

Development of a Research Agenda for General Practice Based on Knowledge Gaps Identified in Dutch Guidelines and Input from 48 Stakeholders

Burgers et al. (2019)

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13814788.2018.1532993>

For which topic were research priorities identified?

general practice

In which location was the research priority setting conducted?

Europe - Netherlands

Why was it conducted at all?

Several funding organizations using different agendas support research in general practice. Topic selection and prioritization are often not coordinated, which may lead to duplication and research waste.

What was the objective?

to develop systematically a national research agenda for general practice involving general practitioners, researchers, patients and other relevant stakeholders in healthcare

What was the outcome?

a ranking list of 10 research questions

How long did the research prioritization take?

October 2017 - November 2017

Which methods were used to identify research priorities?

consultation; survey

How were the priorities for research identified exactly?

Step 1: collecting research questions: knowledge gaps derived from literature review and asking stakeholders via survey 1. Step 2: data processing: thematic categorization. Step 3: survey 2: participants were asked to think about: How often does the problem occur? What is the importance of the problem? Does answering the question help you in your daily GP practice?, participants were asked to prioritize 5 out of 12 research themes, resulting in top 20 lists of items. Step 4: stakeholder consultation/consensus conference: participants were asked to select a maximum of 10 items

Which stakeholders took part?

8 research departments of general practice, primary care research institutes, scientific societies in primary and secondary care, organizations funding research, patient and consumer organizations, and governmental agencies relevant to general practice. Survey 1: 96 participants. Survey 2: 232 participants. Consultation: 64 participants: 48 general practitioners, 16 representatives of other stakeholders in healthcare (e.g. patient organizations and medical specialists).

How were stakeholders recruited?

In total, 96 stakeholders were identified and approached.

Were stakeholders actively involved or did they just participate?

Stakeholders not only participated but were also actively involved in the research prioritization process: They were part of an advisory board. Members were selected from the national working group of heads of the eight research departments of general practice of the University Medical Centres, working group Science of the National Organization of General Practitioner Trainees, the NHG Member Council, and the NHG Committee for Scientific Research. The advisory board was involved in data processing and prioritization.