

1 **Shouldering our Way into a More Meaningful Research Agenda for Atraumatic**

2 **Shoulder Pain: A Priority Setting Study**

3 **Authors**

4 Lyng KD^{1,2}, Børsting TK^{2,3}, Clausen MB⁴, Larsen AH⁵, Liaghat B⁶, Ingwersen KG^{7,8}, Bateman
5 M⁹, Rangan A¹⁰⁻¹², Bjørnholdt KT¹³, Christiansen DH¹⁴⁻¹⁶, Jensen SL^{17,18}, Thomsen JNL²,
6 Thorborg K^{19,20}, Ziegler C²¹, Olesen JL², Rathleff MS^{1,2,5}

7 8 **Affiliations**

- 9 1. Department of Health Science and Technology, Faculty of Medicine, Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark
- 10 2. Center for General Practice at Aalborg University, Department of Clinical Medicine, Aalborg University, Denmark
- 11 3. Aalborg Center of Health and Rehabilitation, Aalborg Municipality, Denmark
- 12 4. Department of Midwifery, Physiotherapy, Occupational Therapy and Psychomotor Therapy, Faculty of Health, University College Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark
- 13 5. Department of Physiotherapy and Occupational Therapy, Aalborg University Hospital, Aalborg, Denmark
- 14 6. Department of Sports Science and Clinical Biomechanics, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark
- 15 7. Research Unit in Physiotherapy and Occupational Therapy, University Hospital of Southern Denmark, Vejle, Denmark
- 16 8. Department of Regional Health Research, University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark
- 17 9. Derby Shoulder Unit, Orthopaedic Outpatient Department, Royal Derby Hospital, Derby, United Kingdom
- 18 10. Department of Health Sciences, University of York, York, UK
- 19 11. Faculty of Medical Sciences & NDORMS, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
- 20 12. James Cook University Hospital, Middlesbrough, UK
- 21 13. Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Horsens Regional Hospital
- 22 14. Centre of Elective Surgery, Regional Hospital Silkeborg
- 23 15. Department of Clinical Medicine, Aarhus University Health, Aarhus, Denmark
- 24 16. Centre for Health and Nursing Research, Regional Hospital Viborg, Denmark
- 25 17. Department of Orthopaedics, Aalborg University Hospital, Aalborg, Denmark
- 26 18. Department of Clinical Medicine, Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark
- 27 19. Sports Orthopaedic Research Center-Copenhagen (SORC-C), Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Copenhagen University Hospital, Amager-Hvidovre, Denmark;
- 28 20. Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Research-Copenhagen (PMR-C), Department of Physical and Occupational Therapy, Copenhagen University Hospital, Amager-Hvidovre, Denmark.
- 29 21. The Danish Rheumatism Association, Denmark

30

31 **Corresponding Author**

32 Kristian Damgaard Lyng, Department of Health Science and Technology, Aalborg University,
33 Selma Lagerlöfs Vej 249, 9260 Gistrup, Denmark, Telephone: +45 30669439, E-mail:
34 klyng@dcm.aau.dk.

35

36 **Keywords:** Atraumatic shoulder pain, patient and public involvement, research priorities

37

38

39

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

40 **Key points**

41 **Question:** What are the top research priorities with atraumatic shoulder pain that can help
42 directing future research agendas for improving current care.

43 **Findings:** This priority-setting study included two e-surveys and two virtual workshops to
44 establish top-10 research questions based on input from people living with atraumatic shoulder
45 pain, healthcare practitioners, and relatives. The final list focused on improving knowledge
46 translation to clinical practice, prevention of pain and identifying who benefits from surgery.

47 **Meaning:** This lists provide funders, policymakers, and researchers with user-generated
48 knowledge on where to prioritize their resources for creating meaningful improvements in the
49 management of atraumatic shoulder pain.

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61 **Abstract**

62 **IMPORTANCE:** Atraumatic shoulder pain poses a significant burden to society and the individual.

63 There is a growing need for involving patients and other stakeholders in setting the research agenda.

64 **OBJECTIVE:** To use the voice of people living with atraumatic shoulder pain, healthcare practitioners,
65 and their relatives to establish research questions.

66 **DESIGN, SETTING, AND PARTICIPANTS:** This priority-setting study followed a modified
67 approach originally formulated by the James Lind Alliance (JLA). The process consisted of six phases
68 (initiation, consultation, collation, prioritization, validation, and reporting) and included two e-surveys
69 and two separate virtual workshops. Data collection started on June 2021 until June 2023. We included
70 people with atraumatic shoulder pain, relatives, healthcare practitioners managing shoulder pain, and
71 researchers conducting research within the field.

72 **EXPOSURES:** The first e-survey included basic demographic questions and the possibility to submit
73 at least one and a maximum of five potential research questions. Based on a thematic analysis, questions
74 were arranged into themes and related questions. In the second e-survey, participants were asked to
75 prioritize the questions. Finally, two priority-setting partnership workshop was used to formulate a top-
76 10 list.

77 **MAIN OUTCOMES AND MEASURES:** A top-25 and top-10 list of research questions related to
78 atraumatic shoulder pain.

79 **RESULTS:** Initially, 297 participants submitted 1080 potential research questions. In the second e-
80 survey 290 participants prioritized these questions resulting in a compilation of the top 25. Based on
81 discussions from the workshops with a total of 21 participants, a top 10 list was created.

82 **CONCLUSIONS AND RELEVANCE:** In the final top 10 list, the three research questions with the
83 highest ranking concerned 1) translating the best available knowledge into clinical practice, 2)
84 preventing shoulder pain, and 3) identifying who benefits from surgery. These questions informs future
85 research funding and projects relating to atraumatic shoulder pain.

86 **Introduction**

87 The prevalence of shoulder pain increases with age and is one of the most common reasons
88 people seek care for pain in the upper extremities.¹ Atraumatic shoulder pain is a term which
89 covers multiple specific diagnoses, such as subacromial pain syndrome, rotator cuff
90 tendinopathy, adhesive capsulitis, arthritis, degenerative rotator cuff tears, and instability.²
91 There is not yet a universal agreement of terminology or clear aetiology, which hampers cross-
92 study comparison.³ Also, there is a lack of association between structural changes and pain,
93 highlighting the need to focus on patients' experiences and symptoms.⁴⁻⁶

94 Atraumatic shoulder pain poses a substantial burden both for the individual and the
95 society.⁷⁻¹¹ Recent research shows that 70% of the economic impact associated with shoulder
96 disorders in the working-age population is attributed to sick leave.¹¹ National cost-of-illness
97 studies further highlight that the economic burden is attributed to 20% of the patients, who
98 account for 66% of the total cost of the healthcare system.¹¹ The economic burden of shoulder
99 pain has brought an emphasis on the healthcare costs associated with the condition and its
100 various treatments¹²⁻¹⁵. Costs may be a high priority for some policymakers; however, costs
101 are unlikely to be the main concern for people with lived experience of shoulder pain. Despite
102 large research efforts and advancement, this issue is further highlighted by the existing
103 uncertainties in the treatment of atraumatic shoulder pain. Recent insights from large trials like
104 the SExSI, GRASP, UK-FROST, and CSAW trials have established that no specific treatment
105 strategy has shown superiority for common atraumatic shoulder conditions.¹³⁻¹⁶

106 Despite the recent development of evidence-based interventions, a significant
107 proportion continues to experience pain.¹⁵⁻¹⁷ This underlines the need for further research to
108 optimize the management of atraumatic shoulder pain and to identify what is important to end-
109 users dealing with atraumatic shoulder pain using the safest and most cost-effective approach.

110 Within recent years, there has been a growing interest in patient involvement in
111 healthcare research, especially in musculoskeletal pain research across all ages.^{18–21} Several
112 national and international initiatives have been launched to both involve patients and other
113 stakeholders in research and also to provide guidance to researchers working towards patient
114 and public involvement in research.^{22–25} As recently highlighted in two *Lancet Rheumatology*
115 articles, there is a great need to identify and combat societal issues through the active
116 involvement of patients and the public in research.^{26,27}

117 Several different methodologies and frameworks have been used for the inclusion of
118 various stakeholders in general musculoskeletal pain research prioritizing, including The Child
119 Health and Nutrition Research Initiative (CHNRI) and James Lind Alliance Priority Setting
120 Partnerships (JLA-PSPs).^{28,29} While one surgery-specific shoulder priority-setting study and
121 priority-setting studies on the broader musculoskeletal pain field have already been conducted,
122 it is unknown whether research priorities differ when addressing the entire health situation and
123 management of people living with atraumatic shoulder pain.^{20,21,30–33}

124 Adhering to the JLA-PSP principles, this study aimed to establish research priorities
125 for the field of atraumatic shoulder pain by involving people with atraumatic shoulder pain,
126 their carers, healthcare professionals, and researchers.

127

128 **Methods**

129 **Study Design**

130 The reporting of this study is guided by the Guidance for Reporting Involvement of Patients
131 and the Public (GRIPP2) short-form checklist and the Reporting Guideline for Priority Setting
132 of Health Research (REPRISE).³⁴ The study was conducted using methods similar to those

133 previously described.^{18,21} The study used a modified approach adapted from the James Lind
134 Alliance guidance for conducting Priority Setting Partnerships.²⁹ This approach has previously
135 been used in other pain conditions to identify future patient-oriented research
136 priorities.^{18,21,31,35,36} The process consisted of six phases (initiation, consultation, collation,
137 prioritization, validation, and reporting) (See **Figure 1** for an overview of all phases). All data
138 were processed and stored in accordance with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).
139 Regional ethical approval was deemed exempt due to the low-risk nature of the study. The
140 study was conducted between June 2021 and February 2023. All data were collected in
141 Denmark through e-surveys in the secure web-based software REDcap (Research Electronic
142 Data Capture) hosted at Aalborg University.^{37,38}

143

144 **Search strategy and selection criteria**

145 To ensure relevancy of the project and to inform the findings of the study, we searched PubMed
146 and Embase from Jan 1, 2003 to December 1, 2023 for peer-reviewed English-language
147 articles. The search strategy was separated into two strategies. The first included search terms
148 related to atraumatic shoulder pain. For this search strategy the terms included “shoulder*”,
149 “shoulder pain”, “atraumatic shoulder pain”, “non-traumatic shoulder pain” or “non-specific
150 shoulder pain” combined with “epidemiology”, “diagnosis”, “management”, “therapy” and
151 “treatment”. The second search was concerning chronic musculoskeletal pain and participatory
152 research. This search strategy included search terms such as “chronic musculoskeletal pain”,
153 “adults”, “management”, “therapy” and “treatment” combined with “participatory research”.
154 All articles were selected based on their data and relevance for this study. Studies using primary
155 data or high-quality systematic reviews were prioritised. Furthermore, if two or more studies
156 existed concerning similar aims, the most recent study was prioritised.

157 **Context and Scope**

158 This priority-setting study was conducted across all regions of Denmark, anchored in Aalborg
159 at Aalborg University. The project was initiated as a part of a continuous effort to identify
160 research priorities across musculoskeletal pain conditions.^{21,39} The outcome of this study
161 primarily targets researchers, policymakers, funders, and the industry, who all have an interest
162 in improving the lives of people living with atraumatic shoulder pain.

163

164 **Initiation**

165 In the initiation phase, the steering group (all authors) discussed the scope of the project and
166 designed the protocol. Further, different stakeholders were invited to the initiation of the study,
167 including patient organizations, patients, and carers, all of whom provided feedback on the
168 scope of the study and the protocol. Stakeholders with various backgrounds (e.g., gender, age,
169 work situation, ethnicity, and geographical location) were purposively sampled to ensure
170 representativeness and provide a voice for all relevant stakeholders. All stakeholders were
171 recruited through e-mail.

172

173 **Consultation**

174 This step involved gathering research questions directly from all relevant stakeholders in a
175 Danish context. To accommodate this, the steering group developed an electronic survey (e-
176 survey), which was tailored to fit each respondent category (i.e., people living with atraumatic
177 shoulder pain, carers, and healthcare practitioners). The survey consisted of various
178 demographical questions and the opportunity to state research questions (“What do you think
179 future research should prioritize?”) for future research in relation to the management of

180 atraumatic shoulder pain. The e-survey was piloted on five people with atraumatic shoulder
181 pain, five healthcare practitioners working with people with atraumatic shoulder pain, and three
182 carers. The participants from the pilot tests were asked to provide feedback on the wording and
183 the appropriateness of the e-survey. The survey used a multimodal recruitment process. This
184 involved distribution through newsletters from patient organizations, personal and professional
185 networks, and targeted advertisement through Facebook and LinkedIn. No reimbursement was
186 given for participation. All participants were aged 18 years or above and were residents of
187 Denmark. Three groups were recruited for the study:

- 188 1) People with atraumatic shoulder pain, their carers, or relatives
- 189 2) Healthcare practitioners with clinical experience in managing shoulder pain
- 190 3) Researchers with experience in conducting research on shoulder pain

191 People with atraumatic shoulder pain were included if they had experienced consistent non-
192 traumatic shoulder pain for more than three months. Only authorized healthcare practitioners,
193 such as medical doctors, psychologists, physiotherapists, and chiropractors, were included in
194 group 2. All participants who completed the survey were invited to take part in the later phases
195 of the study.

196

197 **Collation**

198 After the collection of research questions from Step 1, a thematic analysis was conducted in
199 agreement with the James Lind Alliance guidebook, through a thematic text analysis as
200 described by Braun and Clarke.^{29,40} This involved the following steps: familiarisation with data,
201 coding of data, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining, and naming themes, and
202 presenting the results. KDL and TKB familiarised themselves with the raw data through naïve
203 reading. After this, both researchers independently coded each individual research question and

204 categorized potential domains. All potential domains were organized in a mind map for vertical
205 and horizontal interpretation. This was then condensed into a table including the main themes,
206 sub-themes, sub-sub-themes, indicative questions, examples, and summative descriptions. The
207 thematic analysis was presented to two people with atraumatic shoulder pain and two
208 healthcare practitioners, who provided feedback on the thematic analysis to ensure that it was
209 kept true to the data. Furthermore, they validated the excluded inquiries (e.g., answers that were
210 not relevant to atraumatic shoulder pain and unreadable inquiries) and determined whether
211 these research questions were conclusively irrelevant or not. All individuals were recruited
212 through patient organizations and professional networks. NVivo 12 (NVivo qualitative data
213 analysis software; QSR International Pty Ltd. Version 12, 2018) was used for the thematic
214 analysis.

215

216 **Prioritization**

217 *Interim prioritization*

218 To reduce the list of research questions emerging from the previous steps, we developed an
219 interim prioritization e-survey. The results from the thematic analysis were summarized into
220 questions based on feedback from two people with atraumatic shoulder pain, one carer, and
221 one healthcare practitioner. The e-survey was distributed through clinical practices across
222 Denmark and social media (Facebook and LinkedIn) and to participants from the consultation
223 phase who had consented to participate in later stages. In the interim prioritization e-survey,
224 the respondents were asked to choose the ten most important research questions and the five
225 least relevant research questions. The participants ranked the importance of each research
226 question on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 to 5, with 1 = not at all important, two = low
227 importance, 3 = neutral, 4 = important, and 5 = very important. An overall score for each

228 question was determined by counting the number of times the research question was rated “very
229 important” or “important”. The top 25 research questions were presented to the steering group
230 and constituted the list of final questions for the workshops. The order of the top 25 research
231 questions was randomized prior to the workshops to minimize the influence on the voting.
232 Before completion of the prioritization exercise, the participants were again invited to take part
233 in later phases of the study. The top 25 research questions from the interim prioritization
234 exercise will be presented alongside the top 10 questions to provide full transparency on the
235 weighting from each step and the methodological approach.

236

237 **Validation**

238 *Workshop to Determine the Top 10 Research Priorities*

239 To determine the final top 10 of the research priorities established from the previous steps, we
240 invited people with atraumatic shoulder pain, carers, and healthcare practitioners to participate
241 in two separate workshops. To ensure that all voices were heard, we created two groups
242 consisting of healthcare practitioners in one workshop (W1) and people with atraumatic
243 shoulder pain and carers in another workshop (W2). The participants were recruited through
244 previous e-surveys from the consultation and prioritization phase, clinical practices across
245 Denmark, and social media (Facebook and LinkedIn). Steering group members with no conflict
246 of interest were also invited to participate. The participants were purposively sampled to
247 include participants with various backgrounds (e.g., ethnicity, education, work situation),
248 diagnosis, care journey (i.e., healthcare practitioners seen), sex, age, and duration of symptoms
249 (in months). We aimed to recruit an equal number of people with atraumatic shoulder pain,
250 carers, and healthcare practitioners of various demographics to ensure representativeness. The
251 first workshop (W1) was facilitated by three authors of the project (KDL, TKB and AHL). The

252 second workshop (W2) was facilitated by one author (KDL). Both workshops included both
253 small and large group exercises. All participants received the list of the top 25 research
254 questions and an introduction to the aim of the project prior to the workshop. The participants
255 were asked to familiarize themselves with the top 25 research questions. The workshop was
256 initiated with an introduction to the agenda, and all participants were informed about the
257 previous steps of the process that led to the workshop. In each workshop, the participants were
258 first divided into small groups and asked to identify the *least* important research questions.
259 Then, the questions were removed based on consensus from all the attending participants.
260 Again, the participants were divided into small groups and asked to select the *most* important
261 research questions, which were discussed to obtain consensus in the entire group of
262 participants. Using the nominal group technique, each participant was asked to forward the
263 three most important research questions to the lead author (KDL). Using this approach
264 minimized the influence that participants could potentially pose on each other. The answers
265 from all participants were used to formulate the final top 10 list of research questions within
266 the management of atraumatic shoulder pain. All votes were given a nominal value, and the
267 total values were used to create the final top 10. All votes were weighed equally.

268

269 **Results**

270 Of all the 212 included healthcare practitioners, 4 (2%) had three months – 1 year of experience
271 working with the population, 10 (5%) had 1-2 years of experience, 19 (9%) had 2-5 years of
272 experience, 30 (14%) had 5-10 years of experience, 85 (40%) had 10-20 years of experience,
273 and 64 (30%) had +20 years of experience (**Table 1**). Of the total 385 included people with
274 atraumatic shoulder pain, 69 (18%) had experienced atraumatic shoulder pain between 3
275 months – 1 year, 58 (15%) had 1-2 years of pain duration, 111 (29%) had 2-5 years of pain

276 duration, 62 (16%) had 5-10 years of pain duration, 50 (13%) had 10-20 years of pain duration,
277 and 35 (9%) had +20 years of pain duration. The most consulted practitioners were
278 physiotherapists (339 (88.1%)) and general practitioners (338 (87.8%)). An orthopaedic
279 surgeon had been seen by 209 (54.3%) of the patients, and a rheumatologist, chiropractor,
280 psychologist, or neurologist had been seen by 169 (43.9%), 164 (42.6%), 57 (14.8%), and 44
281 (11.4%) respectively. Further, 26.5% of the patients had consulted a specialized pain clinic. In
282 the first phase, 297 participants (177 (59.5%) females and 120 (40.5%) males) completed the
283 e-survey and submitted 1080 potential research questions. Of these, 230 (77.5%) participants
284 were people with atraumatic shoulder pain, one was a carer (0.3%), and 66 (22%) were
285 healthcare practitioners. The potential questions were condensed into 16 main themes (See
286 **Panel 1**) and 94 subthemes that were formulated into research questions. In the interim
287 prioritization exercise, 290 completed the e-survey, and 94 questions were reduced to 25
288 research questions for further use in the workshops (**Table 2**). The top three themes were
289 treatment (prioritized by 211 (73%)), self-management (prioritized by 171 (59%)), and
290 prognosis (prioritized by 153 (53%)). Eleven healthcare practitioners participated in the first
291 virtual workshop (W1) to determine the top research priorities in relation to atraumatic shoulder
292 pain. Three invited participants (one medical doctor, one psychologist, and one
293 physiotherapist) did not attend the workshop because of unexpected work issues. The results
294 from the nominal voting can be seen in **Table 3**. Eight people with atraumatic shoulder pain
295 and two carers participated in the second workshop (W2), which also took place online. Four
296 had been diagnosed with subacromial pain syndrome, two with glenohumeral osteoarthritis,
297 one with adhesive capsulitis, and one with an atraumatic rotator cuff tear (supraspinatus). Nine
298 invited participants (seven people with atraumatic shoulder pain and two carers) did not attend
299 the workshop because of pain-related issues (n = 5) or unexpected work issues (n = 4).

300

301 Discussion

302 There is an increased need to involve end-users in research to maximize the impact of research
303 for the benefit of society.⁴¹ We established the priorities for research in atraumatic shoulder
304 pain. These findings can guide the future direction of research to address the end-user's
305 priorities and needs. The three research questions with the highest ranking in the top 25 list
306 (based on 290 e-survey answers) included: 1) which exercise regimen is the most effective, 2)
307 how can patients learn to self-manage their own pain, and 3) how effective is painful exercising
308 compared with non-painful exercising. From the top 10 list (based on two workshops with 19
309 participants), the three research questions with the highest ranking were: 1) how can we
310 improve the translation of research into clinical practice, 2) how can we prevent atraumatic
311 shoulder pain, and 3) who benefits from surgery, and who does not? The results from this study
312 represent different areas of interest across and outside the healthcare sector.

313 The research question with the highest ranking in the top 10 list is “*How can we improve*
314 *the translation of research into clinical practice?*”. This priority shows that healthcare
315 practitioners, people in pain, and careers have a priority to strengthen the implementation of
316 the most up-to-date knowledge. No published studies have investigated how to translate
317 research on atraumatic shoulder pain most effectively into clinical practice. Furthermore, only
318 limited evidence exists regarding the most effective implementation strategy for new
319 knowledge in terms of musculoskeletal pain.⁴² This underlines a difference between end-users’
320 priorities and the published literature. The priority of knowledge translation aligns with the
321 policies of the World Health Organization (WHO) and the Evidence-Informed Policy Network
322 (EVIPNet). These policies emphasize the need to accelerate the implementation of research
323 into clinical practice and the healthcare system in general.^{43,44}

324 Of the total 35 research priorities, 15 of these priorities from both the top 25 and 10
325 lists were related to improving the existing treatments and how to tailor the treatments to the
326 individual. This aligns well with larger trials published in leading medical journals within the
327 last few years.^{13–16,45,46} From the top 10 list, three priorities included traditional treatments,
328 including exercise and surgery, which have been investigated intensively within the last
329 decade.^{15–17,47–52} The majority of the research conducted on surgery for the most common
330 shoulder pain conditions has failed to demonstrate a clear improvement compared to a placebo.
331 This has led to most guidelines advising strongly against surgery.^{53,54} Recent studies have
332 shown a decrease in surgery rates during the last years. However, surgical procedures such as
333 subacromial decompression are still frequently performed indicating a need for more
334 knowledge on who might benefit from surgery and implementation of research into
335 practice.^{55,56}

336 Exercise only provides small to moderate effect sizes comparable to laser therapy and
337 extracorporeal shock wave therapy after 3–6 months.¹⁷ Recent trials have underpinned the lack
338 of superiority of exercise compared to best-practice advice¹⁵ (irrespective of the dosage of
339 exercise).¹⁶ The priorities that concern exercise and surgery highlight the need for more
340 research on how we can optimize health through a combination of treatments to maximize
341 effectiveness. To the author's knowledge, most of the existing randomized control trials have
342 focused on single interventions or multimodal interventions with only limited capacity for
343 individualization or person-centred care. Policymakers such as the International Consortium
344 for Personalised Medicine (ICPerMed) highlights the increase in interest in order to build
345 capacity for more personalized care in health care research.

346 We identified the need for more research on novel interventions, including shared
347 decision-making, patient education, and self-management interventions for atraumatic
348 shoulder pain. These findings underline the need for management strategies that focus on

349 challenging common misconceptions and supporting patients' agency, which has been
350 underprioritised in current literature.¹⁷ Encouraging active patient involvement and agency has
351 been recognized by global organizations such as the European Union and WHO. This further
352 stress the importance of conducting more research empowering people living with atraumatic
353 shoulder pain to gain more agency and learn more about their own condition.

354 Other key priorities for future research include a better understanding of disease
355 development, prevention, and prediction of how atraumatic shoulder pain influence's function,
356 workability, and quality of life. These findings correspond to a previously published evidence
357 and gap map concerning chronic musculoskeletal pain, in which a minority of the included
358 systematic reviews (n=457) focused on outcomes such as work-related health and quality of
359 life. Further, the findings highlighted the low quality of the existing evidence.⁵⁷ The authors
360 advocate for future evidence and gap-mapping studies that could systematically identify
361 disparities between the current evidence and the research priorities derived from stakeholders
362 for atraumatic shoulder pain. Potentially, the combined knowledge of such studies will help
363 policymakers, decision-makers, and researchers determine where to invest their resources.

364 An important strength of our study is that we closely collaborated with end-users
365 throughout the entire study process. This helped ensure that the final product was kept as
366 relevant to the end-users as possible. Furthermore, the end-users helped decide what was
367 relevant and what was irrelevant throughout, again strengthening the relevancy of this study
368 and minimizing potential biases posed by the steering group. We were guided by the JLA-PSP
369 approach, which follows a specific set of steps to capture research priorities and formulate top
370 10 lists. Capturing research uncertainties through several steps, and using several different
371 methods strengthens the validity of our priority lists and creates a foundation for an equal and
372 transparent discussion of future research priorities. Furthermore, we also present the results
373 from both the e-surveys and the workshops to be fully transparent and to highlight the

374 differences between the two steps. Based on previous experience and feedback, we decided to
375 conduct two workshops to provide patients with a better environment to express their views on
376 equal terms with other persons in the same situation. We recommend this for future studies
377 capturing research priorities.

378 Our study is not without limitations. Establishing priorities using these methods lacks
379 a deep understanding of the “why” of the proposed research questions. Our research questions
380 should be interpreted as valuable insights into which areas matter to the stakeholders but not
381 why they matter. We are not able to provide credible explanations for the underlying reasons
382 and mechanisms for why these research priorities emerged from our end-users. The priorities
383 could, in theory, have multiple meanings. As an example, the priority “who benefits from
384 surgery” could also represent patients feeling unjustly denied surgery, patients operated but not
385 experiencing benefit, or clinicians doubting correct indications for surgery. This illustrates the
386 need for patient education, adjusting patient expectations, or large RCTs with subgroup
387 analysis to establish core indications of a specific surgery. Future studies should explore the
388 reasons behind specific research priorities and explore if some priorities emerge as a result of
389 poor knowledge translation.

390 Several studies have identified research priorities for the general musculoskeletal pain
391 field^{20,21,31,33}. In this study, we aimed to be more specific and focused on atraumatic shoulder
392 pain to deliver more specific priorities. This may be important for future priority-setting studies
393 to consider as research priorities vary across different healthcare-related contexts.³⁹ Despite
394 our narrower focus, atraumatic shoulder pain is still a broad term encompassing several
395 heterogeneous diagnoses, which are often treated through different care pathways. Hence,
396 some priorities may be more or less valid for individual diagnoses and should be interpreted
397 with care. Creating actionable research priorities is a difficult task that requires the priority to
398 be formulated as a testable research question while the intended meaning of the original priority

399 remains.⁵⁸ It is questionable if all the generated research priorities can be translated into a
400 falsifiable hypothesis that can be tested through traditional research methodologies.
401 Importantly, research priorities also provide useful insight to policymakers and funders of
402 research as the priorities provide information on what stakeholders jointly report as relevant
403 for improving certain research areas. Therefore, we recommend that future research projects
404 informed by the outcomes of this study formulate their research questions in close collaboration
405 with relevant patient partners and healthcare practitioners.

406 Our study had an overrepresentation of people in pain (versus healthcare
407 practitioners/careers) throughout all phases, predominantly with a Danish background. While
408 this limits the applicability and generalisability to other groups, countries, healthcare systems
409 and questions whether we have captured all research priorities, it also underpins that there is a
410 need to create effective recruitment strategies for ethnic minorities and other underrepresented
411 groups across society. Lastly, while several systematic steps are taken to obtain the top priority
412 list, these priority-setting studies are not inherently protected against potential biases or
413 agendas of the participants, including secondary gain issues. This is important when
414 interpreting our findings. Future studies should also consider refining and validating research
415 priorities from people with different lived experiences rather than specific diagnoses and in
416 different life situations such as litigation or awaiting disability payments.

417 In conclusion, our study adds crucial knowledge to shape the future research agenda
418 within atraumatic shoulder pain. Our study finds that priorities related to which exercise
419 regimen is the most effective and how we can most effectively translate research into clinical
420 practice are the two research questions with the highest ranking across the top 25 and top 10
421 lists, respectively. Funders and researchers should consider focusing on the priorities derived
422 from this study to inform proper allocation of funds and resources to meet the priorities of
423 people living with atraumatic shoulder pain and other end-users. Creating more end-user-

424 driven innovation and research is highly needed within this area, and this study will provide
425 guidance for accommodating this need identified by people living with atraumatic shoulder
426 pain.

427

428 **Author Contributions**

429 KDL, MBC, and MSR drafted the first version of the manuscript. KDL and TKB created all
430 surveys with feedback from the rest of the author group. Data from the consultation and
431 prioritization phase were collected, analyzed, and summarised by KDL and TKB. MBC, MSR,
432 and CZ contributed to the analysis. CZ was in charge of reviewing the entire data analysis and
433 ensuring the perspectives of the stakeholders. KDL, TKB, and AHL were in charge of the
434 workshops, including setup, data collection, analysis, and summarizing. MB and AR provided
435 significant expert methodological considerations throughout the entire process. KDL, TKB,
436 MBC, AHL, BL, MB, AR, KTB, DHC, SLJ, JNLT, KT, CZ, JLO, and MSR all helped support
437 the recruitment for all phases. KDL, TKB, MBC, AHL, BL, MB, AR, KTB, DHC, SLJ, JNLT,
438 KT, CZ, JLO, and MSR made significant contributions to the design, interpretation, approval
439 of data analysis, reporting (i.e., manuscript writing) and revisions.

440

441 **Acknowledgements**

442 The authors would like to thank all the participants throughout all phases. We are grateful for
443 your input, and we are honoured to act as the conveyor of all your voices. Furthermore, we
444 want to thank the stakeholder group for providing essential input during the initiation of the
445 study and the interim prioritization.

446

447

448 **Declaration of Interest**

449 All authors state no conflict of interest, except Dr. Steen Lund Jensen and Prof. Amar Rangan.

450 Dr. Steen Lund Jensen has previously received consulting fees from Zimmer Biomet outside

451 the project. Furthermore, he has received payment from the European Commission Screening

452 Panel for Medical Devices for his expertise. This had also no influence on the project. The

453 department of Prof. Amar Rangan has previously received research and educational grants from

454 DePuy J&J Ltd., again that was outside this project and hence had no influence on the project.

455

456 **Informed Consent**

457 Informed consent was collected to ensure that participants accepted that we could contact them

458 at later stages of the project and that data from this study were stored on a secure file share.

459 **References**

- 460 1 Lucas J, Doorn P van, Hegedus E, Lewis J, Windt D van der. A systematic review of the
461 global prevalence and incidence of shoulder pain. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 2022; **23**:
462 1073.
- 463 2 Lee DYL, Haas R, Wallis JA, O'Connor DA, Buchbinder R. Clinical practice guidelines
464 for the management of atraumatic shoulder conditions: protocol for a systematic review. *Bmj*
465 *Open* 2021; **11**: e048297.
- 466 3 Witten A, Mikkelsen K, Mayntzhusen TW, *et al.* Terminology and diagnostic criteria used
467 in studies investigating patients with subacromial pain syndrome from 1972 to 2019: a
468 scoping review. *Br J Sports Med* 2023; **57**: 864–71.
- 469 4 Harris JD, Pedroza A, Jones GL, *et al.* Predictors of Pain and Function in Patients With
470 Symptomatic, Atraumatic Full-Thickness Rotator Cuff Tears. *Am J Sports Med* 2012; **40**:
471 359–66.
- 472 5 Dunn WR, Kuhn JE, Sanders R, *et al.* Symptoms of Pain Do Not Correlate with Rotator
473 Cuff Tear Severity. *J Bone Jt Surg, Inc* 2014; **96**: 793–800.
- 474 6 Curry EJ, Matzkin EE, Dong Y, Higgins LD, Katz JN, Jain NB. Structural Characteristics
475 Are Not Associated With Pain and Function in Rotator Cuff Tears. *Orthop J Sports Med*
476 2015; **3**: 2325967115584596.
- 477 7 Kuijpers T, Tulder MW van, Heijden GJ van der, Bouter LM, Windt DA van der. Costs of
478 shoulder pain in primary care consultants: a prospective cohort study in The Netherlands. *Bmc*
479 *Musculoskelet Di* 2006; **7**: 83.
- 480 8 Aurora A, McCarron J, Iannotti JP, Derwin K. Commercially available extracellular matrix
481 materials for rotator cuff repairs: State of the art and future trends. *J Shoulder Elb Surg* 2007;
482 **16**: S171–8.
- 483 9 Virta L, Joranger P, Brox JI, Eriksson R. Costs of shoulder pain and resource use in
484 primary health care: a cost-of-illness study in Sweden. *Bmc Musculoskelet Di* 2012; **13**: 17–
485 17.
- 486 10 Marks D, Comans T, Bisset L, Thomas M, Scuffham PA. Shoulder pain cost-of-illness in
487 patients referred for public orthopaedic care in Australia. *Aust Health Rev* 2019; **43**: 540–8.
- 488 11 Sørensen L, Tulder M van, Johannsen HV, *et al.* Costs of shoulder disorders in Denmark;
489 a nationwide cost-of-illness study investigating 617,334 patients and matched controls. *Pain*
490 2022; **Publish Ahead of Print**. DOI:10.1097/j.pain.0000000000002610.
- 491 12 Carr A, Cooper C, Campbell MK, *et al.* Effectiveness of open and arthroscopic rotator
492 cuff repair (UKUFF): a randomised controlled trial. *Bone Jt J* 2017; **99-B**: 107–15.
- 493 13 Beard DJ, Rees JL, Cook JA, *et al.* Arthroscopic subacromial decompression for
494 subacromial shoulder pain (CSAW): a multicentre, pragmatic, parallel group, placebo-
495 controlled, three-group, randomised surgical trial. *Lancet Lond Engl* 2018; **391**: 329–38.

- 496 14 Rangan A, Brealey SD, Keding A, *et al.* Management of adults with primary frozen
497 shoulder in secondary care (UK FROST): a multicentre, pragmatic, three-arm, superiority
498 randomised clinical trial. *Lancet* 2020; **396**: 977–89.
- 499 15 Hopewell S, Keene DJ, Marian IR, *et al.* Progressive exercise compared with best practice
500 advice, with or without corticosteroid injection, for the treatment of patients with rotator cuff
501 disorders (GRASP): a multicentre, pragmatic, 2 × 2 factorial, randomised controlled trial.
502 *Lancet* 2021; **398**: 416–28.
- 503 16 Clausen MB, Hölmich P, Rathleff M, *et al.* Effectiveness of Adding a Large Dose of
504 Shoulder Strengthening to Current Nonoperative Care for Subacromial Impingement: A
505 Pragmatic, Double-Blind Randomized Controlled Trial (SExSI Trial). *Am J Sports Medicine*
506 2021; **49**: 3040–9.
- 507 17 Babatunde OO, Ensor J, Littlewood C, *et al.* Comparative effectiveness of treatment
508 options for subacromial shoulder conditions: a systematic review and network meta-analysis.
509 *Ther Adv Musculoskelet Dis* 2021; **13**: 1759720X2110375.
- 510 18 Birnie KA, Dib K, Ouellette C, *et al.* Partnering For Pain: a Priority Setting Partnership to
511 identify patient-oriented research priorities for pediatric chronic pain in Canada. *Cmaj Open*
512 2019; **7**: E654–64.
- 513 19 Beresford P, Russo J. Patient and public involvement in research. In: Anell A, Nolte E,
514 Merkur S, editors. *Achieving Person-Centred Health Systems: Evidence, Strategies and*
515 *Challenges.* European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies. Cambridge: Cambridge
516 University Press; 2020. p. 145–72. 2020; : 145–72.
- 517 20 Paskins Z, Farmer CE, Manning F, *et al.* Research priorities to reduce the impact of
518 musculoskeletal disorders: a priority setting exercise with the child health and nutrition
519 research initiative method. *Lancet Rheumatology* 2022; **4**: e635–45.
- 520 21 Lyng KD, Larsen JB, Birnie KA, *et al.* Participatory research: a Priority Setting
521 Partnership for chronic musculoskeletal pain in Denmark. *Scand J Pain* 2022; **0**.
522 DOI:10.1515/sjpain-2022-0019.
- 523 22 European Patient’s Forum. European Patient’s Forum—The Value+Handbook 2022.
524 <https://www.eu-patient.eu/>.
- 525 23 Patient Centered Outcomes Research Institute. 2022. <https://www.pcori.org>.
- 526 24 National Institute for Health and Care Research. 2022. <https://www.nihr.ac.uk/>.
- 527 25 International Collaboration for participatory Health research. International Collaboration
528 for participatory Health research, the Canadian Institutes for Health Research 2022.
529 <http://www.icphr.org/>.
- 530 26 Yeoh S-A, Burke B, Castelino M, *et al.* Patient and public involvement in rheumatology
531 research: embracing the wave of change. *Lancet Rheumatology* 2021; **3**: e540–2.

- 532 27 Berkovic D, Ackerman I, Buchbinder R. Patient-led research in rheumatology: the way
533 forward? *Lancet Rheumatology* 2023; **5**: e180.
- 534 28 Rudan I, Gibson JL, Ameratunga S, *et al.* Setting Priorities in Global Child Health
535 Research Investments: Guidelines for Implementation of the CHNRI Method. *Croat Méd J*
536 2008; **49**: 720–33.
- 537 29 Alliance JL. National Institute for health research, the James Lind alliance Guidebook:
538 version 10. 2021.
- 539 30 Foster NE, Dziedzic KS, Windt DA van der, Fritz JM, Hay EM. Research priorities for
540 non-pharmacological therapies for common musculoskeletal problems: nationally and
541 internationally agreed recommendations. *Bmc Musculoskelet Di* 2009; **10**: 3.
- 542 31 Rangan A, Upadhaya S, Regan S, Toye F, Rees JL. Research priorities for shoulder
543 surgery: results of the 2015 James Lind Alliance patient and clinician priority setting
544 partnership. *Bmj Open* 2016; **6**: e010412.
- 545 32 Beneciuk JM, Verstandig D, Taylor C, *et al.* Musculoskeletal pain stakeholder
546 engagement and partnership development: determining patient-centered research priorities.
547 *Res Involv Engagem* 2020; **6**: 28.
- 548 33 Slater H, Jordan JE, O’Sullivan PB, *et al.* “Listen to me, learn from me”: a priority setting
549 partnership for shaping interdisciplinary pain training to strengthen chronic pain care. *Pain*
550 2022; **Publish Ahead of Print**. DOI:10.1097/j.pain.0000000000002647.
- 551 34 Tong A, Synnot A, Crowe S, *et al.* Reporting guideline for priority setting of health
552 research (REPRISE). *BMC Méd Res Methodol* 2019; **19**: 243.
- 553 35 Poulin P, Shergill Y, Romanow H, *et al.* Researching what matters to improve chronic
554 pain care in Canada: A priority-setting partnership process to support patient-oriented
555 research. *Can J Pain* 2018; **2**: 191–204.
- 556 36 Fitzcharles M-A, Brachaniec M, Cooper L, *et al.* A paradigm change to inform
557 fibromyalgia research priorities by engaging patients and health care professionals. *Can J*
558 *Pain* 2017; **1**: 137–47.
- 559 37 Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data
560 capture (REDCap)—A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing
561 translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform* 2009; **42**: 377–81.
- 562 38 Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, *et al.* The REDCap Consortium: Building an International
563 Community of Software Platform Partners. *J Biomed Inform* 2019; **95**: 103208.
- 564 39 Andersen LN, Kristensen KL, Howell CM, Rathleff MS, Fonager K, Lyng KD. What
565 matters to people with chronic musculoskeletal pain consulting general practice? Comparing
566 research priorities across different sectors. *Scand J Pain* 2023; **23**: 759–66.
- 567 40 Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in*
568 *Psychology* 2006; : 77–101.

- 569 41 Levelink M, Voigt-Barbarowicz M, Brütt AL. Priorities of patients, caregivers and health-
570 care professionals for health research – A systematic review. *Health Expect* 2020; **23**: 992–
571 1006.
- 572 42 [PREPRINT] Hansen PB, Bahnsen M, Nørgaard MS, Jepsen JF, Rathleff MS, Lyng KD.
573 Effectiveness of Implementation Interventions in Musculoskeletal Healthcare: A Systematic
574 Review. *medRxiv* 2023; : 2023.11.29.23299209.
- 575 43 Straus SE, Tetroe J, Graham I. Defining knowledge translation. *Can Méd Assoc J* 2009;
576 **181**: 165–8.
- 577 44 WHO. (2017b). EVIPNet. [http://www.euro.who.int/en/data-and-evidence/evidence-](http://www.euro.who.int/en/data-and-evidence/evidence-informed-policy-making/evidence-informed-policy-network-evipnet)
578 [informed-policy-making/evidence-informed-policy-network-evipnet](http://www.euro.who.int/en/data-and-evidence/evidence-informed-policy-making/evidence-informed-policy-network-evipnet). .
- 579 45 Dubé M-O, Desmeules F, Lewis JS, Roy J-S. Does the addition of motor control or
580 strengthening exercises to education result in better outcomes for rotator cuff-related shoulder
581 pain? A multiarm randomised controlled trial. *Br J Sports Med* 2023; **57**: 457–63.
- 582 46 Zadro JR, Ferreira GE, Muller R, *et al.* Education can reassure people with rotator cuff–
583 related shoulder pain: a 3-arm, randomised, online experiment. *PAIN* 2024; **165**: 951–8.
- 584 47 Lapner P, Henry P, Athwal GS, *et al.* Treatment of rotator cuff tears: a systematic review
585 and meta-analysis. *J Shoulder Elb Surg* 2022; **31**: e120–9.
- 586 48 Challoumas D, Biddle M, McLean M, Millar NL. Comparison of Treatments for Frozen
587 Shoulder. *Jama Netw Open* 2020; **3**: e2029581.
- 588 49 Singh JA, Sperling J, Buchbinder R, McMaken K. Surgery for shoulder osteoarthritis.
589 *Cochrane Db Syst Rev* 2010; : CD008089.
- 590 50 Glazebrook H, Miller B, Wong I. Anterior Shoulder Instability: A Systematic Review of
591 the Quality and Quantity of the Current Literature for Surgical Treatment. *Orthop J Sports*
592 *Medicine* 2018; **6**: 2325967118805983.
- 593 51 Pieters L, Lewis J, Kuppens K, *et al.* An Update of Systematic Reviews Examining the
594 Effectiveness of Conservative Physical Therapy Interventions for Subacromial Shoulder Pain.
595 *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2020; **50**: 131–41.
- 596 52 Griffin J, Jaggi A, Daniell H, Chester R. A systematic review to compare physiotherapy
597 treatment programmes for atraumatic shoulder instability. *Shoulder Elb* 2022; :
598 175857322210807.
- 599 53 Vandvik PO, Lähdeoja T, Ardern C, *et al.* Subacromial decompression surgery for adults
600 with shoulder pain: a clinical practice guideline. *Bmj* 2019; **364**: l294.
- 601 54 Lafrance S, Charron M, Roy J-S, *et al.* Diagnosing, Managing, and Supporting Return to
602 Work of Adults With Rotator Cuff Disorders: A Clinical Practice Guideline. *J Orthop Sport*
603 *Phys* 2022; **52**: 647–64.

604 55 Curtis DM, Bradley AT, Lin Y, *et al.* National Trends Show Declining Use of
605 Arthroscopic Subacromial Decompression Without Rotator Cuff Repair. *Arthrosc: J Arthrosc*
606 *Relat Surg* 2021; **37**: 3397–404.

607 56 Ozdag Y, Hayes DS, Garcia VC, *et al.* Surgeon Factors and Trends Associated With the
608 Use of Subacromial Decompression at the Time of Rotator Cuff Repair. *J Hand Surg* 2024;
609 **49**: 465–71.

610 57 Lyng KD, Djurtoft C, Bruun MK, *et al.* What is known and what is still unknown within
611 chronic musculoskeletal pain? A systematic evidence and gap map. *Pain* 2023; **Publish**
612 **Ahead of Print**. DOI:10.1097/j.pain.0000000000002855.

613 58 Deering K, Brimblecombe N, Matonhodze JC, Nolan F, Collins DA, Renwick L.
614 Methodological procedures for priority setting mental health research: a systematic review
615 summarising the methods, designs and frameworks involved with priority setting. *Heal Res*
616 *Polyc Syst* 2023; **21**: 64.

617

618 **Figure legends**

619 **FIGURE 1 – LEGEND: Overview of Study Phases 1-6**

620 **TABLE 1 - LEGEND: Participants' Characteristics**

621 **PANEL 1 - LEGEND: Listing of Main Themes**

622 **TABLE 2 - LEGEND: Top 25 Research Questions based on Interim Prioritisation**

623 **TABLE 3 - LEGEND: Top 10 Research Question Priorities**

624