

# Research agenda for integrated knowledge translation (IKT) in healthcare: what we know and do not yet know

Anna R Gagliardi,<sup>1</sup> Anita Kothari,<sup>2</sup> Ian D Graham<sup>3</sup>

## INTEGRATED KNOWLEDGE TRANSLATION (IKT)

In the health sector, considerable resources are deployed for knowledge translation (KT) to ensure that stakeholders are aware of, and use research to inform policies, programmes and practices, leading to improved health.<sup>1</sup> However, commonly used strategies, often based on one-way communication of research syntheses or summaries, have had inconsistent impact on the actual use of research and associated outcomes such as improved healthcare delivery and health gains.<sup>2</sup> IKT represents an alternative approach for promoting research use in which research users function as active partners to generate research from conceptualisation to implementation, rather than passive recipients of research or research products.<sup>3 4</sup> Sometimes referred to as engaged scholarship, participatory research, co-production of knowledge or mode 2 research, IKT appears to enhance researcher understanding of the research user context and needs, thereby enhancing the relevance of the generated research, and increasing research user understanding of the research process, awareness of the research, and appreciation for how and when it can be applied.<sup>3 4</sup>

The imperative to optimise patient and population outcomes is driving a growing interest in IKT among those who fund and deliver health programmes and services. The UK instituted Collaborations for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care, and the Netherlands implemented Academic Collaborative Centres for public health to integrate research, policy and practice, with the overall aim of improving health.<sup>5 6</sup> Funders of research also promote IKT by stipulating that research teams include research users.<sup>7</sup> As a result, syntheses of studies that describe and evaluate research–research user

collaboration have emerged. For example, we conducted a scoping review of 13 studies published between 2005 and 2014 on IKT involving researchers and healthcare policymakers or managers.<sup>8</sup> Camden *et al*<sup>9</sup> conducted a scoping review of 19 studies on stakeholder engagement in rehabilitation research published between 2003 and 2013. Cook conducted a systematic review of 20 studies published from 1995 to 2005 involving participatory research in the USA to address health disparities in environmental and occupational health.<sup>10</sup> Reviews such as these provide valuable insight into what we do and do not yet know about IKT. Few pressing themes that emerged from these reviews are discussed here for the purpose of identifying issues warranting ongoing research.

## PROCESSES

Interaction between researchers and researcher users was achieved through one or more meetings of research teams, committees, steering groups or working groups.<sup>8 9</sup> Meetings were referred to as planning meetings, group discussions, workshops and conferences; often in person and sometimes by teleconference; and frequently supplemented with print, web and media communication of data or research summaries. In previous research we demonstrated how mixed-methods workshops that engaged researchers and researcher users prioritised health service and policy needs, and generated research questions.<sup>11 12</sup> Our review<sup>8</sup> and the Camden review<sup>9</sup> found that time, travel expenses, competing professional demands and geographic distance influenced participation in meetings, therefore further research should identify and evaluate processes or methods other than traditional meetings that may be more conducive to researcher–research user collaboration. Examples include concept mapping, deliberative dialogue or formal consensus techniques that can be conducted in person or remotely, in a synchronous or asynchronous manner, using various types of communication technologies.<sup>12</sup>

## ROLES

In our review, research users were largely involved in early (establishing or prioritising research questions, research planning) and later (dissemination, implementation) activities, with little involvement in other aspects of research such as recruitment, data collection or interpretation.<sup>8</sup> Research users similarly held a largely consultative role in both the Camden and Cook reviews.<sup>9 10</sup> This raises questions about the appropriate role for research users—perhaps the current vision of an absolute partnership is not attainable or even necessary—or perhaps optimal IKT processes have not yet been established. The Cook review found that research user engagement and impact appeared to be greater when partnerships were initiated by the affected communities.<sup>10</sup> We observed no such trend in our review;<sup>8</sup> however, ongoing research should investigate the impact of IKT models that vary according to the degree of research user engagement in terms of what works, for whom and under what conditions.

## DETERMINANTS

Key factors that positively or negatively influenced stakeholder engagement in the Camden review were establishing a common language, and roles and expectations.<sup>9</sup> Our review, in which all teams had been in place for a minimum of 2 years, also identified these and other determinants of interaction including differing needs and priorities among participants, attitudes about research, incentives for participation, funding and space for activities, and the actions of leaders and facilitators.<sup>8</sup> These findings clearly distinguish a lengthy early phase during which the capacity for collaboration is established. Our previous research found that capacity included conditions and interventions at both the individual and organisational levels.<sup>13 14</sup> Further research is needed to establish the most effective incentives and interventions to foster and support IKT across different phases of research, from initiating a partnership, developing a research proposal, undertaking the research project, to ongoing research partnership.

## IMPACT

Most studies in our review<sup>8</sup> and the Camden review<sup>9</sup> assessed outcomes related to partnership formation, for example, value for different perspectives or mutual understanding of language, work style, needs and constraints. Fewer studies evaluated intermediate (ie,

<sup>1</sup>Toronto General Hospital Research Institute, University Health Network, Toronto, Canada; <sup>2</sup>Faculty of Health Sciences, Western University, London, Canada; <sup>3</sup>Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada

Correspondence to Anna R Gagliardi, 200 Elizabeth Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5G2C4; anna.gagliardi@uhnresearch.ca

identification of research questions, conduct of research) or long-term outcomes (ie, use and impact of research). This again highlights the considerable time and effort needed to establish functional partnerships before collaborative research generation and then implementation can occur. Further research is needed to validate measures of IKT-related immediate, intermediate and long-term outcomes so that, in future, we can more consistently and reliably assess the processes, determinants and impact of researcher–research user collaborations. Our previous research found that such measures might differ for new versus mature partnerships.<sup>15</sup> To date, investigations of researcher–research user collaboration have focused on isolated improvements in specific services or programmes, perhaps because the IKT concept is relatively new and not commonly practiced. Future research should focus on how IKT can be embedded in health system planning to achieve action oriented, whole system impact on community or population health.

## RESEARCH DESIGN

The quality of studies included in each review was not formally assessed; however, they all noted that studies were usually mixed methods or qualitative in design, and none used either theoretical or standardised measures for evaluation. Overall, studies were difficult to find, given the variable terms used to describe researcher–research user collaboration, and few studies were eligible.<sup>8–9</sup> Although it may prove controversial and challenging, there may be merit in further research to achieve consensus on terminology so that researchers pursue complementary research and published research is subsequently easier to retrieve. Our review found that IKT processes and research user involvement in research-related decisions or activities were not well described.<sup>8</sup> It is imperative that, in future research, IKT design and activities are thoroughly described so that the findings can be easily interpreted and replicated.

## CONCLUSION

Select reviews discussed here show that IKT represents a promising means of

influencing research use in multiple contexts. However, ongoing research is needed to establish common terminology, effective processes for partnership formation and collaboration, appropriate participant roles, enabling individual and organisational conditions and interventions, and measures of impact including whole systems change. The key finding that partnership formation is a lengthy and complex process must be conveyed to agencies that support research so that funding opportunities based on an IKT model acknowledge and accommodate this preparatory phase, perhaps by providing small grants for planning meetings with research users, or multiyear grants that specifically support the processes and infrastructure needed to develop flourishing partnerships.

**Acknowledgements** IDG is a recipient of a Canadian Institutes of Health Research Foundation Grant (RFN number 143237).

**Contributors** ARG conceived the idea and drafted the editorial. All authors were involved in reviewing and editing the editorial, and approved the final version.

**Competing interests** None declared.

**Provenance and peer review** Commissioned; externally peer reviewed.



## OPEN ACCESS

**Open Access** This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>



CrossMark

**To cite** Gagliardi AR, Kothari A, Graham ID. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2017;**71**:105–106.

Received 26 July 2016

Revised 6 September 2016

Accepted 7 September 2016

Published Online First 19 September 2016

*J Epidemiol Community Health* 2017;**71**:105–106.  
doi:10.1136/jech-2016-207743

## REFERENCES

- 1 Straus SE, Tetroe JM, Graham ID. Knowledge translation is the use of knowledge in health care decision making. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011;**64**:6–10.
- 2 Grimshaw JM, Thomas RE, MacLennan G, *et al*. Effectiveness and efficiency of guideline dissemination and implementation strategies. *Health Technol Assess* 2004;**8**:1–72.
- 3 Kothari A, Wathen CN. A critical second look at integrated knowledge translation. *Health Policy* 2013;**109**:187–91.
- 4 Graham ID, Tetroe JM, Pearson A, eds. *Turning knowledge into action: practical guidance on how to do integrated knowledge translation research*. Wolters Kluwer-Joanna Briggs Institute Synthesis Series in Healthcare. Book 21. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Williams and Wilkins, 2014.
- 5 Currie G, Lockett A, El Enany N. From what we know to what we do: lessons learned from the translational CLAHRC initiative in England. *J Health Serv Res Policy* 2013;**18**(Suppl 3):27–39.
- 6 Molleman G, Franssen G. Academic collaborative centres for health promotion in the Netherlands: building bridges between research, policy and practice. *Fam Pract* 2012;**29**(Suppl 1):157–62.
- 7 Tetroe JM, Graham ID, Foy R, *et al*. Health research funding agencies' support and promotion of knowledge translation: an international study. *Milbank Q* 2008;**86**:125–55.
- 8 Gagliardi AR, Berta W, Kothari A, *et al*. Integrated knowledge translation (IKT) in health care: a scoping review. *Implement Sci* 2016;**11**:38.
- 9 Camden C, Shikako-Thomas K, Nguyen T, *et al*. Engaging stakeholders in rehabilitation research: a scoping review of strategies used in partnerships and evaluation of impacts. *Disabil Rehabil* 2015;**37**:1390–400.
- 10 Cook WK. Integrating research and action: a systematic review of community-based participatory research to address health disparities in environmental and occupational health in the USA. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2008;**62**:668–76.
- 11 Gagliardi AR, Fraser N, Wright FC, *et al*. Fostering knowledge exchange between researchers and decision-makers: exploring the effectiveness of mixed-methods approach. *Health Policy* 2008;**86**:53–63.
- 12 Boyko JA, Kothari A, Wathen CN. Moving knowledge about family violence into public health policy and practice: a mixed method study of a deliberative dialogue. *Health Res Policy Syst* 2016;**14**:31.
- 13 Gagliardi AR, Webster F, Brouwers MC, *et al*. How does context influence collaborative decision-making for health services planning, delivery and evaluation? *BMC Health Serv Res* 2014;**14**:545.
- 14 Gagliardi AR, Dobrow MJ. Identifying the conditions needed for integrated knowledge translation (IKT) in health care organizations: qualitative interviews with researchers and research users. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2016;**16**:256.
- 15 Kothari A, MacLean L, Edwards N, *et al*. Indicators at the interface: managing policymaker–researcher collaboration. *Knowledge Manage Res Pract* 2011;**9**:203–14.