

A Lung Cancer Research Agenda that Reflects the Diverse Perspectives of Community Stakeholders: Process and Outcomes of the SEED Method

Rafie et al. (2019)

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40900-018-0134-y>

For which topic were research priorities identified?

lung cancer outcomes

In which location was the research priority setting conducted?

North America - USA

Why was it conducted at all?

End users of health research are increasingly being engaged throughout the research process. Involvement of those impacted by health issues in the identification and prioritization of research topics allows inclusion of their unique experiential understanding and ensures that research priorities reflect their concerns. It also provides opportunities for research that is more valid, relevant, accepted, and sustainable.

What was the objective?

to explore factors influencing lung cancer outcomes and develop a stakeholder-driven research agenda

What was the outcome?

a ranking list of 12 research questions

How long did the research prioritization take?

November 2015 - July 2016

Which methods were used to identify research priorities?

meeting

How were the priorities for research identified exactly?

Step 1: meeting: participants generated research questions, followed by literature review of 12 research questions to identify existing evidence and target research gaps, small groups then selected top 4 questions for inclusion in final research agenda, resulting in final list of 12 questions

Which stakeholders took part?

Cancer patients and caregivers, healthcare providers and administrators, and policymakers from a rural Virginia community. 21 participants: 7 lung cancer patients and caregivers, 8 non-physician clinical care providers involved in lung cancer patient care, and 6 access influencers.

How were stakeholders recruited?

Flyers, direct communication, and newspaper advertisements were used to recruit participants.

Were stakeholders actively involved or did they just participate?

Stakeholders were mere participants of the research prioritization process; they were not actively involved in the process.