

IV. Results from Research Gap Rating Tool

TEPP Priority Ratings for 8 Research Gaps

Research Gap	Priority Rating Category	Partial Total (6/8/10*) (n=6)	Partial Rank	Final Total (n=9)	Final Rank
<i>Population 1:</i> Identifying which patients to treat (e.g., those most likely to have aggressive cancer) and when.	Current Importance	30		44	
	Potential for significant health impact	29		44	
	Total	59	1	88	1
<i>Population 2:</i> Understanding the natural history of the disease among men with screen-detected cancer	Current Importance	26		38	
	Potential for significant health impact	28		41	
	Total	54	2 (tie)	79	2
Intervention 1: Having better evidence on advanced technologies such as IMRT, proton beam radiation, laparoscopic and robotic assisted prostatectomy, high-intensity focused ultrasound, cryotherapy	Current Importance	23		32	
	Potential for significant health impact	27		37	
	Total	50	5	69	6
Intervention 2: Identifying biomarkers to provide reliable estimates about prostate cancer aggressiveness and the relative effectiveness of treatments	Current Importance	23		33	
	Potential for significant health impact	24		37	
	Total	47	6 (tie)	70	5
Comparison 1: Having better comparative evidence on alternative treatment strategies, such as surgery vs. radiotherapy vs. active surveillance	Current Importance	27		37	
	Potential for significant health impact	27		38	
	Total	54	2 (tie)	75	3

Research Gap	Priority Rating Category	Partial Total (6/8/10*) (n=6)	Partial Rank	Final Total (n=9)	Final Rank
Comparison 2: Making better treatment decisions that incorporate physician and patient preferences	Current Importance	23		32	
	Potential for significant health impact	24		34	
	Total	47	6 (tie)	66	7
Outcomes: Obtaining better evidence on outcomes of treatment for patient subgroups (e.g., age, comorbidities, disease characteristics, racial/ethnic groups, including disparities)	Current Importance	25		32	
	Potential for significant health impact	27		37	
	Total	52	4	72	4
Setting: Investigating treatment patterns by physician characteristics (e.g., specialty, years in practice, volume) or institutional characteristics (e.g., tertiary vs. community hospital)	Current Importance	17		24	
	Potential for significant health impact	15		22	
	Total	32	8	46	8

Biostatistician recused himself because of lack of clinical expertise; one other member did not respond.

*Received before second conference call.