

Article title: Examining and Contextualizing Approaches to Establish Policy Support Organizations – A Mixed Method Study

Journal name: International Journal of Health Policy and Management (IJHPM)

Authors' information: Sultana Al Sabahi^{1*}, Michael G. Wilson^{2,3,4}, John N. Lavis^{2,3,4,5,6,7}, Fadi El-Jardali⁸, Kaelan Moat³

¹Centre of Studies and Research, Ministry of Health, Muscat, Oman.

²Health Policy PhD Program, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada.

³McMaster Health Forum, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada.

⁴Department of Health Evidence and Impact, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada.

⁵Centre for Health Economics and Policy Analysis, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada.

⁶Department of Political Science, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada.

⁷Africa Centre for Evidence, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa.

⁸Knowledge to Policy Center, American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon.

(*Corresponding authors: Al-sabahiS@hotmail.com)

Supplementary file 2.

Table S1. Contextual Feature of the of the Participated Organizations

	Total	WHO region				
		Africa	America	Eastern Mediterranean	Europe	Western Pacific
Income level according to World Bank classification (n=18)						
Low-income	3 (17%)	3 (17%)	0	0	0	0
Lower-middle-income	5 (28%)	3 (17%)	0	0	2 (11%)	0
Upper-middle-income	7 (39%)	0	3 (17%)	2 (11%)	2 (11%)	0
High-income	3 (17%)	0	2 (11%)	0	0	1 (6%)
*Political jurisdiction in which the organizations principally provide supports within (n=18)						
National/ federal	17 (94%)	7 (39%)	4 (22%)	2 (11%)	3 (17%)	1 (6%)
Provincial/ sub-national	9 (50%)	3 (17%)	3 (17%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)
Local	5 (28%)	2 (11%)	2 (11%)	0	0	1 (6%)
Other (global)	1 (6%)	0	1 (6%)	0	0	0
Governance arrangement of the health system in which the organizations operate (n = 17)						
Mainly centralized	7 (41%)	0	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	4 (24%)	1 (6%)
Mainly decentralized	6 (35%)	2 (12%)	3 (18%)	1 (6%)	0	0
Equally centralized and decentralized	4 (24%)	3 (18%)	1 (6%)	0	0	0
Financial arrangement of the health system in which the organizations operate (n = 18)						
Mainly publicly funded	12 (67%)	5 (28%)	3 (17%)	0	3 (17%)	1 (6%)
Mainly privately funded	1 (6%)	0	0	1 (6%)	0	0
Mix of public and private	5 (28%)	1 (6%)	2 (11%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0
Delivery arrangement of the health system in which the organizations operate (n = 18)						
Predominately public delivery	11 (61%)	4 (22%)	3 (17%)	0	3 (17%)	1 (6%)
Predominately private for-profit	1 (6%)	0	0	0	1 (6%)	0

Predominately private not-for-profit	1 (6%)	0	1 (6%)	0	0	0
Mix of private for-profit and not-for-profit	4 (22%)	2 (11%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0	0
Equally delivered by public and private	1 (6%)	0	0	1 (6%)	0	0

◊Research system in which the organizations operate (n = 18)

Availability of centralized fund for HSR	14 (78%)	4 (22%)	5 (28%)	1 (6%)	3 (17%)	1 (6%)
Provision of funds for prioritized KT activities from funding agencies	10 (56%)	3 (17%)	3 (17%)	0	3 (17%)	1 (6%)
Funding agency requirement for collaboration between researchers & policy-makers	10 (56%)	3 (17%)	3 (17%)	0	3 (17%)	1 (6%)
Funding agency requirement for collaboration between researchers & citizens	6 (33%)	1 (6%)	2 (11%)	0	3 (17%)	0

* *More than one answer was possible for this question*

◊ *Each question of this section has been asked separately*

Note: the total percentage may not be exact because of the rounding

Table S2. Organizational Attributes

	Total	♦WHO region				
		Africa	America	Eastern Mediterranean	Europe	Western Pacific
Location (n= 15)						
Embedded within universities	5 (33%)	2 (13%)	1 (7%)	2 (13%)	0	0
Embedded within ministry of health	3 (20%)	0	3 (20%)	0	0	0
Independent	7 (47%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	4 (27%)	1 (7%)

Organization type (n =14)						
Government department/ unit	4 (29%)	1 (7%)	2 (14%)	0	1 (7%)	0
Research center in academic institution	2 (14%)	0	0	2 (14%)	0	0
Independent research center	3 (21%)	1 (7%)	2 (14%)	0	0	0
Evidence-Informed Policy Network	3 (21%)	1 (7%)	0	0	2 (14%)	0
Professional association	1 (7%)	0	1 (7%)	0	0	0
Independent non for-profit organization	1 (7%)	0	0	0	0	1 (7%)
Governance approach (n =15)						
Through executive board	9 (60%)	3 (20%)	2 (13%)	1 (7%)	2 (13%)	1 (7%)
Advisory committee	4 (27%)	0	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	2 (13%)	0
Other (in house senior officials)	2 (13%)	0	2 (13%)	0	0	0
Budget in US dollar (n=12)						
Mean	\$ 105,880,000	\$ 157,500	\$ 312,820,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 1,975,000	13,000,000
Median	\$ 250,000	\$ 157,500	\$ 62,500	\$ 20,000	\$ 1,200,000	13,000,000
Range	\$ 10,000 to 1,250,000,000	\$ 65,000 to 250,000	\$ 30,000 to 1,250,000,000	\$ 10,000 to 30,000	\$ 225,000 to 4,500,000	-
*Source(s) of funding (n =15)						
Government	11 (73%)	2 (13%)	4 (27%)	1 (7%)	3 (20%)	1 (7%)
Grants from research-funding agencies	10 (67%)	2 (13%)	4 (27%)	2 (13%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)
Philanthropic donations	1 (7%)	0	1 (7%)	0	0	0
International agencies	5 (33%)	1 (7%)	2 (13%)	0	2 (13%)	0
Biomedical or other for-profit companies	1 (7%)	0	0	0	1 (7%)	0

Other sources	4 (27%)	0	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)
---------------	---------	---	--------	--------	--------	--------

Human resources (n =15)

Total number of staff	Mean	63	9	36	11	153	100
	Median	15	8	12	11	115	100
	Range	4 to 360	5 to 15	4 to 93	10 to 12	24 to 360	-
Full time employees	Mean	51	4	19	9	141	80
	Median	12	2	12	9	105	80
	Range	0 to 337	0 to 10	1 to 55	-	18 to 337	-
Part-time employees	Mean	14	5	23	2	13	20
	Median	6	5	9	2	13	20
	Range	0 to 66	3 to 8	0 to 66	1 to 3	0 to 25	-

***Background of full-time employees (n =15)**

Policy analysis	12 (80%)	1 (7%)	4 (27%)	2 (13%)	4 (27%)	1 (7%)
Health economics	7 (47%)	1 (7%)	4 (27%)	0	2 (13%)	0
Health services research	13 (87%)	2 (13%)	4 (27%)	2 (13%)	4 (27%)	1 (7%)
Clinical epidemiology	10 (67%)	1 (7%)	5 (33%)	1 (7%)	2 (13%)	1 (7%)
Informatics / library science	5 (33%)	1 (7%)	2 (13%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0
Biostatistics	9 (60%)	1 (7%)	4 (27%)	2 (13%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)
Population and public health research	13 (87%)	2 (13%)	5 (33%)	2 (13%)	3 (20%)	1 (7%)
Other types of social science	7 (47%)	0	3 (20%)	1 (7%)	2 (13%)	1 (7%)

***Information system access (n =15)**

Electronic databases	12 (80%)	1 (7%)	5 (33%)	2 (13%)	3 (20%)	1 (7%)
Database that index local studies or reports	9 (60%)	2 (13%)	4 (27%)	2 (13%)	1 (7%)	0
Local data sets	13 (87%)	2 (13%)	5 (33%)	1 (7%)	4 (27%)	1 (7%)

Other	1 (7%)	0	0	0	1 (7%)	0
-------	--------	---	---	---	--------	---

***Organizational linkages (n =15)**

Type of organizational linkages

Government institution	11 (73%)	3 (20%)	3 (20%)	1 (7%)	3 (20%)	1 (7%)
Academic institution	12 (80%)	3 (20%)	5 (33%)	0	3 (20%)	1 (7%)
Other local/ provincial organization	8 (53%)	2 (13%)	3 (20%)	0	3 (20%)	0
Other international organization	11 (73%)	3 (20%)	3 (20%)	1 (7%)	3 (20%)	1 (7%)
Other (NGOs)	1 (7%)	0	0	0	1 (7%)	0

Organizations that mentored others	11 (73%)	2 (13%)	4 (27%)	1 (7%)	4 (27%)	0
---	----------	---------	---------	--------	---------	---

Organizations that have ‘sister’ centres	3 (20%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	0	0
---	---------	--------	--------	--------	---	---

Organizations that have a strategic plan	10 (67%)	0	3 (20%)	2 (13%)	4 (27%)	1 (7%)
---	----------	---	---------	---------	---------	--------

Organizations that monitoring and devaluation the organization performance/ impact	8 (53%)	0	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	3 (20%)	1 (7%)
---	---------	---	---------	---------	---------	--------

Frequency update of products produced (n = 15)

Update regularly	2 (13%)	1 (7%)	0	0	1 (7%)	0
Update irregularly	8 (53%)	2 (13%)	3 (20%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)
Do not update	5 (33%)	0	2 (13%)	1 (7%)	2 (13%)	0

◊ Establishment (n = 15)

	Mean	23	20	24	8	31	17
Organizational age	Median	17	14	10	8	25	17
	Range	3 to 71	4 to 43	3 to 60	4 to 11	2 to 71	-

Organizations that found lessons from other countries helpful	8 (53%)	2 (13%)	3 (20%)	1 (7%)	2 (13%)	0
---	---------	---------	---------	--------	---------	---

Organizations that conduct situation analysis	5 (33%)	0	1 (7%)	2 (13%)	1 (7%)	1 (7%)
---	---------	---	--------	---------	--------	--------

Organizations that used readiness assessment tool	1 (7%)	0	0	1 (7%)	0	0
---	--------	---	---	--------	---	---

♦ The Western Pacific region dropped because the survey not complete

* More than one answer was possible for this question

◊ Each question of this section has been asked separately

Table S3. Organizational Focus, and Activities

	Total	WHO region				
		Africa	America	Eastern Mediterranean	Europe	Western Pacific
*The domains in which the organizations provide service (n = 17)						
Clarifying problems	16 (94%)	4 (24%)	5 (29%)	2 (12%)	4 (24%)	1 (6%)
Framing options	15 (88%)	4 (24%)	5 (29%)	2 (12%)	3 (18%)	1 (6%)
Identifying implementation considerations	14 (82%)	3 (18%)	5 (29%)	2 (12%)	3 (18%)	1 (6%)
Supporting monitoring and evaluation	14 (82%)	4 (24%)	3 (19%)	2 (12%)	4 (24%)	1 (6%)
*Organizational activities (n = 16)						
Provide online courses	6 (38%)	0	2 (13%)	1 (6%)	2 (13%)	1 (6%)
Provide face-to-face courses/ workshops	15 (94%)	4 (25%)	5 (31%)	2 (13%)	3 (19%)	1 (6%)
Provide searchable repositories/databases	8 (50%)	1 (6%)	4 (25%)	1 (6%)	2 (13%)	0
Conduct rapid synthesis/rapid reviews of evidence	12 (75%)	2 (13%)	5 (31%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	1 (6%)
Conduct systematic reviews of primary research	8 (50%)	3 (19%)	3 (19%)	2 (13%)	0	0
Conduct overviews of systematic reviews	8 (50%)	2 (13%)	3 (19%)	1 (6%)	2 (13%)	0
Create evidence/policy briefs	14 (88%)	3 (19%)	5 (31%)	2 (13%)	3 (19%)	1 (6%)
Convening deliberations with citizens/patients	7 (44%)	1 (6%)	3 (19%)	1 (6%)	2 (13%)	0

Convening deliberations among system leaders	13 (81%)	3 (19%)	3 (19%)	2 (13%)	4 (25%)	1 (6%)
Convening communities of practice	6 (38%)	1 (6%)	2 (13%)	0	2 (13%)	1 (6%)
Supportive audits of policies and practices	9 (56%)	1 (6%)	3 (19%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)	1 (6%)
External reviews of reports or policies	11 (69%)	3 (19%)	3 (19%)	1 (6%)	4 (25%)	0
Adapting resources to the needs of the organization	10 (63%)	2 (13%)	3 (19%)	1 (6%)	3 (19%)	1 (6%)
Evaluate approaches to support EIDM	10 (63%)	3 (19%)	3 (19%)	1 (6%)	2 (13%)	1 (6%)
Other	3 (19%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0	0
Organizations that formulate recommendations (n=14)	10 (71%)	2 (14%)	2 (14%)	2 (14%)	3 (21%)	1 (7%)
*Methods of formulating recommendation (n = 10)						
Subjective review	5 (50%)	1 (10%)	0	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)
Informal consensus	6 (60%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	0
Formal consensus	6 (60%)	1 (10%)	0	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	1 (10%)
Graded according to the quality	3 (30%)	0	1 (10%)	0	1 (10%)	1 (10%)
Other	1 (10%)	0	0	1 (10%)	0	0

* More than one answer was possible for this question

◊ Each question of this section has been asked separately

Table S4. Organizational Products

♣ Type of product	Number /16	Years since start producing this product	Number produced in the last 12 months
-------------------	------------	--	---------------------------------------

		Median	Range	Median	Range
Rapid syntheses or rapid review	12 (75%)	4.5	1-12	5.5	0-46
Evidence or policy briefs	14 (88%)	5	1-10	2.5	1-10
Citizen friendly syntheses or summaries of research	8 (50%)	4.5	1-10	2.5	0-15
Analysis or summaries of deliberations	8 (50%)	7	5-10	2	0-20
Database of research evidence	10 (62%)	5.5	1-30	3	0-4
Information about the health system in which you work	10 (62%)	7	2-30	5	0-20
Tools for application (eg, algorithms, flow charts, checklists)	5 (31%)	4	2-10	4	0-15
Videos	7 (44%)	5	1-10	2.5	0-5

* More than one answer was possible for this question

♣ Not presented across WHO regions because in many cases there is one response only, where we cannot present a median

Table S5. Engagement of Target Audience

*♣ Approaches to engage selected groups n = 16 (%)	Health-system policymakers	Social-system policymakers	Policymakers in central agencies	Managers of regions, central agencies	Stakeholders	Citizens/patients	Other target users
Organizational governance	13 (81%)	6 (34%)	10 (63%)	11 (69%)	9 (56%)	3 (19%)	2 (13%)
Working groups or project steering committees	14 (88%)	8 (50%)	12 (75%)	12 (75%)	12 (75%)	2 (13%)	3 (19%)
Conduct interviews to identify insights	10 (63%)	7 (44%)	7 (44%)	9 (56%)	9 (56%)	3 (19%)	3 (19%)
Reviews of draft reports	15 (94%)	7 (44%)	10 (63%)	11 (69%)	8 (50%)	2 (13%)	3 (19%)

As participants in other activities	14 (88%)	7 (44%)	8 (50%)	10 (63%)	10 (63%)	5 (31%)	5 (31%)
Other mechanism	2 (13%)	1 (6%)	2 (13%)	0	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0

* *More than one answer was possible for this question*

♣ *Not presented across WHO regions because in many cases there is one response only, where we cannot present a median*