Annals Journal Club: Hot Flashes & Other Sleep Disorders

The Annals of Family Medicine encourages readers to develop the learning community of those seeking to improve health care and health through enhanced primary care. You can participate by conducting a RADICAL journal club, and sharing the results of your discussions in the Annals online discussion for the featured articles. RADICAL is an acronym for: Read, Ask, Discuss, Inquire, Collaborate, Act, and Learn. The word radical also indicates the need to engage diverse participants in thinking critically about important issues affecting primary care, and then acting on those discussions.1

HOW IT WORKS

In each issue, the Annals selects an article or articles and provides discussion tips and questions. We encourage you to take a RADICAL approach to these materials, and to post a summary of your conversation in our online discussion. (Open the article online and click on “TRACK Comments: Submit a response.”) You can find discussion questions and more information online at: http://www.AnnFamMed.org/misc/AJC.shtml.

CURRENT SELECTION

Article for Discussion

Discussion Tips
The study featured in this article is from a practice-based research network (PBRN). PBRNs have emerged as an essential laboratory for primary care research.2 Like many PBRN investigations, this study used data collection techniques that are practical in real-world practice and that engaged practice members in formulating the research question and interpreting the findings to generate knowledge relevant to the care of patients in general practice. In addition to discussing the specific content of the study, you may wish to consider whether and how you might like to participate in a PBRN and what research questions might emerge from your practice.

Discussion Questions
• What is the research question in this study? Why does it matter? How does it fit with what already is known about night sweats?
• Is the study design appropriate for the research question? Does the design take into account what already is known about the question?
• Study methods—to what degree can the findings be accounted for by:
  1. How participants were selected, particularly who might have been excluded?
  2. How key variables were defined and measured?
  3. Confounding (false attribution of causality because 2 variables discovered to be associated actually are associated with a third factor)?
  4. How information was interpreted?
  5. Chance (as indicated by inferential statistics)?
• Main findings—does this study advance current knowledge?
• Generalizability—how transportable are the findings to other settings, particularly to my patients, practice and community?
• Implications—how can the information be used to change practice or advance new hypotheses and research?
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