, Garrod D, et al. Saving Mothers’
26
27 351 Lives: Reviewing maternal deaths to make motherhood safer: 2006–2008. The Eighth Report of
28
29 352 the Confidential Enquiries into Maternal Deaths in the United Kingdom. *BJOG Int J Obstet*
30
31 353 *Gynaecol*. 2011 Mar;118 Suppl 1:1–203.
32
33
34
35 354 10. Irgens HU, Roberts JM, Reisaeter L, Irgens LM, Lie RT. Long term mortality of mothers and
36
37 355 fathers after pre-eclampsia: population based cohort studyPre-eclampsia and cardiovascular
38
39 356 disease later in life: who is at risk? *BMJ*. 2001;323(7323):1213–1217.
40
41
42
43 357 11. Kajantie E, Eriksson JG, Osmond C, Thornburg K, Barker DJP. Pre-Eclampsia Is Associated With
44
45 358 Increased Risk of Stroke in the Adult Offspring: The Helsinki Birth Cohort Study. *Stroke*. 2009
46
47 359 Apr 1;40(4):1176–80.
48
49
50 360 12. Cirillo PM, Cohn BA. Pregnancy complications and cardiovascular disease death: 50-year
51
52 361 follow-up of the Child Health and Development Studies pregnancy cohort. *Circulation*. 2015
53
54 362 Sep 29;132(13):1234–42.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 363 13. Crowe S, Fenton M, Hall M, Cowan K, Chalmers I. Patients', clinicians' and the research
4
5 364 communities' priorities for treatment research: there is an important mismatch. *Res Involv*
6
7 365 *Engagem.* 2015 Dec;1(1):2.
8
9
10
11 366 14. Partridge N, Scadding J. The James Lind Alliance: patients and clinicians should jointly identify
12
13 367 their priorities for clinical trials. *The Lancet.* 2004 Nov 27;364(9449):1923–4.
14
15
16 368 15. ACOG Practice Bulletin No. 202: Gestational Hypertension and Preeclampsia. *Obstet Gynecol.*
17
18 369 2019 Jan;133(1):e1.
19
20
21
22 370 16. National Institute for Clinical Excellence. Hypertension in pregnancy: diagnosis and
23
24 371 management | Guidance | NICE [Internet]. 2009. Available from:
25
26 372 <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg107>
27
28
29
30 373 17. Alliance J. The James Lind Alliance Guidebook. Version 8. Available from:
31
32 374 [http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/jla-guidebook/downloads/Version-8-JLA-Guidebook-for-download-](http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/jla-guidebook/downloads/Version-8-JLA-Guidebook-for-download-from-website.pdf)
33
34 375 [from-website.pdf](http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/jla-guidebook/downloads/Version-8-JLA-Guidebook-for-download-from-website.pdf)
35
36
37 376 18. Elwyn G, Crowe S, Fenton M, Firkins L, Versnel J, Walker S, et al. Identifying and prioritizing
38
39 377 uncertainties: patient and clinician engagement in the identification of research questions. *J*
40
41 378 *Eval Clin Pract.* 2010;16(3):627–31.
42
43
44
45 379 19. Prior M, Bagness C, Brewin J, Coomarasamy A, Easthope L, Hepworth-Jones B, et al. Priorities
46
47 380 for research in miscarriage: a priority setting partnership between people affected by
48
49 381 miscarriage and professionals following the James Lind Alliance methodology. *BMJ Open.* 2017
50
51 382 Aug;7(8):e016571.
52
53
54
55 383 20. Fackrell K, Stratmann L, Gronlund TA, Hoare DJ. Top ten hyperacusis research priorities in the
56
57 384 UK. *The Lancet.* 2019 Feb 2;393(10170):404–5.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 385 21. Oliver S, Uhm S, Duley L, Crowe S, David AL, James CP, et al. Top research priorities for preterm
4
5 386 birth: results of a prioritisation partnership between people affected by preterm birth and
6
7 387 healthcare professionals. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2019 Dec 30;19(1):528.
8
9
10
11 388 22. Heazell AEP, Whitworth MK, Whitcombe J, Glover SW, Bevan C, Brewin J, et al. Research
12
13 389 priorities for stillbirth: process overview and results from UK Stillbirth Priority Setting
14
15 390 Partnership. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol Off J Int Soc Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. 2015
16
17 391 Dec;46(6):641–7.
18
19
20
21 392 23. Khan N, Bacon SL, Khan S, Perlmutter S, Gerlinsky C, Dermer M, et al. Hypertension
22
23 393 management research priorities from patients, caregivers, and healthcare providers: A report
24
25 394 from the Hypertension Canada Priority Setting Partnership Group. *J Clin Hypertens*.
26
27 395 2017;19(11):1063–9.
28
29
30
31 396 24. Online surveys [Internet]. Available from: <https://www.onlinesurveys.ac.uk/>
32
33
34 397 25. Optimal Workshop [Internet]. Optimal Workshop. Available from:
35
36 398 <https://www.optimalworkshop.com/>
37
38
39
40 399 26. Duley L, Uhm S, Oliver S. Top 15 UK research priorities for preterm birth. *The Lancet*. 2014 Jun
41
42 400 14;383(9934):2041–2.
43
44
45 401 27. Lough K, Hagen S, McClurg D, Pollock A. Shared research priorities for pessary use in women
46
47 402 with prolapse: results from a James Lind Alliance Priority Setting Partnership. *BMJ Open*. 2018
48
49 403 Apr;8(4):e021276.
50
51
52
53 404 28. Thomas RH, Hammond CL, Bodger OG, Rees MI, Smith PEM, on behalf of the members of
54
55 405 WERN & James Lind Alliance. Identifying and prioritising epilepsy treatment uncertainties. *J*
56
57 406 *Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2010 Aug 1;81(8):918–21.
58
59
60

1
2
3 407 29. Rowbotham NJ, Smith SJ, Elliott ZC, Leighton PA, Rayner OC, Morley R, et al. Adapting the
4
5 408 James Lind Alliance priority setting process to better support patient participation: an example
6
7 409 from cystic fibrosis. *Res Involv Engagem* [Internet]. 2019 Aug 20 [cited 2019 Oct 29];5.
8
9
10 410 Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6701046/>
11
12

411

412 Figure and table legends

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 413 Figure 1: Summary of the priority setting partnership stages. Number of questions at each stage
21
22 414 illustrated in black circle.

23
24 415 Table 1: Characteristics of initial survey participants. Values given as a number (percentage)

25
26
27 416 Table 2: Summary questions presented in second online survey for interim prioritisation (50 in total).

28
29 417 The first 25 listed below were highly ranked in the survey and therefore brought forward to the final
30
31 418 prioritisation workshop.

32
33 419 Table 3: Characteristics of interim prioritisation survey participants. Values given as a number
34
35 420 (percentage).

36
37
38 421 Table 4: Final top 10 prioritised and ranked uncertainties
39
40 422
41
42 423

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Priority Setting Partnership and steering group established

Scope and protocol agreed (July 2018)



764

Identifying clinical uncertainties

Initial survey online and literature search (October 2018 - January 2019)



50

Refining uncertainties

Out-of-scope removed, remaining questions grouped into themes:

241 in education	91 in perinatal and child outcomes
191 in antenatal management	71 in postnatal management
120 in mechanism	65 in prediction
104 in maternal outcomes	57 in prenatal management

Summary questions formed and verified as uncertainties by steering group (February 2019 - March 2019)



25

Interim prioritisation

Interim prioritisation survey online to rank summary questions (April 2019 - May 2019)



Final prioritisation workshop

Small group discussions, two rounds of small group ranking followed by whole group review (June 2019)



10

Top 10 research priorities