

5.3 Strategies used by evidence intermediaries



Strategies	Examples
<p>Improving the climate for evidence use</p> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing examples of outcomes and impacts achieved using best evidence and of missed opportunities from failing to use best evidence • Demonstrating how to distinguish high- from low-quality evidence (see section 4.5), how to distinguish best evidence from 'other things' (section 4.8), and how to get more out of 'other things' (section 4.8) • 'Auditing' decision-making and advisory structures, processes and outputs, as well as the incentives that influence them, to identify opportunities to systematize evidence use (e.g., (1)) • Comparing a local (national or sub-national) evidence-support system to a high-functioning evidence-support system, or comparing a local evidence-implementation system to a high-functioning evidence-implementation system, using prompts like this list of strategies that evidence intermediaries can use
<p>Prioritizing and co-producing evidence</p> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engaging in listening (e.g., rapid response) and foresight activities (e.g., horizon scanning) to identify emerging issues, make sense of them, prioritize those requiring evidence support, and commissioning or undertaking the evidence support • Co-producing – with decision-makers – new local (national or sub-national) evidence specific to the jurisdiction of focus (data analytics, modeling, evaluations, behavioural / implementation research, qualitative insights), synthesizing the best evidence globally (evidence synthesis), and translating global and local evidence into local evidence support specific to the jurisdiction (technology assessments and guidelines, as well as modeling if it is undertaken with this intent) • Co-developing and maintaining living evidence products (data analytics, modeling, evidence syntheses, and guidelines)

