

Setting an Agenda for Comparative Effectiveness Systematic Reviews in CKD Care

Crews et al. (2012)

<https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2369-13-74>

For which topic were research priorities identified?

chronic kidney disease

In which location was the research priority setting conducted?

North America - USA

Why was it conducted at all?

A core research method of CER is systematic review and synthesis of existing literature, but this has not been widely employed to study CKD care. Findings from systematic reviews can help decision-makers draw conclusions about effective care strategies employed among heterogeneous populations and clinical settings. Systematic reviews also help to identify gaps in the existing evidence that need to be addressed by future primary research studies.

What was the objective?

to identify and prioritize topics for future comparative effectiveness research (CER) systematic reviews and to help set an agenda for future primary CER studies of chronic kidney disease (CKD) care

What was the outcome?

a ranking list of 18 research topics

How long did the research prioritization take?

No information provided.

Which methods were used to identify research priorities?

consultation

How were the priorities for research identified exactly?

Step 1: literature review: review of recent clinical practice guidelines and perspectives pieces published by CKD thought leaders to develop a preliminary list of potential topics, preliminary list of 30 topics generated. Step 2: stakeholder consultation 1: stakeholders revised preliminary list of CER topics by refining the proposed topics and added additional topics, resulting in list of 46 topics, stakeholders agreed that the four proposed domains for categorizing topics for CER appropriately reflected the range of potential CER topics about CKD care, stakeholders then each independently ranked their 10 highest priority topics for CER studies, stakeholders agreed that topics with a global rank of 12 or better should be considered high priority for future funded CER reviews. Step 3: preliminary literature searches: to estimate the feasibility of performing CER systematic reviews on topics ranked highly by stakeholders

Which stakeholders took part?

2 patient advocacy groups, 1 from primary care (family practice and internal medicine), 2 health professional societies, 1 adult nephrology, 1 private healthcare insurer, 1 pediatric nephrology, 2 governmental healthcare insurers, endocrinology, 2 members of National Institutes of Health, 2 not representing an organization. 15 participants.

How were stakeholders recruited?

Many of the individuals were employed or had active memberships in organizations representing relevant decision-makers in the CKD community and/or had clinical expertise relevant to the care of patients with CKD.

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.