

Characteristics and Methods for Mapping and Evaluating Knowledge Translation Platforms: a Scoping Review Protocol

Bey-Marrié Schmidt (✉ bschmidt@uwc.ac.za)

University of the Western Cape School of Public Health <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1363-171X>

Sara Cooper

South African Medical Research Council

Taryn Young

Stellenbosch University Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences

Nasreen S Jessani

Stellenbosch University Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences

Protocol

Keywords: Knowledge translation platform, knowledge broker, intermediary, evidence-informed decision-making

Posted Date: April 20th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-426129/v1>

License:  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Background

Knowledge translation platforms (KTPs) are intermediary organisations, initiatives or networks whose intent is to bridge the evidence into action divide. Strategies and tools include collaborative knowledge production, capacity building, information exchange and dialogue to facilitate relevant and timely engagement between researchers and decision-makers and other relevant stakeholders. With the wide range of definitions and descriptions of KTPs, there is a need to (a) provide a nuanced understanding of characteristics of KTPs and (b) assess and consolidate research methods used in mapping and evaluating KTPs to inform standardised process and impact evaluation.

Methods

This scoping review will follow the recommended and accepted methods for scoping reviews and reporting guidelines. Eligibility for inclusion is: any conceptual or empirical health-related qualitative, quantitative and/or mixed method studies including (a) definitions, descriptions and models or frameworks of KTPs (including those that do not self-identify as KTPs, e.g. university research centres) and (b) research methods for mapping and/or evaluating KTPs. Searches will be carried out in PubMed, Scopus, CINAHL, EMBASE, Global Health and Web of Science using search terms and synonyms for 'knowledge translation platform' and 'evidence-informed decision-making', without any date, language or geographic restrictions. Two reviewers will independently screen titles and abstracts. One reviewer will complete data extraction for all included studies, and another will check a sample of 50% of the included studies. All reviewers will be involved in the analysis process. The analysis and synthesis will provide: (a) an understanding of the various characteristics of KTPs; b) insight into characteristics or factors that make them resilient and/or adaptive to facilitate impact (i.e. influence policy and practice); and (c) an overview of the different methods for mapping and evaluating KTPs.

Discussion

Results of the three aims above, will permit us to explore enhancing an existing matrix or framework for classifying KTPs or perhaps even developing a new framework for identifying and monitoring KTPs if necessary and relevant. This would be a helpful first step in establishing as well as evaluating KTPs.

Background

The global focus on achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and implementing Universal Health Coverage (UHC) has resulted in an increased demand for research evidence to inform policy and practice (1, 2). SDG 3 is about ensuring healthy lives and promoting wellbeing at all ages, which is closely linked with the aims of UHC (3). Universal health coverage aims to ensure that all people have access to needed and effective health services (including prevention, promotion, treatment, rehabilitation and palliation) of sufficient quality, without exposing users to financial hardship (4). However, despite the

widely agreed SDGs and the UHC model, there is limited use of high-quality research on the effectiveness, acceptability and cost implications of health system, healthcare or public health interventions to inform policy, practice and implementation (5). Although research evidence on health-related interventions and systems are increasingly available, there are challenges around translating research evidence into policy and practice (5, 6, 7, 8).

Translating research evidence into policy and practice, or knowledge translation (KT), entails a “dynamic and iterative process that includes synthesis, dissemination, exchange and ethically sound application of knowledge to improve health, provide more effective health services and products and strengthen the healthcare system” (9). Limited institutional support and/or buy-in from leadership and relevant stakeholders for KT has been linked to several challenges (10, 11, 12, 13, 14), for example: poor infrastructure and inadequate financial and technical resources specifically for KT, inadequate soft skills, relationships and networks amongst evidence producers and evidence users negative attitudes and poor knowledge about what KT is and how to do it, and scarce local research evidence relevant to micro-level policy and practice, amongst others (10, 11, 12, 13, 14).

KT platforms (KTPs) are intermediary organisations, initiatives or networks whose intent is to overcome a range of inter-relationship and contextual challenges (see examples above) using a multitude of strategies and tools. These include collaborative knowledge production, capacity building, information exchange and dialogue to facilitate relevant and timely engagement between researchers and different health decision-makers (e.g. patients, health practitioners, health care managers, policy-makers and funders). There are currently a wide range of definitions and descriptions (15–25) as well as models and frameworks (26, 27) of KTPs in the literature. But there is only one published systematic review on KTPs by Partridge et al., which primarily synthesised the lessons learned about activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts from KTPs specifically in LMICs (28).

Firstly, there is a need to synthesise the different definitions and descriptions of KTPs in the literature so as to provide a common and nuanced understanding of what KTPs are. This is necessary for planning and carrying out comparisons and evaluations of KTPs, as one mechanism for strengthening their overall usefulness. Secondly, there is a need to synthesise a wider range of characteristics of KTPs beyond those characteristics explored in the Partridge review; for example: strengths and limitations of different KTP models, funding and sustainability of KTPs, current operational status (determined using evidence from the scoping review and institutional websites), and the relationship between design and implementation factors or characteristics and successful functioning of KTPs and their influence to policy and practice. Having a better understanding of the different characteristics and types of KTPs can inform funders and governments about their implementation, sustainability and overall support for evidence-informed policy and practice. Additionally, identifying the different types of KTPs that can support evidence-informed policy and practice in local settings is critical, especially in the context of many public health and health system interventions for achieving UHC and the SDGs. For example, in the case that a KTP exists at the local level, decision-makers need to understand what KTPs are (including what KT is in general) and their role in supporting UHC decision-making processes. And thirdly, there is a need to synthesise the research

methods used in the literature for mapping and evaluating KTPs. Identifying the different qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods used for mapping and evaluating KTPs is an important step in exploring how different methods can be used or combined to address the gap for more robust evaluations of KTPs. At a practical level, mapping KTPs can help like-minded organisations to identify opportunities that avoid duplication and amplify collaboration, particularly in settings where there are limited resources and expertise.

This scoping review therefore aims (a) provide a more nuanced understanding of the characteristics of KTPs and (b) assess and consolidate research methods used in mapping and evaluating KTPs to inform standardised process and impact evaluation. The review authors intend to use the review findings to inform a future research study on mapping, evaluating and strengthening KTPs that can support UHC policy, practice and implementation in South Africa.

Identifying the research questions

This scoping review is on the characteristics and methods for mapping and evaluating KTPs. The specific objectives of the scoping review are:

- To identify and synthesise definitions as well as characteristics of KTPs (for example: activities, processes, outputs, purpose, functions, models, stakeholders, positioning, funding, strengths, limitations, monitoring, impact and status);
- To identify and synthesise the design and implementation factors or characteristics that facilitate and/or hinder the successful functioning of KTPs and their influence to policy and practice;
- To identify and summarise the various research methods for mapping and evaluating KTPs (that is: qualitative, quantitative and mixed), and where evaluations were conducted, to synthesise their outcomes (e.g. impact, success or failure); and
- To explore the potential for developing a new or enhancing an existing framework for classifying KTPs.

Identifying relevant studies

We will use the scoping review methods outlined by Arksey and O'Malley (29). The proposed steps are: identifying the research question; identifying relevant studies; study selection; charting the data; collating, summarising and reporting the results; and consultation (i.e. seeking insights beyond those in the literature from content experts). To report our review findings, we will follow the PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation (Additional file 1) (30).

Any published, empirical and conceptual, health research studies from anywhere on KTPs will be eligible. Eligible studies will include a definition or description of what a KTP is and/or include one or more

methods for mapping and/or evaluating KTPs. We will consider any type of qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods research.

The search will identify all relevant studies without data, language or geographic restrictions. We will search the following electronic databases: PubMed, Scopus, CINAHL, EMBASE, Global Health and Web of Science. Search strings will include keywords and Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms related to knowledge translation platform (concept A) (e.g. policy brief, deliberate dialogue, knowledge exchange) and evidence-informed decision-making (concept B) (e.g. health policy, policymaking). We have developed a preliminary search strategy in the PubMed database (see Additional file 2). To finalise our search strategy, we will apply an iterative approach to check whether known articles that meet our eligibility criteria were found by the search. We will also identify missing keywords and MeSH terms to add to our search strategy from the iterative process. In addition to the electronic searches, review authors will search the reference lists of all included studies and key references (for example, relevant systematic reviews) and (b) contact authors of included studies and/or experts in the field for additional references.

Methods

Study selection

The search across databases will identify titles and abstracts of relevant studies. The search results will be merged in the Endnote reference management programme where duplicates will be removed. The titles and abstracts will then be uploaded to an electronic programme, such as Covidence or Rayyan, for screening and data extraction. Two review authors will independently screen the titles and abstracts to determine their eligibility for full-text screening. We will retrieve full-texts for titles and abstracts deemed relevant. One review author (BMS) will screen all full-texts and make a final decision about inclusion. Another review author will check the eligibility of a random sample of 50% of the full-texts. Conflicts will be resolved with a third reviewer. The study selection process will be summarised using a Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow diagram.

Charting the data

Data extraction or 'charting of data' will be carried out once we have a final list of all the studies to be included in the review. Data extraction will be conducted by one review author (BMS) who will collect, sift and sort data according to the objectives. The review author will extract information on the study and author details; research type and study design; research setting and participants; definitions, descriptions and characteristics of KTPs; and methods used for mapping and/or evaluating KTPs. A second review author will check data extraction of all included studies. Data extraction will be done in Excel to allow for comparison of key items across studies and to allow for synthesis within and across data items. We will

not assess the methodological quality of the included studies, as that is the convention for such scoping reviews (29, 30).

Collating, summarising, and reporting the results

One review author (BMS) will manually code extracted data and categorise by, for example, definitions, different types of characteristics (e.g. models, functions, impact), different types of research methods (e.g. qualitative, quantitative, mixed) used. A second review author will check the data analysis work on an ongoing basis to ensure quality of the process. We will synthesise the data according to key components (depth) and variations (breadth) across definitions, characteristics and methods of KTPs.

Consultations

As mentioned earlier, to identify additional relevant studies, we will contact authors of included studies and/or experts in the field. We will engage with other KT researchers (i.e. those undertaking scientific research in the KT field) and KT practitioners (i.e. those designing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating KT interventions) as we carry out different stages of this scoping review to ensure its relevance and applicability. It is an advantage that our review team is made up of both KT researchers and practitioners who have the appropriate content and methods expertise to ensure scientific rigour of the review. We will shape the review process and findings according to what we know is most useful from experience, and also draw on colleagues working in the field to validate the findings and extract key messages or implications for research and practice.

Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first scoping review of the evidence on KTPs globally. Our synthesis will be on the wide range of definitions, descriptions and characteristics of KTPs and aims to provide a better understanding of the relationship between some of the characteristics of KTPs (for example, we will explore the relationship between KTP design, success factors and effectiveness or impact). A key methodological strength of the scoping review is that we will scope for both conceptual and empirical studies, using any study design, and without applying any date, language or geographic restrictions.

Mapping KTPs in this scoping review can help researchers and other stakeholders leading KTPs identify opportunities for collaborating with other KTPs in their local setting or globally. Collaborations amongst KTPs can potentially reduce duplication of efforts and optimise the use of already-limited resources and expertise to effectively engage decision-makers. Additionally, a synthesis of the characteristics of KTPs can help researchers and other stakeholders leading KTPs compare and evaluate the usefulness and effectiveness of different KTPs in relation to theirs. Evidence on the usefulness and effectiveness of KTPs, areas of improvement and the gaps in research can guide government and funding agencies' agendas. The review findings can also help decision-makers identify KTPs to collaborate with and

provide them with an understanding of how KTPs can support their decision-making processes. And lastly, the synthesis will guide review authors in developing a matrix or framework for classifying KTPs and inform the design of a future study to map and evaluate KTPs that can support UHC policy, practice and implementation in South Africa.

Abbreviations

KTP: knowledge translation platform; SDGs: sustainable development goals; UHC: universal health coverage; KT: knowledge translation; PRISMA-ScR: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews; PRISMA: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses.

Declarations

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Mrs. Joy Oliver, Cochrane South Africa, South African Medical Research Council, who assisted with developing the search strategy.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for this work.

Availability of data and materials

Not applicable.

Authors' contributions

BMS conceptualised the protocol together with TY and NJ. BMS drafted the protocol with the help of all authors. All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript before final submission for peer review.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

1. Special Programme for Research and Training in Tropical Diseases (TDR). 2019. Promoting implementation research for accelerating universal health coverage.
<https://www.who.int/tdr/news/2019/promoting-ir-for-accelerating-uhc/en/>
2. Eichler R, Gigli S, LeRoy L. 2018. Implementation Research to Strengthen Health Care Financing Reforms Toward Universal Health Coverage in Indonesia: A Mixed-Methods Approach to Real-World Monitoring. *Global Health: Science and Practice*, 6(4): 747-753; <https://doi.org/10.9745/GHSP-D-18-00328>
3. United Nations (UN). 2019. Take action for the Sustainable Development Goals.
<https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/>
4. World Health Organisation. 2020. What is health financing for universal coverage?
https://www.who.int/health_financing/universal_coverage_definition/en/
5. Uneke C, Ndukwe C, Ezeoha A, Uro-Chukwu H, Ezeonu C. 2015. Implementation of a Health Policy Advisory Committee as a Knowledge Translation Platform: The Nigeria Experience. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*, 4(3): 161-168;
<https://dx.doi.org/10.15171/ijhpm.2015.21>
6. Langlois EV, Becerril Montekio V, Young T, Song K, Alcalde-Rabanal J, Tran N. 2016. Enhancing evidence informed policymaking in complex health systems: lessons from multi-site collaborative approaches. *Health Research Policy Systems*, 14(20); <https://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12961-016-0089-0>
7. Mathews C, Goga A, Loveday M, Zembe W, Daviaud E, Siegfried N, Lewin S. 2018. Moving towards universal health coverage: Strengthening the evidence ecosystem for the South African health system. *South African Medical Journal (Research)*, 109(1);
<https://dx.doi.org/10.7196/SAMJ.2019.v109i11b.14245>
8. Young T, Garner P, Clarke M, Volmink J. 2017. Series: Clinical Epidemiology in South Africa. Paper 1: Evidence-based health care and policy in Africa: past, present, and future. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 8(2017); <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2016.06.006>
9. Straus SE, Tetroe J, Graham I. 2009. Defining knowledge translation. *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, 181(3-4): 165-168; <https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.081229>
10. Kalbarczyk A, Rodriguez DC, Mahendradhata Y, Sarker M, Seme A, Majumdar P, Akinyemi OO, Kayembe P, Alonge OO. 2021. Barriers and facilitators to knowledge translation activities within academic institutions in low- and middle-income countries. *Health Policy and Planning*, 00;
<https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czaa188>
11. Jessani NS, Siddiqi SM, Babcock C, Davey-Rothwell M, Ho S, Holtgrave DR. 2018. Factors affecting engagement between academic faculty and decision-makers: learnings and priorities for a school of public health. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, 16(65); <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-018-0342-9>
12. Jessani NS, Babcock C, Siddiqi S, Davey-Rothwell M, Ho S, Holtgrave DR. 2018. Relationships between public health faculty and decision makers at four governmental levels: a social network

- analysis. *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, 14(3); <https://doi.org/10.1332/174426418X15230282334424>
13. Malla C, Aylward P, Ward P. Knowledge translation for public health in low- and middle- income countries: a critical interpretive synthesis. 2018. *Global Health Research Policy*, 3 (1); <https://doi.org/1186/s41256-018-0084-9>
 14. Mahendradhata Y, Kalbarczyk A. 2021. Prioritizing knowledge translation in low- and middle-income countries to support pandemic response and preparedness. *Health Research Policy Systems*, 19 (1); <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-020-00670-1>
 15. Orton L, Lloyd-Williams F, Taylor-Robinson D, O'Flaherty M, Capewell S. 2011. The use of research evidence in public health decision making processes: systematic review. *PLoS One*, 6(7); <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0021704>
 16. Young T, Shearer JC, Naude C, Kredo T, Wiysonge CS, Garner P. Researcher and policymaker dialogue: the Policy BUDDIES Project in Western Cape Province, South Africa. 2018. *BMJ Global Health*, 3(6); <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2018-001130>
 17. Kothari A, MacLean L, Edwards N. 2009. Increasing capacity for knowledge translation: understanding how some researchers engage policy makers. *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, 8(1):1-21; <https://doi.org/10.1332/174426409X395402>
 18. Berman J, Mitambo C, Matanje-Mwagomba B, Khan S, Kachimanga C, Wroe E, et al. 2015. Building a knowledge translation platform in Malawi to support evidence-informed health policy. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, 13(73); <https://doi.org/1186/s12961-015-0061-4>
 19. Cheung A, Lavis JN, Hamandi A, El-Jardali F, Sachs J, Sewankambo N, Knowledge-Translation Platform Evaluation Team. 2011. Climate for evidence-informed health systems: A print media analysis in 44 low- and middle-income countries that host knowledge-translation platforms. *Health Research Policy Systems*, 9 (1); <https://doi.org/10.1186/1478-4505-9-7>
 20. El-Jardali F, Ataya N, Jamal D, et al. 2012. A multi-faceted approach to promote knowledge translation platforms in eastern Mediterranean countries: climate for evidence-informed policy. *Health Research Policy Systems*, 10 (1); <https://doi.org/10.1186/1478-4505-10-15>
 21. Kasonde JM, Campbell S. 2012. Creating a Knowledge Translation Platform: nine lessons from the Zambia Forum for Health Research. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, 10 (1); <https://doi.org/1186/1478-4505-10-31>
 22. Ongolo-Zogo P, Lavis JN, Tomson G, Sewankambo NK. 2018. Assessing the influence of knowledge translation platforms on health system policy processes to achieve the health millennium development goals in Cameroon and Uganda: a comparative case study. *Health Policy Plan*, 33(4): 539-554; <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czx194>
 23. Poldrugovac M, Kuchenmüller T, Dobrin PT, Ivanuša M. 2016. The evidence-informed policy-making context in Slovenia: groundwork for a knowledge translation platform. *Public Health Panorama*, 2(3): 313-318; <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/325376>

24. Scarlett J, Köhler K, Reinap M. Evidence-informed Policy Network (EVIPNet) Europe: success stories in knowledge translation. *Public Health Panorama*, 4(02): 161-169;
<https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/325029>
25. Pettman TL, Armstrong R, Waters E, et al. 2016. Evaluation of a knowledge translation and exchange platform to advance non-communicable disease prevention. *Evidence and Policy*, 12(1): 109-126;
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1332/204674315X14297901956276>
26. Bennett G, Jessani N (Editors). *The Knowledge Translation Toolkit: Bridging the Know–Do Gap: A Resource for Researchers*. Sage Publications, International Development Research Centre;
<https://www.idrc.ca/en/book/knowledge-translation-toolkit-bridging-know-do-gap-resource-researchers>
27. Pettman TL, Armstrong R, Johnson S, Love P, Gill T, Coveney J, Swinburn B, Allender S. 2020. Evaluation outcomes of a knowledge translation platform: a structure for support and exchange in prevention. *Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice*, 16(1): 99-12;
<https://doi.org/10.1332/174426418X15260526569269>
28. Partridge ACR, Mansilla C, Randhawa H, et al. 2020. Lessons learned from descriptions and evaluations of knowledge translation platforms supporting evidence-informed policy-making in low- and middle-income countries: a systematic review. *Health Research Policy Systems*, 18 (1);
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-020-00626-5>
29. Arksey H, O'Malley L. 2005. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(1): 19–32; <https://doi.org/1080/1364557032000119616>
30. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, et al. 2018. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 169(7): 467-473;
<https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850>

Additional File

Additional file 2

Database: PubMed

Search	Query
#3	Search: #1 AND #2
#2	Search: health policy[mh] OR policy maker[tiab] OR policy makers[tiab] OR policymaker[tiab] OR policymakers[tiab] OR policy making[tiab] OR policymaking[tiab] OR decision making[mh] OR decision making[tiab] OR decisionmaking[tiab] OR decision maker[tiab] OR decision makers[tiab] OR stakeholder[tiab] OR stakeholders[tiab]
#1	Search: translational medical research[mh] OR translational medical research[tiab] OR translational medical science[tiab] OR medical translational research[tiab] OR translational medicine[tiab] OR knowledge translation[tiab] OR translational research[tiab] OR evidence-informed[tiab] OR evidence brief[tiab] OR evidence briefs[tiab] OR policy brief[tiab] OR policy briefs[tiab] OR deliberative dialogue[tiab] OR deliberative dialogues[tiab] OR knowledge synthesis[tiab] OR knowledge syntheses[tiab] OR knowledge transfer[tiab] OR research uptake[tiab] OR evidence summary[tiab] OR evidence summaries[tiab] OR knowledge uptake[tiab] OR knowledge exchange[tiab] OR research to action[tiab] OR knowledge to action[tiab]

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [KTPscopingreviewprotocolPRISMAchecklist13April2021.docx](#)