

## Topic list 'Walking the Line'

*Short introduction of the interview/focus group [recorder off]*

*Short introductions of the interviewer/focus group discussion leader.*

*Asking for a short introduction of the participant(s):*

- Could you introduce yourself shortly? Could you tell me what your job entails? What topics are you working on?

*[Recorder on]* You have received the information letter and signed informed consent, but again: do you agree with the recording?

I would like to start with looking at this figure together and discuss it. That's part 1 of the interview. Then, in part 2, I have a few more questions that go deeper into certain dilemmas. There are a number of topics that I would like to cover in a short time, so I may interrupt if we stray too much from that.

*Short introduction:*

This interview is held in the context of scientific research into the use of peer discussion of audit and feedback in general practice. This research was initiated by general practitioners from our region. We are looking at how we can best use peer discussion of audit and feedback to improve quality of care. In this study we look into how the various stakeholders view this. We ask for your ideas as an expert in primary care.

In order to clearly state what we are talking about, I would like to look at this figure with you.

Audit and feedback is already widely used in general practice in various forms. Examples of this are the pharmacotherapeutic consultations (FTOs), diagnostic consultations (DTOs) and the summary of AF that general practitioners receive from health insurers every year. AF is, however, more widely applicable: the general principle is that data is collected about the actions of the general practitioner (the audit), which is then fed back to the general practitioner (feedback). That data can come from different sources. You can also compare with different benchmarks.

- Looking at the figure: what are your thoughts?

If we then look at different parts of this figure.

*Sources:*

- What are the possible sources for AF? [subjects, sources, bench marks to be discussed: ask further about sources/bench marks]

*Discussing the group:*

- How do you feel about discussing AF in group?
- What kind of group should it be?
- What are the conditions for discussing AF in a group?

- How should or could you form such a group?

*Quality improvement:*

- Some people would like to give more prominence to peer discussion of AF in quality improvement and continuing professional development for general practitioners. What are your ideas on this?
- What benefits would there be from your perspective? Can you tell us more about that?
- What risks could there be?
- Which conditions are important?

*Transparency:*

- How do you feel about transparency when it comes to quality improvement/assurance? What should transparency look like? What transparency do you think is important? (towards health insurer, towards patients?) What do you think GPs themselves think of this? What do you think patients want?

*Accountability:*

- How do you think doctors should be accountable for the care they provide? And to who?

*Process/outcome measure and consequences:*

- Should there be requirements for peer discussion of AF? To the process? Or also the results? Should there be consequences to it? How? (Reward/punishment?)

*Feasibility:*

- What could go wrong? Where could it go wrong?
- How do we involve GPs who are less motivated to work on quality?

Finally, a number of contrasts [*choose based on conversation: to clarify ambiguities*]:

Do you think peer discussion of AF should be used as a learning tool or quality control? [*If not clear enough yet: why and how?*]

Do you think that GPs should have control over quality improvement themselves or that it should lie more externally? (why, how?)

Do you think we should set requirements for the process or the results?

*Concluding:*

Are there any other people you think we should definitely speak to as part of this investigation? Who and why?

Thank you for your time! I'll keep you updated on the investigation if you'd like. We are going to talk to more people. Eventually we will publish the results in a scientific journal. We may also use the input to design an intervention that is based on peer discussion of AF.