

1 *[Full Title]*

2 **Implementing evidence ecosystems in the public health service: Development of a seven-step**
3 **framework for designing tailored training programs**

4 *[Short Title]*

5 **Toolbox to develop tailored training programs to strengthen public health evidence ecosystems**

6 *[Authors and Affiliation]*

7 Laura Arnold^{1,2 *}, Simon Bimczok¹, Timo Clemens², Helmut Brand², Dagmar Starke¹, on behalf of the
8 EvidenzÖGD study consortium[^]

9 ¹Academy of Public Health Services, Kanzlerstraße 4, 40472 Duesseldorf, Germany

10 ²Department of International Health, Care and Public Health Research Institute—CAPHRI, Faculty of
11 Health, Medicine and Life Sciences, Maastricht University, 6211 Maastricht, The Netherlands

12 * Corresponding author: arnold@akademie-oegw.de

13 [^] Membership of the EvidenzÖGD study consortium is provided in the acknowledgments

14

15 **Abstract**

16 The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted the importance of local evidence-ecosystems in which aca-
17 demia and practice in the Public Health Service (PHS) are interconnected. However, appropriate or-
18 ganizational structures and well-trained staff are lacking and evidence use in local public health deci-
19 sion-making has to be integrated into training programs in Germany. To address this issue, we devel-
20 oped a toolbox to conceptualize training programs designed to qualify public health professionals for
21 working at the interface between academia and practice. We conducted a scoping review of training
22 programs, key-informant interviews with public health experts, and a multi-professional stakeholder
23 workshop and triangulated their output. The toolbox consists of four core elements, encompassing 15
24 parameters: (1) content-related aspects, (2) context-related aspects, (3) aspects relevant for deter-
25 mining the training format, and (4) aspects relevant for consolidation and further development. Guid-
26 ing questions with examples supports the application of the toolbox. The developed seven-step frame-
27 work aims to facilitate new training programs for knowledge-transfer at the academia-practice inter-
28 face, equipping public health researchers and practitioners with relevant skills for needs-based PHS
29 research. The joint development of training approaches can foster cross-institutional collaboration
30 and enhance evidence utilization, resulting in long-term resource savings and a stronger evidence base
31 for implementing complex public health measures on site. In this way, co-development of tailored
32 solutions within the local evidence ecosystem has the potential to enhance both scientific and practi-
33 cal impact.

34 **Keywords**

35 Public health workforce, Public health service, Local health authorities, Capacity building, Knowledge-
36 transfer, Evidence-informed decision-making, evidence-ecosystem, evidence-based public health

37 **1. Introduction**

38 The systematic incorporation of research evidence into health policy is crucial for the provision of high-
39 quality public health services. Public health professionals are increasingly required to engage in evi-
40 dence-informed decision-making (EIDM) (1), which aims to identify the most effective and cost-effi-
41 cient interventions, while also minimizing harm, assessing adverse consequences, and enhancing
42 health outcomes for individuals and communities (2, 3). Accomplishing this requires that public health
43 policy and practice are informed by the best available evidence, as well as a comprehensive consider-
44 ation of normative and contextual factors, including political and societal preferences, setting-specific
45 considerations, feasibility, affordability, and sustainability (4–6). Proper implementation and execu-
46 tion of EIDM has the potential not only to enhance the effectiveness of health policies and public
47 health interventions but also to promote transparency, acceptability, and accountability (7, 8).

48 A system that encompasses the formal and informal connections and interactions among various
49 stakeholders involved in the production, implementation, and utilization of evidence can be referred
50 to as evidence ecosystem (9). The formulation and adoption of effective policies and programs relies
51 on the presence of a functional evidence ecosystem encompassing diverse actors from various do-
52 mains and with diverse agendas (10). Within such a system, two distinct but interconnected concep-
53 tual domains must be considered: evidence generation and evidence utilization, usually linked either
54 to policy or practice (11, 12).

55 The effectiveness of such an ecosystem relies on robust relationships and active collaboration be-
56 tween public health academia (e.g., universities, research institutes, or academies of public health
57 services) and public health practice (e.g., public health service on federal, state, or local level) (13). To
58 date, the responsibility of generating evidence has predominantly been ascribed to academic institu-
59 tions, whereas the utilization of evidence, encompassing the identification, processing, and contextual
60 adaptation of scientific knowledge, has commonly been linked to the domain of public health practice.
61 However, meeting the diverse needs of individuals and communities necessitates a close intertwining
62 of evidence generation and evidence utilization, rather than maintaining a strict separation of respon-
63 sibilities and competencies. This calls for a symbiotic relationship between academia and practice,
64 enabling the harmonization of scientific inquiry with prevailing practical needs and imperatives (14,
65 10). Institutionally anchored, this in turn facilitates informed decision-making in the implementation
66 of evidence-based public health interventions (15, 16).

67 However, the COVID-19 pandemic highlighted considerable disparities between the envisioned inte-
68 gration of EIDM within a comprehensive evidence ecosystem and the practical implementation of evi-
69 dence transfer between academia and practice in the German Public Health Service (PHS) (17–19).

70 In Germany, the health system governance follows a decentralized approach, with responsibilities
71 divided between the federal and state levels, along with corporatist bodies of self-governance (20). The
72 implementation of federal legislation pertaining to PHS, lies within the purview of the 16 state gov-
73 ernments, who wield legislative powers and provide functional and disciplinary oversight of the PHS
74 on local level (21). Consequently, the local health authorities (LHA) operating at the level of munici-
75 palities and independent cities assume a pivotal role in addressing wide range of public health tasks
76 (22). These LHAs are key actors in promoting and protecting population health and well-being, encom-
77 passing health surveillance, evidence gathering, and providing guidance on the prevention of com-
78 municable and non-communicable diseases.

79 Ensuring effective resource utilization and successful intervention implementation requires not only
80 access to scientific knowledge but also its judicious application (6). This is particularly relevant for the
81 municipal level, as LHAs possess an encompassing understanding of local conditions and contexts (23–
82 25). Nevertheless, the COVID-19 pandemic has exposed significant challenges in LHAs' implementa-
83 tion and embedding of EIDM processes. These challenges include among others, limited access to sci-
84 entific information (26, 27), a lack of institutionally anchored collaboration between academia and
85 practice in many places (28, 29), and substantial personnel, material and time constraints that make
86 accessing, reviewing, and applying research findings into local contexts much more difficult (30, 27).

87 Overcoming these barriers necessitates the establishment of institutionalized evidence ecosystems
88 that foster large-scale collaboration between public health practice and academia and enable inter-
89 agency collaboration in line with the Health in All Policies (HiAP) approach (31, 32). At the community
90 level, this entails the presence of a well-qualified public health workforce equipped with scientific ex-
91 pertise, administrative skills, and methodological knowledge to ensure a two-way theory-practice
92 transfer.

93 In Germany, several established training programs provide high-quality education and training oppor-
94 tunities for public health professionals. These programs include, in addition to various public health
95 chairs that primarily prepare students for scientific activities, in particular the Academies of Public
96 Health Services that offer advanced trainings and practice-oriented qualifications. However, to imple-
97 ment and enhance EIDM processes at the academia-practice interface, both comprehensive scientific
98 competencies coupled with extensive expertise in local administrative tasks, activities and responsi-
99 bilities are needed. This interface encompasses activities aimed at enhancing knowledge transfer be-
100 tween the municipal PHS (e.g., LHA) and research institutions (e.g., universities or academies), as well
101 as fostering collaboration. For brevity, we will refer to this domain as "work at the interface" in the
102 following.

103 Effective dissemination and exchange of evidence at the community level requires a profound under-
104 standing of public health services. Consequently, public health professionals working at the interface
105 require competencies in evidence-based policy advice and design, coordination and management
106 skills, and a comprehensive understanding of organizational leadership and decision-making struc-
107 tures (33, 34). Acquiring these competencies necessitates a consolidation of theory and practice,
108 which is often facilitated through postgraduate training approaches. Noteworthy examples of post-
109 graduate training programs in Germany include the medical residency program for public health spe-
110 cialists (35), the trainee program for public health specialists at LHA Fulda (36), or the postgraduate
111 training in applied epidemiology at the Robert Koch Institute (37). However, these existing approaches
112 predominantly focus on one occupational group or prepare for single areas of activity. To address this
113 gap, developing training programs tailored to the complex regional characteristics of PHS at the local
114 level is imperative.

115 The overarching aim of this study was to develop a framework in terms of a toolbox for conceptualizing
116 tailored training programs to equip public health professionals with the necessary skills to enhance
117 evidence-informed approaches at the interface. The study followed a stepwise approach with the fol-
118 lowing research objectives:

- 119 (1) Explore the relevant fields of activity, tasks, required skills, and competencies for a positions
120 at the interface through several semi-structured key informant interviews (Figure 1: RQ-1/2).
- 121 (2) Conduct a scoping review to identify, characterize, and analyze available training programs
122 that prepare public health professionals for working at the interface (Figure 1: RQ-3).
- 123 (3) Develop a toolbox that encompasses key parameters for creating tailored training programs
124 qualifying individuals to facilitate evidence transfer at the local level, drawing from the find-
125 ings of steps 1 and 2.

126 **3. Materials and methods**

127 A stepwise iterative mixed-methods approach was employed. Firstly, **qualitative interviews** were con-
128 ducted to explore the tasks, fields of activities, skills and competencies relevant to working at the
129 interface. Secondly, a **scoping review** was carried out to identify suitable training programs. In the
130 third step, a **stakeholder workshop** was executed, consisting of the critical appraisal and prioritization
131 of the main findings from the previous steps. Finally, the results from all three steps were triangulated
132 and synthesized, leading to the development of a framework, conceptualized as a toolbox that en-
133 compasses both essential content and contextual factors required for the development of tailored

134 training programs. The methodological approach is displayed in **Figure 1**. Details on the activities in
135 each step are described below.

136 → **Figure 1. Schematic of the methodological approach to develop a toolbox for conceptualizing**
137 **tailored training programs for work at the interface (RQ = research question).**

138 **3.2 Qualitative interview study**

139 In the first step, 23 semi-structured key informant interviews (KII) were conducted to explore aspects
140 related to public health research, knowledge transfer, collaboration between academia and practice
141 in the PHS, and training programs. Participants were purposefully selected using a sampling plan that
142 utilized professional networks and snowballing. Recruitment took place from November 24, 2021 to
143 March 31, 2022. The first interview was conducted on January 12, 2022, the last on May 03, 2022.
144 During recruitment, all participants were informed about the study procedure and objectives. Written
145 informed consent was obtained from all participants. The consent forms were filed in accordance with
146 German data protection regulations. Prior to recording the interview, all participants were informed
147 about the procedure and verbally asked if they agreed to be recorded. To incorporate the heteroge-
148 neity of the PHS accordingly and to reach saturation, the sampling plan considered two dimensions:
149 representation of experts from federal, state, and local governments, and inclusion of experts from
150 public health practice, public health academia, experts with teaching background, and young profes-
151 sionals. A semi-structured interview guide was developed based on existing literature and through
152 brainstorming and iteratively refined by a group of five researchers (LA, DD, SB, SG, and SW) who are
153 all part of the project consortium. After incorporating minor adjustments from the pilot test, the final
154 guide was used for virtual video call interviews. In most cases, participants were invited by e-mail or
155 telephone.

156 All interviews were conducted by a pair of researchers and the resulting audio files were content-
157 semantic transcribed (38), pseudonymized, and afterwards deleted (LA, DD, SB, SG, and SW). If re-
158 quested, the transcripts were returned to the participants for correction or comments. No repeat in-
159 terviews were conducted. The transcripts underwent a deductive-inductive qualitative content analy-
160 sis following Mayring's approach (39, 40). After calibration of the coding frame within a group of five
161 researchers from the project consortium, all interviews were coded by two researchers independently
162 using MAXQDA Analytics Pro 2022 (VERBI Software GmbH, Berlin) (LA, DD, SB, SG). Inductive additions
163 to the coding frame were made as required. Any discrepancies were resolved through discussion.

164 Relevant tasks, activities, skills, and competencies associated with working at the interface and facili-
165 tating evidence transfer at the local level were identified and extracted (**RQ-1 and RQ-2, Figure 1**). The

166 insights obtained from the interviews were utilized to determine priority areas of activity at the inter-
167 face. Furthermore, these results informed the subsequent development of the toolbox.

168 **3.1 Scoping review of relevant training programs**

169 The second step involved a scoping review aiming to identify, characterize, and analyze available train-
170 ing programs that prepare public health professionals for working at the interface. This methodologi-
171 cal approach was chosen due to its comprehensive format, allowing for efficient mapping the existing
172 literature within a limited timeframe while capturing the scope and characteristics of current research
173 activity. We did not attempt to identify all records on training programs at the interface, but enough
174 to assume that saturation had been reached regarding the parameters to be identified in the analysis.
175 To the best of our knowledge, there is currently no such overview.

176 The scoping review was conducted following the framework proposed by Arksey and O'Malley (41).
177 To answer **RQ-3 (Figure 1)**, we developed a search strategy focusing on two themes:

- 178 • PHS workforce, referring to professionals providing essential public health services within lo-
179 cal, state, or national level public health authorities.
- 180 • Practice-oriented training programs, such as continuing education, training opportunities, and
181 professional development programs, prepare individuals for academic work in PHS practice or
182 practice-oriented roles in public health academia, including hybrid training programs that
183 bridge both areas.

184 After piloting and refining the search strategy by two researchers (LA, SB), we searched the scientific
185 databases PubMed and LIVIVO on October 26, 2021 (**Appendix S1 and 2**). Retrieved records were de-
186 duplicated in the bibliographic management software CITAVI (Swiss Academic Software GmbH) and
187 imported in Rayyan, a web-based tool for conducting systematic reviews (42). Initially, the screening
188 process was calibrated and the predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria were tested for practicabil-
189 ity and applicability. Records were assessed for eligibility based on the following criteria:

- 190 • *Population*: Included records referred to the PHS workforce as defined above or individuals engaged in
191 academic public health. Excluded records focused primarily on professionals involved in patient treat-
192 ment.
- 193 • *Context*: Included records referred to practice-oriented training and qualification approaches and pro-
194 grams as defined above. Excluded records encompassed training exclusively focused on one area (e.g.,
195 new master programs unrelated to the PHS) or lacked the objective of qualifying for the interface.
- 196 • *Setting*: Included records focused on training approaches implemented in Germany as well as results
197 from neighboring countries with comparable healthcare systems, including Austria - AT, Switzerland -
198 CH, and the Netherlands - NL. Examples from the United Kingdom - UK, known for its Public Health

199 Specialist Program within the National Health Service (NHS), were also considered exemplary. Excluded
200 records concentrated on training approaches from other countries.

201 • *Publication date and language*: The search was restricted to articles published between 2011 and 2021
202 in English, German, or Dutch.

203 • *Publication type*: No restrictions were imposed based on publication type.

204 • *Full-text accessibility*: Excluded records were those for which full-text access was unavailable.

205 Following the calibration of the screening process, a title-abstract screening and subsequent full-text
206 screening was conducted independently by two researchers (LA, SB). Relevant publications were
207 transferred to MAXQDA Analytics Pro 2022 (VERBI Software GmbH, Berlin) for coding and thematic
208 synthesis analysis based on the approach outlined by Thomas and Harden (43). A critical appraisal was
209 not conducted in accordance with Arksey and O'Malley's scoping review framework methodology (41).
210 Initially, three sample documents were coded line-by-line inductively by both researchers, demon-
211 strating a high level of consensus. Subsequently, the remaining documents were coded individually by
212 one researcher each, with new codes developed and added inductively as needed. All coded passages
213 were then grouped, defined, and labeled according to identified similarities and differences, resulting
214 in a hierarchical tree structure ([Appendix Table S3](#)). From the emerging descriptive themes, a first
215 version of the toolbox was developed (LA, SB).

216 **3.3 Stakeholder workshop**

217 The third step involved a multi-professional and interdisciplinary stakeholder workshop, which aimed
218 to critically appraise the first version of the toolbox by prioritizing skill-sets, competencies, and key
219 elements for the development of tailored training programs. The in total 44 participants were pur-
220 posely selected using a sampling plan similar to the interview approach, with an emphasis on including
221 individuals who possessed similar professional and communication skills but held diverse opinions to
222 encourage critical discussion. This approach aimed to prevent the occurrence of "group think", where
223 decisions are influenced by conformity or dominance of certain individuals within the group (44). The
224 recruitment phase lasted from April 01, 2022 to June 14, 2022, and the workshop itself took place
225 from July 04-05, 2022.

226 The workshop utilized the Strategic Orientation Mapping (SOR) approach for the decision-making pro-
227 cess proposed by Schlicht and Zinsmeister (44). Prior to the workshop, participants completed an
228 online survey to prioritize fields of activity at the interface. The workshop consisted of two parts: a
229 critical appraisal of predefined tasks and activities, and an assessment of existing training programs
230 using the SWOT analysis approach (45, 46). The workshop results were documented, processed by the
231 project team, and shared with participants for feedback and final adaptations.

232 **3.4 Triangulation and synthesis**

233 The results from step one to three were integrated and consolidated through triangulation in work-
234 shops with the research consortium members. Triangulation in this context refers to a systematic in-
235 tegration of results obtained from the various methodological approaches employed in the previous
236 steps (47). Based on the findings of this study, the toolbox was applied in a series of workshops within
237 the project consortium to design a training program that was tailored to the specific structural condi-
238 tions of all consortium member institutions. A detailed description of the final training program can
239 be found in forthcoming publications (Arnold et al., in preparation).

240 Since the qualitative interviews and the stakeholder workshops contained exclusively technical ques-
241 tions, study-related stresses and risks were expected to be minimal. As some information provided by
242 participants might involve criticism of their own agency or partner organizations, the pseudonymity
243 of data was ensured, and no detailed information was disclosed. The study was conducted in accord-
244 ance with the Declaration of Helsinki and data collection was approved by the Institutional Ethics Com-
245 mittee of Faculty of Medicine at the Heinrich-Heine-University Düsseldorf, protocol code 2021-1646_1
246 (2021-12-16). We adhered to the Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research (COREQ)
247 checklist in reporting the qualitative interviews, stakeholder workshops, and final triangulation and
248 synthesis (48). The members of the interdisciplinary research team had backgrounds in epidemiology
249 (LA, DD), medicine (DD), public health (LA, SB, TC, SG, DS), sociology (SW, DS), and social sciences (LA,
250 DS). All authors had experience in conducting qualitative research projects. Results of the scoping re-
251 view were reported according to the Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses ex-
252 tension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) checklist (49).

253 **4. Results**

254 As a result of the methodology employed, two main outcomes have emerged. The first outcome in-
255 volves the mapping of relevant areas of activity at the interface. The second outcome pertains to the
256 development of a toolbox designed to create tailored training programs aimed at equipping public
257 health professionals for work at these interface. Both outcomes laid the groundwork for the currently
258 ongoing development and pilot testing of a customized training program tailored to the specific re-
259 quirements and local needs of the EvidenzÖGD research consortium ([Link](#)). A comprehensive report
260 on this aspect will be provided once the piloting phase is completed (Arnold et al., in preparation).

261 **4.1 Fields of activity at the interface**

262 A total of 24 individuals were interviewed in 23 semi-structured interviews. We interviewed fourteen
263 public health professionals, four of whom worked at the federal level, two at the state level, and five
264 at the local level. Eleven participants worked at a university, five were young professionals, and eight
265 had an international perspective. Most participants possessed multiple areas of expertise according
266 to their professional backgrounds. The sampling plan can be found in **Appendix Table S4**. The duration
267 of the interviews ranged from 31 to 56 minutes. The interviews included an equal representation of
268 men and women. Based on the interviews, areas of knowledge transfer activity at the municipal level
269 were identified and clustered, along with identification of requisite skills and competencies.

270 The obtained results were further discussed and prioritized in the multi-professional and interdiscipli-
271 nary stakeholder workshop with 48 experts. Of these, 40 participants responded to the initial question
272 regarding the positioning of their professional expertise in a triangle between practice, academia, and
273 teaching. Among them, 18 experts primarily identified with public health practice, 14 experts primarily
274 with public health academia, and four experts indicated a prior focus on teaching and conceptualiza-
275 tion of training programs. Four experts situated themselves at the intersection of all three domains.
276 Additionally, 30 experts reported having five or more years of experience in the field of public health,
277 while 21 experts reported having five or more years of experience specifically in the PHS. Furthermore,
278 21 experts mentioned their participation in the design of a training program at least once.

279 The results of the interview analysis and the stakeholder workshop were further elaborated by the
280 interdisciplinary research consortium through a series of conceptual workshops. Finally, the consor-
281 tium consolidated six fields of activity for establishing evidence-informed processes and structures at
282 the interface between academia and practice in LHAs in Germany:

- 283 • *Networking and committee activities*: This field focuses on creating and fostering networking
284 opportunities among stakeholders at the community level. It also includes the mapping of
285 needs, goals, and expectations to promote ongoing engagement.
- 286 • *Knowledge management (evidence use)*: This field entails building sector-specific and cross-
287 sectoral expertise on municipal PHS ("practical knowledge"). It also includes the development
288 of practice-oriented research questions, the conduction of evidence syntheses including qual-
289 ity assessments, and the identification of suitable implementation approaches.
- 290 • *Knowledge communication*: This field involves tailoring expertise and research findings to local
291 conditions by developing appropriate communication materials, such as policy briefs, state-
292 ments, or evidence synthesis. It also includes the development, implementation, and promo-
293 tion of a joint communication strategy to facilitate cross-institutional knowledge exchange
294 between stakeholders, team members, leaders, and decision-makers.

- 295 • *Project management*: This field encompasses evidence-informed identification, adaptation
296 and subsequent implementation, administration, and evaluation of (complex) public health
297 interventions and measures. It also includes the securement of project funding.
- 298 • *Capacity building and change management*: This field focuses on opportunities to strengthen
299 the structural conditions of knowledge-transfer processes, aiming to enhance the capacity of
300 individuals and organizations to apply research evidence effectively.
- 301 • *Consolidation of knowledge-transfer processes*: This field involves the sustainable implemen-
302 tation of evidence-informed processes and structures. It also includes establishing feedback
303 mechanisms and promoting individual as well as organizational self-reflection in evidence use.

304 A detailed description of the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and attributes required for each field can be
305 found in the competency framework developed as part of the EvidenzÖGD project ([Link](#)).

306 **4.2 Toolbox for the development of relevant training programs**

307 The identification and extraction of relevant aspects for the development of tailored training programs
308 for the PHS workforce on local level was informed by the Six-Step Model for Developing Competency
309 Frameworks proposed by Batt et al. (50). Emphasis was placed on defining desired outcomes and con-
310 sidering relevant process aspects, including inputs and activities. Continuous evaluation of this process
311 took place throughout the iterative development phase, enabling the utilization of findings to enhance
312 the ongoing processes of model development and revision.

313 A total of 1,1706 records (PubMed: n=1,468; LIVIVO: n=238) were identified in the scoping review.
314 Following the title-abstract screening, 1,590 records were excluded, and an additional 24 records were
315 excluded during the full-text screening. Exclusion reasons are displayed in [Figure 2](#). Ultimately, 25 rec-
316 ords were included in the review. The characteristics of the included records can be found in [Appendix](#)
317 [Table S5](#).

318 → [Figure 2. PRISMA Flowchart](#).

319 Based on these 25 records, four core elements were identified as relevant for the development of a
320 training program intended to qualify professionals for work at the interface: (1) context-related as-
321 pects, (2) content-related aspects, (3) aspects relevant for determining the training format and (4)
322 aspects relevant for consolidation and further development of the program. A total of 15 parameters
323 were assigned to these core elements, and specific guiding questions with examples were developed
324 to facilitate the application of the toolbox. Subsequently, each of the four aspects, along with corre-
325 sponding guiding questions, will be presented.

326 **Context-related aspects** involve essential program parameters and factors that need to be established
 327 prior to program implementation. These aspects encompass (a) agreement on program objectives, (b)
 328 involvement of relevant stakeholders, (c) identification of required resources, and (d) definition of the
 329 program setting. To facilitate the conceptualization of a training program considering contextual fac-
 330 tors, **Table 1** presents these parameters and corresponding guiding questions.

331 **Table 1. Context-related aspects for the development of a training program**

Parameters	Guiding questions to be answered
(a) Program objectives	What are the overarching guiding principles and objectives of the training program? (51–67)
(b) Stakeholder involvement	Which stakeholders are involved in the training program? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Who takes the lead in program management and organization?</i> (51–53, 55–58, 60, 61, 68, 62–64, 69, 65, 70) - <i>Which stakeholders are included in program administration?</i> (71, 51, 53, 55–58, 60, 61, 68, 63, 64, 69, 66, 72) - <i>Who is the target audience of the program?</i> (e.g., Bachelor/Master/PhD students, professionals, specific professions) (73, 71, 51–54, 74, 55–61, 75, 62, 64, 69, 65, 70, 66)
(c) Necessary resources	What resources are required for program establishment? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>What financial resources are needed for the program?</i> (66, 51–55, 57, 58, 60–62, 65) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Is there a financing concept in place for program establishment and maintenance?</i> - <i>What are the participation fees for the program?</i> - <i>Are participants responsible for covering participation fees?</i> - <i>What human resources are needed to deliver program content?</i> (51–53, 74, 56–61, 75, 62, 72, 64, 69) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Which qualifications are required for program instructors?</i> - <i>What other resources are necessary for program establishment and maintenance</i> (e.g., technical equipment, facilities, literature resources, licenses)? (51, 56, 57, 59–61, 75, 62)
(d) Program setting	In which setting will the program be carried out? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Where will the program be conducted?</i> (e.g., local, regional, national, international) (64) - <i>What setting will be used for the practical component?</i> (e.g., LHA, hospital, general practice) (52, 53, 59, 62) - <i>What setting will be used for the theoretical component?</i> (e.g., universities, academies, public health schools) (52, 53, 59, 62) - <i>Are there any restrictions to consider?</i> (e.g., distance, daily work routine, internet access) (56, 60, 64) - <i>What delivery formats will be used?</i> (e.g., face-to-face, distance learning, hybrid) (71, 51–54, 56–58, 60, 61, 68, 75, 76, 63) - <i>In what language will the program content be delivered?</i> (60) - <i>Does the program setting ensure equal access participation for all?</i> (60, 56, 64)

332 **Content-related aspects** are essential for structuring the program content effectively. These aspects
 333 include determining the (a) relevant program content, (b) selecting suitable training and education
 334 formats, (c) didactical concepts, and specifying (d) appropriate measurability and assessment meth-
 335 ods. **Table 2** illustrates these parameters and provides guiding questions to aid determining the pro-
 336 gram’s content.

337 **Table 2. Content-related aspects for the development of a training program**

Parameters	Guiding questions to be answered
(a) Program content	<p>Horizontal Integration^{*1}(53, 74, 72, 64)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Which professions should be integrated in the program’s content? (73, 51, 53, 55, 58, 60, 72) (e.g., public health experts, medical doctors)^{*2} - Which disciplines should be integrated in the program’s content? (73, 53, 74, 55, 58–60, 72) (e.g., healthcare, public health, law, ethics)^{*2} - How can the curriculum accommodate the diverse professional backgrounds of the public health workforce? (73, 53, 74, 55, 58–60, 72) - Should the curriculum allow for individual content preferences? (72, 53, 74, 56, 59, 60, 76) - Should international experience be integrated into the curriculum? (76, 52–54, 56, 60, 61) <p>Vertical integration^{*3} (51, 74, 58, 59, 61, 76, 68, 64)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What content should be included to enhance knowledge-transfer between practice and academia in the PHS? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Which theories and models should be integrated? (74, 55, 58, 59, 76, 68, 75, 70) (e.g., Evidence-based Public Health (EBPH) (6), Essential Public Health Operations (EPHOs) (77), Health in all Policies (HiAP) (78), Information Pyramid (79)) o What content areas should be integrated?(75, 68, 76, 61, 60, 59, 58, 57, 56, 55, 74, 53, 52, 71, 66, 70, 69, 64, 63, 72, 62) o Should the program have predefined learning outcomes? (52, 53, 57–59, 76, 72, 69, 70) (e.g., WHO-ASPHER Competency Framework (80), UK Public Health Skills and Knowledge Framework (PHSKF) (81), Core competencies in applied infectious disease epidemiology in Europe (82), Catalogue of Learning Objectives Epidemiology (83)) - Should the program follow a competency framework? (52, 53, 74, 55, 56, 58, 60, 63, 69, 70, 66) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o If yes, which one? (e.g., European Core Competences for Public Health Professionals [49], Core Competencies for Public Health Professionals [50], Public Health Skills and Knowledge Framework[51], WHO-ASPHER Competency Framework [52], Core competencies in applied infectious disease epidemiology in Europe [53]) o If no, should a new competency framework be developed? (e.g., in accordance with the Six-Step Model for Developing Competency Frameworks [43] and aligned with the CONFERD-HP Guideline [54]) - Which research methods and skills should be delivered in the program? (71, 51, 53, 74, 56, 58–61, 76, 75, 63, 64, 70) (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative methodology, academic writing, analytical reasoning, critical appraisal, identification of knowledge gaps, problem analysis, understanding scientific language) - How does the practical application succeed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o How can academia and practice be connected within the content of the program?(73, 71, 51, 53, 74, 56, 58, 59, 76, 72, 64, 70) (e.g., by addressing aspects relevant for collaborative relationships between researchers and end users, the involvement of decision makers in research processes, or timely access to research) o How can the program deliver practical knowledge and address practice-oriented problems?(53, 66, 70) (e.g., by applying problem-oriented or practice-based learning approaches) o How can the program provide career development options perspectives?(71, 53, 56, 58, 59, 76) (e.g., by providing coaching or mentoring) o How can the program be relevant to the workplace reality of participants?(73, 71, 53, 57, 59, 60, 76, 62, 72) (e.g., by co-creating the qualification model, co-hosting the final training approach)
(b) Training and education forms	<p>Which training and education forms should be applied to deliver the content of the program?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Which teacher-centered training and education forms should be used?(e.g., (guest) lectures, mentoring, supervision, personal development planning, Q&A formats, train-the-trainer) (51–54, 74, 57–61, 76, 68, 75, 63, 64, 70, 66) - Which training and education forms promoting interaction and exchange between participants should be employed? (e.g., discussion formats, group exercises, interprofessional knowledge-exchange, journal clubs, networking formats, peer-assisted learning, research projects, tandem models, tutorials) (73, 71, 51, 53, 54, 74, 56–59, 75, 76, 61, 60, 62, 64, 70, 66)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Which training and education forms emphasizing practical experience for participants should be incorporated? (e.g., internships, networking formats, exposure to practical problems, rotational concepts) (71, 53, 55, 58, 62, 72, 63, 70, 66)
(c) Didactical concepts	Which didactical concepts should be used to deliver the content of the program (73, 71, 52–54, 74, 57, 59, 60, 76, 68, 72, 69, 70) (e.g., adult/lifelong learning, problem-based learning (PBL), presentation of real-life problems, research-based learning, self-directed learning, self-reflective learning)?
(d) Measurability and assessment methods	<p>What assessment methods should be used to evaluate participants' understanding of the program's content?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should the examination contain a theoretical component? (e.g., exams, presentations, group work formats) (52, 55, 57, 72, 69, 65) - Should the examination contain a practical component? (e.g., working on research projects) (71, 55, 58, 61, 72) - How can the time spent studying the program's content be made measurable? Should some kind of credit point system be used for this? (e.g., European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) (84)) (73)

338 *1 **Horizontal integration** describes the integration of content for different professional disciplines into the curriculum so
339 that participants can adopt a broad public health perspective (74).

340 *2 We defined "**professions**" as roles obtained through specific training, academic education, or professional trajectory, and
341 "**disciplines**" as overarching fields of work according to (85).

342 *3 **Vertical integration** describes the linkage of theories, methods, content, and application within the content of the pro-
343 gram (bridging the gap between research and practice) (74).

344 Once the context- and content-related aspects have been established, the next step is to specify the
345 **preferred program format**. Based on the findings of the scoping review, four parameters were iden-
346 tified as relevant for the transition into a training program (Table 3). These parameters include deter-
347 mining the program format (a), program duration and density (b), professional credentialing require-
348 ments (c), and the recruitment process and selection strategy (d).

349 **Table 3. Aspects relevant for determining the training format**

Parameters	Guiding questions to be answered
(a) Program format	<p>What is the most suitable program format?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What program forms are generally suitable? (73, 51, 54, 53, 74, 56, 57, 59–61, 68, 75, 62, 72, 63, 69, 66) (e.g., hospitations/seminars/courses/workshops, stand-alone vs. integrated into existing programs, postgraduate programs, PhD programs, trainee programs) - Can existing program forms be adopted? If not, which core elements seem particularly suitable? To address this question, it is worthwhile to develop an overview of the core elements of existing programs as presented in Table 4.
(b) Program duration and density	<p>What is the overall duration of the program?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is the most suitable duration of individual modules within the program? (71, 51–55, 58, 60, 61, 72, 63–66) - What are the scheduling options for participants? (e.g., full-time, part-time, block sessions, self-determined) (71, 51–53, 55–58, 60, 59, 61, 62, 72, 66)
(c) Professional credentialing requirements	<p>What are the required standards for program completion? *1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there professional credentialing standards upon program completion? (e.g., acknowledgements, degrees, certificates, register) (61, 55, 53, 52) - What are the accreditation requirements for the program? (e.g., Accreditation body, public health registry, boards) (52, 53, 55, 56, 68, 63) - What credentials or certificates do participants receive upon completion? (e.g., degree, certificate, certificate of attendance)? (53, 57, 59, 61)

Parameters	Guiding questions to be answered
(a) Program format	<p>What is the most suitable program format?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>What program forms are generally suitable? (73, 51, 54, 53, 74, 56, 57, 59–61, 68, 75, 62, 72, 63, 69, 66) (e.g., hospitations/seminars/courses/workshops, stand-alone vs. integrated into existing programs, postgraduate programs, PhD programs, trainee programs)</i> - <i>Can existing program forms be adopted? If not, which core elements seem particularly suitable? To address this question, it is worthwhile to develop an overview of the core elements of existing programs as presented in Table 4.</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Does program completion grant entry into a (national) public health registry (if existent)? (73, 52, 55)</i>
(d) Recruitment and selection	<p>How are participants recruited and selected?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>What procedure is used to select participants for the program? (e.g., recruitment strategy, written and / or face-to-face assessments, admission exam) (71, 52, 55–58, 61)</i> - <i>What selection criteria must be met for program participation? (e.g., required professional background, years of postgraduate experience, completion or enrollment in a Master’s program that covers specific areas, appointment to a specific training site) (52, 53, 55, 59, 61)</i> - <i>What is the desired number of participants for the program? (52, 55, 57–59, 56, 60, 61, 65)</i>

350 *1 For more details, see Gershuni et al. (86). Their systematic review on professional regulation and credentialing of public
351 health workforce contains detailed information on relevant factors to be considered.

352 Among the various qualification models identified in the scoping review, five were deemed particularly
353 suitable for facilitating evidence use and knowledge transfer within the local PHS in Germany: trainee
354 programs, PhD programs, rotational concepts, continuing professional development (CPD) courses
355 that address both academia and practice, and PHS related modules in academic degree programs.
356 [Table 4](#) presents the selected training programs based on their program parameters. All five qualifica-
357 tion models were subject of a SWOT analysis during the stakeholder workshop. Special attention was
358 paid to the feasibility of ensuring knowledge transfer at the local level.

Table 4 Program parameters of selected training programs

	Trainee programs	PhD-programs	Rotational concepts	CPD*1 courses addressing academia and practice	PHS-modules in academic degree programs
(a) Program objectives	Preparation of qualified (young) professionals for future professional activities in the PHS through a practice-oriented approach.	Investigation of public health-related research problems, addressing the needs of local and state health authorities. Integration of research findings into the practical work of the PHS to facilitate the long-term adoption of evidence-informed approaches in the PHS.	Familiarization of participants with the different working environments of academia and practice in the PHS. Establishment of a strong network between participating institutions. Addressing practical deficits in academia as well theoretical deficits in practice.	Empowering participants to engage in evidence-informed activities related to PHS-specific topics, thereby contributing to quality assurance in daily PHS operations.	Sustainable promotion of scientific knowledge in the public health sector. Facilitation of career orientation for students and young professionals.
(b) Setting	Practical training in trainee programs frequently takes place across various departments within a LHA or a training institution. Collaboration with (inter)national partners is occasionally involved.	PhD Programs are often based on collaborations between institutions of academia and practice related to public health. PhD students with an academic background often undertake a complementary placement within the PHS.	Rotational concepts typically occur between at least one PHS institution at the municipal or federal level and one academic institution, such as universities, research institutes. Presence in these institutions is obligatory most of the time.	CPD courses addressing academia and practice often encompass a series of individual modules, seminars, or workshops delivered in face-to-face, online, or hybrid formats.	PHS-modules in academic degree programs are typically offered as compulsory or elective subjects within the curricula of undergraduate or postgraduate academic programs, such as public health and medicine.
(c) Optimal duration	Several months or even years	Custom (usually 3-5 years)	Ranges from permanent positions to limited time durations (e.g., one year).	Ranges from one-day training sessions to multi-year CPD programs.	Custom (often 1-2 semesters)
(d) Core content focus	Acquiring hands-on skills. Focus on practical and theoretical training components of various PH-/PHS-related topics	Aligning research projects (PhD) with specific practice-based research needs of the PHS.	Learning new skills and methods, applying evidence-based decision-making to practice, and aligning research questions with practical needs.	Acquiring specific skills and/or competencies for working at the interface. Integration of current public health discourses.	Learning about more complex topics, issues, and methods. Variation in module scope, professional depth, and the specific content.
(e) Participant selection criteria	Academic degrees. Content-related knowledge is sometimes assessed in eligibility tests.	Masters' Degree with thematic relation to the PHS. Practical experience with PHS institutions at the municipal or state level is often beneficial.	Employment in a PHS institution at the municipal or state level or academic institutions, such as universities or research institutes is often required.	Activity in the PHS or another area of the health system is often required.	Dependent on the respective study programs.

(f) additional considerations	Supervision is often provided by a mentor.	PhD-projects are usually supervised by both university professors and experts from public health institutions, such as LHA.	Encourages participants to integrate their own expertise into the field they are rotating in, benefiting the participating institutions considerably.	-	Ideally, the module includes a diverse range of potential career paths in public health institutions.
Examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trainee program for public health specialists in Fulda (36) - Postgraduate Training for Applied Epidemiology (PAE) at the RKI (37) - Public health specialist training (87) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Doctorate/ Ph.D. Program: Doctor of Public Health (Dr.PH) Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D. in Public Health) (88) - Ph.D. Program: Medical Research in Epidemiology & Public Health (89) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Embedded research approaches (51) - Rotation within the medical residency program for public health specialists training in the LHA Hamburg (90) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public health literature searching training course within Knowledge and Library Service (75) - Structured Operational Research and Training Initiative (61) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PHS-relevant courses in the MSc Public Health at the HHU (91) - PHS-relevant courses in the MA Applied Health Science at the RWU (92)

360 *¹CPD = Continuing professional development (CPD).

361

362 Furthermore, parameters necessary for the long-term existence of the program were classified as **as-**
 363 **pects relevant for consolidation and further development of the program.** These aspects encompass
 364 a range of factors that can be grouped into three overarching parameters, including (a) piloting and
 365 implementation, (b) evaluation and quality assessment, and (c) advancement and transferability. **Table**
 366 **5** provides an overview of these aspects, along with guiding questions that aim to support a compre-
 367 hensive understanding and careful consideration of the fundamental elements required for ensuring
 368 the ongoing success of the program.

369 **Table 5. Aspects relevant for consolidation and further development of the training program**

Parameters	Guiding questions to be answered
(a) Piloting and implementation	How can a piloting phase before establishing the training program be established? - <i>How to test feasibility and practicability of the model?</i> (60, 68, 75)
(b) Evaluation and quality assessment	How can the evaluation concept be designed to ensure a comprehensive quality assessment of the program? - <i>Which components of the program should be evaluated? (e.g., development process, content, performance, acceptability, feasibility, satisfaction)</i> - <i>What are the objectives to be achieved through the evaluation process (e.g., assessing program effectiveness, identifying strengths and weaknesses, improving program outcomes, informing decision-making, resource allocation)?</i> - <i>Which methods and indicators should be employed to evaluate the program?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Level 1: Reaction (e.g., satisfaction with the program and/or the program content, application rate, attendance rate) (65, 71, 59, 60, 76, 62, 72, 63)</i> ○ <i>Level 2: Learning (e.g., graduation rate, assessment of newly acquired competencies, participants' achievements after graduation, employment rate of participants after graduation) (73, 71, 52–54, 56–59, 76, 72, 63, 64, 70)</i> ○ <i>Level 3: Behavior (e.g., factors contributing to the successful application of the program content, barriers contributing to the successful application of the program content) (63, 76, 60, 59, 54, 51, 71)</i> ○ <i>Level 4: Results (e.g. impact of the program on practice / on certain institutions / on political debates) (72, 63)</i> ○ <i>Level 5: Return on investment (e.g., cost-effectiveness of the program) (63)</i>
(c) Advancement and transferability	How can the continuity of further program development be ensured? - <i>Does the program receive sufficient support from relevant stakeholders, such as experts and recognized institutions, to be effective in practice?</i> (55, 69) - <i>Should the program be aligned with other existing training programs?</i> (73, 51, 59, 76) - <i>How to secure adaptability to developments in the field of public health/in the PHS?</i> (71, 51, 56, 58, 61, 68, 76, 75, 62, 72, 63, 69) - <i>How can the program be adjusted to address its criticized aspects?</i> (63) - <i>What is the long-term financing strategy for the training program?</i> How can the transferability of the program to other contexts be ensured? ^{*1} - <i>Are there good-practice examples of successful transferring the training program to other contexts?</i> (51, 55, 58, 61, 69, 64, 63) How should the dissemination concept be designed to enhance visibility of the program? (71, 51, 57, 58, 76, 63, 64)

370 ^{*1} For more details, see Schloemer et al. (93). The authors developed a model for the assessment of transferability of health
 371 interventions through identification and systematization of influencing criteria, including facilitators and barriers within a
 372 systematic review.

373 5. Discussion

374 5.1 Summary of findings

375 Current research-oriented training opportunities provided by well-established public health programs
376 effectively prepare students for academic roles but often neglect the complexities of working in and
377 with local governments (94). Conversely, practice-based training programs often do not adequately
378 manage to equip practitioners with the skills necessary for academic tasks and roles.

379 To address the lack of available training offerings that meet the unique needs and requirements of the
380 local context, we have developed a comprehensive toolbox for conceptualizing integrated training pro-
381 grams. These programs aim to enhance evidence transfer between academia and practice in local PHS.
382 Through an iterative process involving key informant interviews, a scoping review, and a multidisciplinary
383 stakeholder workshop, we identified essential aspects and parameters for such a toolbox. The
384 toolbox presented comprises four core elements, encompassing a total of 15 parameters:

- 385 (1) content-related aspects (incl. four parameters),
- 386 (2) context-related aspects (incl. four parameters),
- 387 (3) aspects relevant for determining the training format (incl. four parameters), and
- 388 (4) aspects relevant for consolidation and further development (incl. three parameters).

389 Specific guiding questions with illustrative examples have been developed for each parameter to assist
390 in the development of tailored training models aligned with local needs and requirements. These guid-
391 ing questions enable program developers to effectively assess the complexities associated with devel-
392 oping, implementing, and sustaining the program's effectiveness and impact.

393 5.2 Short guidance on how to apply the toolbox

394 The toolbox presented is deliberately generic so that it can be applied to different contexts. To this
395 end, the accompanying guiding questions are intended to be assistive to determine the relevant focus
396 and content. While the toolbox can be used as a "ready-to-use" framework by systematically answer-
397 ing all questions in sequence, we believe the toolbox to be most useful in an iterative deliberative
398 process, as recommended by experts in the field (50). **Figure 3** provides a graphical representation of
399 the planned process, with a brief explanation of each step outlined below.

400 → **Figure 3. Schematic how-to-use guidance of the toolbox.**

401 To **initiate the process** (step 1), it is crucial to form a core team comprising representatives from rele-
402 vant public health institutions on the local level. This core team should include experts with broad

403 professional backgrounds from universities, research institutions, academies of public health services,
404 local public health authorities, local administration, and ideally, government agencies. Reflecting on
405 activities and structures relevant for evidence transfer between academia and practice provides in-
406 sights into existing practices and highlights areas for improvement. This reflection enhances under-
407 standing regarding the dissemination of research findings and utilization of evidence in current prac-
408 tice. Ensuring alignment and collaboration throughout the development process is further supported
409 by each entity represented in the core team initially defining their goals, needs, resources, and require-
410 ments.

411 In the **preparation phase** (step 2), the defined goals, interests, needs, resources and requirements
412 should be aligned with underlying competencies of each member institution. This mapping exercise
413 provides a deeper understanding of the strengths and expertise within the core team while identifying
414 any overlaps or conflicts. Promptly resolving potential conflicts enables effective collaboration and
415 smooth progress throughout the development process. Performing a stakeholder analysis based on
416 the results of the mapping will provide insights into the broader ecosystem and helps identifying rele-
417 vant experts not yet involved. These experts can be engaged by expanding the core team or involving
418 them in the program advisory group, which should be formed to ensure comprehensive guidance
419 throughout the development process.

420 During the **development phase** (step 3), the core team reaches a consensus on the fundamental ele-
421 ments of the training program. An iterative process is recommended refining content- as well as con-
422 text-related aspects by systematically assessing the provided guiding questions (see **Table 1 and 2**) in
423 successive workshops conducted by the core team. To ensure continuous exchange within the core
424 team, a predetermined schedule should be agreed upon in the initial meeting. Once program objec-
425 tives and content are specified, the program format, including duration and density, professional cre-
426 dentialing requirements, and desired recruitment and selection criteria, can be defined (see **Table 3**
427 **and 4**).

428 In the **refinement phase** (step 4), the core team consolidates the first version of the qualification model
429 based on the agreed-upon parameters. Subsequently, the model is presented to the program advisory
430 group, including future participants, policy makers, and experts not involved in prior steps. Gathering
431 input and feedback allows for refining and improving the model. The core team adapts the model ac-
432 cording to the feedback received, ensuring its relevance, effectiveness, and alignment with stakehold-
433 ers' expectations.

434 To test the feasibility and practicability of the model, it is recommended to pilot the model in a real-
435 world setting at the outset the **implementation phase** (step 5) (see **Table 5 (a)**). Careful assessment of
436 results and feedback from the pilot phase enables necessary adaptations to the model. Once refined,

437 the model can be implemented in the respective setting. Efforts should be dedicated to developing a
438 comprehensive evaluation and quality assessment strategy for the program.

439 During the **evaluation phase** (step 6), the core team defines relevant quality assurance tools to assess
440 the program's effectiveness, impact, and adherence to standards (see **Table 5 (b)**). Continuous moni-
441 toring and evaluation, accompanied by adjustments, ensure the ongoing quality improvement of the
442 tailored qualification model.

443 In the final **advancement phase** (step 7), a strategy for continuous development to update and main-
444 tain the program over time should be established (see **Table 5 (c)**). Assessing the transferability of the
445 adapted model to other contexts and settings, while considering scalability and applicability, is crucial.
446 Defining a dissemination strategy facilitates sharing the knowledge and experiences gained during the
447 development and implementation process, ensuring broader adoption and impact of the model.

448 **5.3 Need for institutional anchored evidence eco-systems on local** 449 **level**

450 Effective implementation of needs-based public health interventions requires the assessment, synthe-
451 sis, and appropriate utilization of research evidence, in alignment with the broader policy system. The
452 practical challenges encountered by LHAs in this regard became evident during the COVID-19 pan-
453 demic, where time-sensitive decisions had to be made amidst epistemic uncertainties (5, 17). This was
454 aggravated by absence of structures facilitating rapid knowledge transfer and exchange in many mu-
455 nicipalities, particularly at the pandemics' onset. To bridge the gap between evidence generation and
456 utilization in the local PHS in Germany, the establishment of evidence ecosystems is deemed highly
457 relevant.

458 Comprehensive methodological skills, including formulating appropriate research questions and con-
459 ducting evidence syntheses, are essential to obtain timely and robust evidence on public health-related
460 challenges. Successful implementation of complex interventions relies on the effective translation of
461 new research findings from academia into practice and vice versa. Therefore, sector-specific and cross-
462 sectoral expertise in public policy and administration is vital for aligning research questions with local
463 needs, as emphasized by experts in the field (95–98), particularly on the local level. To recommend
464 and implement locally tailored strategies, scientific evidence must be communicated in a meaningful
465 and usable manner for policymakers, decision-makers, and practitioners (2, 99). This necessitates the
466 production of succinct and user-friendly evidence syntheses, specifically tailored to meet informational
467 demands of the intended users. Additionally, addressing local needs entails active engagement and
468 involvement of key stakeholders, interdisciplinary teams of experts, and collaborative and continuous
469 efforts between evidence generators and evidence users (10).

470 The toolbox presented aims to serve as a guide to conceptualize training programs that teach skills
471 related to evidence generation and to train participants in evidence utilization by translating and ap-
472 plying parts of a generic body of evidence to the community context in which LHAs operate. Within
473 the EvidenzÖGD-project we utilized the toolbox by following the proposed step-wise approach to de-
474 velop a customized training program tailored to the specific needs of the research consortium. The
475 resulting qualification model is currently undergoing piloting and evaluation (Arnold et al., in prepara-
476 tion).

477 Tailored training programs are intended to equip public health researchers and practitioners with the
478 relevant skills to design and implement needs-based PHS research. The joint development of training
479 approaches seeks to strengthen cross-institutional collaboration and enhance understanding of evi-
480 dence generation and utilization. In the long term, this process is meant to enable public health re-
481 searchers and practitioners to conduct high-quality PHS research, aligned with local needs, thereby
482 saving resources and enhancing the evidence base for successfully conducting complex public health
483 measures on site. Consequently, co-developing tailored solutions within a local evidence ecosystem
484 can contribute not only to scientific impact but, potentially, to practical impact as well.

485 However, the successful implementation and effectiveness of such tailored programs will also be in-
486 fluenced by contextual conditions. In addition to adequate material and financial resources, laws and
487 regulations that mandate evidence-informed decision-making processes are essential. Therefore, a
488 clear political endorsement and support for the integration of evidence-informed practices into the
489 policy and practice on local level are needed. Moving forward, attention to these contextual factors is
490 vital to ensure the optimal impact and sustainability of tailored training programs.

491 **6. Strengths and limitations**

492 The design of this study incorporates some noteworthy strengths. The novelty of our overarching ap-
493 proach, in which we looked at aspects relevant to strengthen knowledge-translation and exchange at
494 the interface of academia and practice in local PHS in Germany by taking into account evidence re-
495 quired from a scoping review, several key-informants and a multi-professional group of experts. The
496 comprehensive mixed-methods approach allowed us to incorporate a broad variety of methods and
497 types of evidence. The iterative approach enabled critical evaluation of our own research results, con-
498 tributing to continuous quality assurance and consolidation. Based on this, we assume that our study,
499 which is jointly organized by academia and practice, can contribute significantly to the improvement
500 of knowledge-transfer processes at the municipal level by means of the proposed toolbox and its ap-
501 plication.

502 However, the study possesses some methodological limitations that warrant consideration. Firstly, the
503 search of the scoping review was restricted to five European countries. This decision was primarily
504 made to identify training programs that have been implemented or tested within a context comparable
505 to the German public health system (AT, CH, and NL) or in a well-established context (GB). We are
506 aware of other good examples from the United States and Canada, among others (e.g., (3, 100–103)).
507 Due to the fact that we supplemented the results with 23 key-informant interviews and finally re-
508 flected and prioritized the entire framework with 48 experts, we assume relevant coverage. It is im-
509 portant to note, that our aim was not to capture all available records within the scoping review. How-
510 ever, the achieved saturation gives us confidence that the approach captured the majority of relevant
511 publications and reflects on the majority of relevant parameters. Some parameters (e.g. “piloting and
512 implementation” or “advancement and transferability”) were underrepresented in the identified train-
513 ing programs, which might be due to the fact that these aspects are so far not regularly considered in
514 training program development.

515 Secondly, the qualitative interview study had a strong focus on the German context, with limited in-
516 clusion of international experiences. Nevertheless, a small sample of well-informed international in-
517 terviewees provided valuable insights into current debates within their country contexts. While this
518 emphasis on individuals' experiences within the system strengthens the development of tailored train-
519 ing programs, it may limit the emergence of "out of the box" thinking.

520 Lastly, the multidisciplinary stakeholder workshop allowed for open discussions, benefiting from par-
521 ticipants diverse professional backgrounds, ranging from students to retired public health experts. This
522 facilitated the integration of different disciplines and varying levels of expertise and interests. Although
523 all topics were successfully discussed and prioritized as planned, it is worth considering alternative
524 approaches, such as a DELPHI process, to generate additional solutions. However, it should be noted
525 that the time and availability of the experts involved was limited and other approaches would have
526 been much more time-consuming. In this regard, the commenting phase following the stakeholder
527 workshop proved valuable in mitigating potential biases associated with group thinking processes,
528 while also partially addressing the time constraint limitation.

529 **7. Conclusions**

530 This study aimed to develop a toolbox that serves as a guide to develop training programs to equip
531 public health professionals and researchers with the knowledge, skills, and capacities relevant to im-
532 plementing evidence-informed approaches at the interface of academia and practice. Training pro-
533 grams that are explicitly tailored to local needs have the potential to foster a shared research culture

534 focusing on topics relevant for the PHS and establish a sustainable cross-institutional infrastructure
535 known as a local evidence ecosystem.

536 Applying the toolbox for training program development can contribute to the strengthening and en-
537 hancement of the local evidence ecosystem in which they are embedded. The efficacy of this approach
538 should and will be evaluated in future studies. If successful, a well-established evidence ecosystem can
539 provide the much-needed bridge between the evidence-generating and the evidence-utilizing system.
540 This mutually beneficial relationship benefits both public health academia and practice, as research
541 questions and projects tailored to local needs can lead to the development of customized solutions.
542 Consequently, an institutionally anchored knowledge-transfer and exchange ecosystem helps to en-
543 sure a transparent and evidence-informed fulfillment of local PHS tasks and activities.

544 Acknowledgments

545 The authors express their gratitude to the study participants for their time and dedication. Addition-
546 ally, we would like to extend our appreciation to Katharina Kreffter, Lena Raith, Meret Reuther, Joy
547 Pirig, and Luisa Urban for their valuable support throughout the project. Special thanks are extended
548 to all members of the EvidenzÖGD study project consortium, listed in the following table. We also
549 thank Jan M. Stratil for his valuable time and constructive feedback on earlier manuscript versions.

550 EvidenzÖGD study consortium

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Name</i>
Academy of Public Health Services (AÖGW)	- Laura Arnold - Simon Bimczok - Hannah Schütt - Dagmar Starke
Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf (HHU)	- Nico Dragano - Delbar Dilmaghani - Annika Höhmann - Simon Götz - Simone Weyers
Local Health Authority Düsseldorf	- Ravina Ambalavanar - Anke Kietzmann - Andrea Melville-Drewes - Michael Schäfer - Guido Schenuit - Trudpert Schoner

551

552 **References**

- 553 1. Yost J, Dobbins M, Traynor R, DeCorby K, Workentine S, Greco L. Tools to support evidence-in-
554 formed public health decision making. *BMC Public Health* 2014; 14:728.
- 555 2. Armstrong R, Waters E, Dobbins M, Anderson L, Moore L, Petticrew M et al. Knowledge translation
556 strategies to improve the use of evidence in public health decision making in local government: inter-
557 vention design and implementation plan. *Implement Sci* 2013; 8:121.
- 558 3. Dobbins M, Greco L, Yost J, Traynor R, Decorby-Watson K, Yousefi-Nooraie R. A description of a tai-
559 lored knowledge translation intervention delivered by knowledge brokers within public health de-
560 partments in Canada. *Health Res Policy Syst* 2019; 17(1):63.
- 561 4. Baltussen R, Jansen M, Oortwijn W. Evidence-Informed Deliberative Processes for Legitimate
562 Health Benefit Package Design - Part I: Conceptual Framework. *Int J Health Policy Manag* 2021.
- 563 5. Stratil JM, Voss M, Arnold L. WICID framework version 1.0: criteria and considerations to guide evi-
564 dence-informed decision-making on non-pharmacological interventions targeting COVID-19. *BMJ*
565 *Glob Health* 2020; 5(11).
- 566 6. Brownson RC, Fielding JE, Maylahn CM. Evidence-based public health: a fundamental concept for
567 public health practice. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2009; 30:175–201.
- 568 7. Langlois EV, Becerril Montekio V, Young T, Song K, Alcalde-Rabanal J, Tran N. Enhancing evidence
569 informed policymaking in complex health systems: lessons from multi-site collaborative approaches.
570 *Health Res Policy Syst* 2016; 14:20.
- 571 8. Oliver K, Pearce W. Three lessons from evidence-based medicine and policy: increase transpar-
572 ency, balance inputs and understand power. *Palgrave Commun* 2017; 3(1).
- 573 9. Stewart R, Dayal H, Langer L, van Rooyen C. The evidence ecosystem in South Africa: growing resili-
574 ence and institutionalisation of evidence use. *Palgrave Commun* 2019; 5(1).
- 575 10. WHO. Evidence, policy, impact: WHO guide for evidence-informed decision-making: WHO guide
576 for evidence-informed decision-making [Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.]. Geneva; 2021 [cited 2023
577 Mar 9]. Available from: URL: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240039872>.
- 578 11. Straus SE, Tetroe J, Graham ID, editors. Knowledge translation in health care: Moving from evi-
579 dence to practice. Second edition. Chichester, West Sussex, Hoboken, NJ: Wiley/BMJ Books; 2013.
580 Available from: URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/book/10.1002/9781118413555>.
- 581 12. Knowledge Translation in Health Care: Moving from Evidence to Practice - CIHR; 2015 [cited 2023
582 Aug 5]. Available from: URL: <https://cibr-irsc.gc.ca/e/40618.html>.

- 583 13. Caron RM, Hiller MD, Wyman WJ. Engaging local public health system partnerships to educate
584 the future public health workforce. *Journal of community health* 2013; 38(2):268–76.
- 585 14. van den Driessen Mareeuw F, Vaandrager L, Klerkx L, Naaldenberg J, Koelen M. Beyond bridging
586 the know-do gap: a qualitative study of systemic interaction to foster knowledge exchange in the
587 public health sector in The Netherlands. *BMC Public Health* 2015; 15:922.
- 588 15. OECD, editor. *Building Capacity for Evidence-Informed Policy-Making*. Paris: OECD; 2020. (OECD
589 Public Governance Reviews) [cited 2023 Jul 19]. Available from: URL: [https://www.oecd-il-](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/86331250-en/index.html?itemId=/content/publication/86331250-en)
590 [brary.org/sites/86331250-en/index.html?itemId=/content/publication/86331250-en](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/86331250-en/index.html?itemId=/content/publication/86331250-en).
- 591 16. Parkhurst JO. *The politics of evidence: From evidence-based policy to the good governance of evi-*
592 *dence*. Abingdon, Oxon, New York, NY: Routledge; 2017. (Routledge studies in governance and public
593 policy).
- 594 17. Greenhalgh T, Engebretsen E. *The science-policy relationship in times of crisis: An urgent call for a*
595 *pragmatist turn*. *Soc Sci Med* 2022; 306:115140.
- 596 18. SVR. *Resilienz im Gesundheitswesen: Wege zur Bewältigung künftiger Krisen Gutachten 2023*.
597 Berlin; 2023.
- 598 19. Arnold L, Teichert U. *Politischer Reformprozess im Zuge der COVID-19-Pandemie: Der Pakt für*
599 *den Öffentlichen Gesundheitsdienst*. *Public Health Forum* 2021; 29(1):47–50.
- 600 20. Blümel M, Spranger A, Achstetter K, Maresso A, Busse R. *Germany: Health System Review*. *Health*
601 *Systems in Transition* 2020; 22(6):1–272.
- 602 21. *The German healthcare system: Strong. Reliable. Proven*. Berlin; 2020.
- 603 22. Busse R, Riesberg A. *Health Care Systems in Transition: Germany*. Copenhagen; 2004.
- 604 23. Starke D, Arnold L. *Der ÖGD im 21. Jahrhundert. Chancen und Herausforderungen*. In: BARMER
605 *Gesundheitswesen aktuell* 2021; 2021. p. 68–95 Available from: URL: [https://www.research-](https://www.research-gate.net/publication/355667456_Der_OGD_im_21_Jahrhundert_Chancen_und_Herausforderungen)
606 [gate.net/publication/355667456_Der_OGD_im_21_Jahrhundert_Chancen_und_Herausforderungen](https://www.research-gate.net/publication/355667456_Der_OGD_im_21_Jahrhundert_Chancen_und_Herausforderungen).
- 607 24. Kuhn J, Wildner M. *Corona-Krise und öffentlicher Gesundheitsdienst*. *GGW* 2020; 20(4).
- 608 25. Szagun B, Kuhn J, Starke D. *Kommunale Gesundheitsförderungspolitik und das Präventionsgesetz*.
609 *Präv Gesundheitsf* 2016; 11(4):265–70.
- 610 26. Holst J. *COVID-19: Besondere Herausforderungen an Public Health in Theorie und Praxis*. *Gesund-*
611 *heitswesen* 2020; 82(11):829–35.
- 612 27. *Beirat Pakt ÖGD. Wissenschaft und Forschung im und für einen zukunftsfähigen ÖGD*. Berlin;
613 2023. *Strukturelle und zukunftsorientierte Weiterentwicklung des Öffentlichen Gesundheitsdienstes*.

- 614 Available from: URL: [https://www.bundesgesundheitsministerium.de/fileadmin/Dateien/3_Down-](https://www.bundesgesundheitsministerium.de/fileadmin/Dateien/3_Downloads/O/OEGD/Beirat_POEGD_3_Bericht_Wissensch_Forschung_OEGD_bf.pdf)
615 [loads/O/OEGD/Beirat_POEGD_3_Bericht_Wissensch_Forschung_OEGD_bf.pdf](https://www.bundesgesundheitsministerium.de/fileadmin/Dateien/3_Downloads/O/OEGD/Beirat_POEGD_3_Bericht_Wissensch_Forschung_OEGD_bf.pdf).
- 616 28. BMG. Stärkung der Zusammenarbeit zwischen Öffentlichem Gesundheitsdienst und Public-
617 Health-Forschung; 2020. Öffentliche Bekanntmachung des Bundesministeriums für Gesundheit
618 (BMG) veröffentlicht am 27.02.2020 [cited 2023 Jul 28]. Available from: URL: [https://projektrae-](https://projektrae-ger.dlr.de/de/foerderung/foerderangebote-und-programme/staerkung-der-zusammenarbeit-)
619 [ger.dlr.de/de/foerderung/foerderangebote-und-programme/staerkung-der-zusammenarbeit-](https://projektrae-ger.dlr.de/de/foerderung/foerderangebote-und-programme/staerkung-der-zusammenarbeit-)
620 [zwischen-oeffentlichem-gesundheitsdienst-und-public-health](https://projektrae-ger.dlr.de/de/foerderung/foerderangebote-und-programme/staerkung-der-zusammenarbeit-).
- 621 29. Leopoldina. Public Health in Deutschland: Strukturen, Entwicklungen und globale Herausforde-
622 rungen. Halle (Saale), München, Mainz; 2015. Available from: URL: [http://nbn-resol-](http://nbn-resol-ving.org/urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:2-106000)
623 [ving.org/urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:2-106000](http://nbn-resol-ving.org/urn:nbn:de:gbv:3:2-106000).
- 624 30. Der Pakt für den Öffentlichen Gesundheitsdienst. Empfehlungen für Umsetzung und Ausgestal-
625 tung: Empfehlungen für Umsetzung und Ausgestaltung; 2020 Jul 8 [cited 2020 Sep 1]. Available from:
626 URL: <https://zukunftsforum-public-health.de/stellungnahme-pakt-oegd/>.
- 627 31. Geene R, Gerhardus A, Grossmann B, Kuhn J, Kurth BM, Moebus S et al. Health in All Policies –
628 Entwicklungen, Schwerpunkte und Umsetzungsstrategien für Deutschland; Ausgearbeitet in einer AG
629 des Zukunftsforums Public Health in Kooperation mit der Bundesvereinigung Prävention und Gesund-
630 heitsförderung und Gesundheit Berlin-Brandenburg; 2020 [cited 2020 Mar 1]. Available from: URL:
631 <https://zukunftsforum-public-health.de/health-in-all-policies/>.
- 632 32. Geene R, Kurth BM, Matusall S. Health in All Policies – Entwicklungen, Schwerpunkte und Umset-
633 zungsstrategien für Deutschland. Gesundheitswesen 2020; 82(7):e72-e76.
- 634 33. Czabanowska K, Smith T, Könings KD, Sumskas L, Otok R, Bjegovic-Mikanovic V et al. In search for
635 a public health leadership competency framework to support leadership curriculum-a consensus
636 study. Eur J Public Health 2014; 24(5):850–6.
- 637 34. Arnold L, Starke D. Evidenzinformiertes Planen für Gesundheit - Koordination und Steuerung. In:
638 Klapper B, Cichon I, editors. Neustart! Für die Zukunft unseres Gesundheitswesens. Berlin: MWV;
639 2021. p. 581–8.
- 640 35. AÖGW, SAMA, Regierungspräsidium Stuttgart, AGL und LGL, Bayerisches Staatsministerium für
641 Gesundheit und Pflege, Sächsisches Staatsministerium für Soziales und Verbraucherschutz, editor.
642 Curriculum Kursweiterbildung Öffentliches Gesundheitswesen [Akademie für Öffentliches Gesund-
643 heitswesen (AÖGW); Sozial- und Arbeitsmedizinische Akademie Baden-Württemberg e.V. (SAMA) in
644 Verbindung mit der Universität Ulm (SAMA); Regierungspräsidium Stuttgart; Akademie für Gesund-
645 heit und Lebensmittelsicherheit (AGL); Bayerisches Landesamt für Gesundheit und Lebensmittelsi-

- 646 cherheit (LGL); Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Gesundheit und Pflege; Sächsisches Staatsministe-
647 rium für Soziales und Verbraucherschutz]. Düsseldorf; 2019 [cited 2023 Apr 18]. Available from: URL:
648 <https://www.akademie-oegw.de/aus-und-weiterbildung/facharzttaerztin-fuer-oeffentliches-gesund->
649 [heitswesen.](https://www.akademie-oegw.de/aus-und-weiterbildung/facharzttaerztin-fuer-oeffentliches-gesund-)
- 650 36. Hoffmann D. Der perfekte Start in eine ÖGD-Karriere; 2022 [cited 2023 Mar 16]. Available from:
651 URL: <https://arztundkarriere.com/statt-weiterbildung-trainee-oegd-karriere-fulda/>.
- 652 37. Robert Koch-Institut. Postgraduierten-ausbildung für angewandte Epidemiologie (PAE) am RKI:
653 (Deutsches Feldepidemiologie-Trainingsprogramm, FETP): Abteilung für Infektionsepidemiologie am
654 RKI; 2021 [cited 2021 Nov 22]. Available from: URL: [https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/Institut/OrgEin-](https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/Institut/OrgEinheiten/Abt3/Infektepidem_Training.html)
655 [heiten/Abt3/Infektepidem_Training.html](https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/Institut/OrgEinheiten/Abt3/Infektepidem_Training.html).
- 656 38. Dresing T, Pehl T. Praxisbuch Interview, Transkription & Analyse: Anleitungen und Regelsysteme
657 für qualitativ Forschende. 8. Auflage. Marburg: Eigenverlag; 2018.
- 658 39. Mayring P. Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse: Grundlagen und Techniken. 12., überarb. Aufl. Weinheim:
659 Beltz; 2015. (Beltz Pädagogik).
- 660 40. Mayring P. Einführung in die qualitative Sozialforschung: Eine Anleitung zu qualitativem Denken.
661 5., überarb. und neu ausgestattete Aufl. Weinheim: Beltz; 2002. (Studium Paedagogik). Available
662 from: URL: [http://haw-hamburg.ciando.com/shop/book/short/index.cfm/fuseac-](http://haw-hamburg.ciando.com/shop/book/short/index.cfm/fuseaction/short/bok_id/11998)
663 [tion/short/bok_id/11998.](http://haw-hamburg.ciando.com/shop/book/short/index.cfm/fuseaction/short/bok_id/11998)
- 664 41. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International Jour-*
665 *nal of Social Research Methodology* 2005; 8(1):19–32.
- 666 42. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan-a web and mobile app for system-
667 atic reviews. *Syst Rev* 2016; 5(1):210.
- 668 43. Thomas J, Harden A. Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic re-
669 views. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2008; 8:45.
- 670 44. Schlicht W, Zinsmeister M. Gesundheitsförderung systematisch planen und effektiv intervenieren.
671 Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2015.
- 672 45. Renault V. SWOT Analysis: Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats: Center for Com-
673 munity Health and Development; 2023 [cited 2023 Mar 12]. Available from: URL:
674 [https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/assessment/assessing-community-needs-and-re-](https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/assessment/assessing-community-needs-and-resources/swot-analysis/main)
675 [sources/swot-analysis/main.](https://ctb.ku.edu/en/table-of-contents/assessment/assessing-community-needs-and-resources/swot-analysis/main)
- 676 46. David FR. Strategic management: Concepts and cases. 13th ed. Upper Saddle River N.J.: Prentice
677 Hall; 2011.

- 678 47. Moran-Ellis J, Alexander VD, Cronin A, Dickinson M, Fielding J, Slaney J et al. Triangulation and in-
679 tegration: processes, claims and implications. *Qualitative Research* 2006; 6(1):45–59.
- 680 48. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a
681 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2007; 19(6):349–57. Availa-
682 ble from: URL: <https://academic.oup.com/intqhc/article/19/6/349/1791966>.
- 683 49. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping
684 Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med* 2018; 169(7):467–73.
- 685 50. Batt A, Williams B, Rich J, Tavares W. A Six-Step Model for Developing Competency Frameworks
686 in the Healthcare Professions. *Front Med (Lausanne)* 2021; 8:789828. Available from: URL:
687 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmed.2021.789828/full>.
- 688 51. Cheetham M, Wiseman A, Khazaeli B, Gibson E, Gray P, van der Graaf P et al. Embedded research:
689 a promising way to create evidence-informed impact in public health? *J Public Health (Oxf)* 2018;
690 40:i64-i70.
- 691 52. Currie CA, Nottage C, Spurrier N, Madden DL. Comparison of public health specialty training in
692 Australia and England. *Public Health* 2020; 188:35–41.
- 693 53. Dorner TE, Diem G. Public Health Ausbildung in Österreich. Ein Überblick; 2014 2014.
- 694 54. Erwin PC, Brownson CA, Eyler AA, Hefelfinger J, Deshpande AD, Macchi M et al. Long-Term Evalu-
695 ation of a Course on Evidence-Based Public Health in the U.S. and Europe; 2021 2021.
- 696 55. Gray SF, Evans D. Developing the public health workforce: training and recognizing specialists in
697 public health from backgrounds other than medicine: experience in the UK. *Public Health Reviews*
698 2018; 39:14.
- 699 56. Harrison RA, Gemmell I, Reed K. The effect of using different competence frameworks to audit
700 the content of a masters program in public health. *Front Public Health* 2015; 3:143.
- 701 57. Heller RF, Zurynski R, Barrett A, Oaiya O, Madhok R. Open Online Courses in Public Health: experi-
702 ence from Peoples-uni. *F1000Research* 2017; 6:170.
- 703 58. Idler N, Huber J, Mutius S, Welbergen L, Fischer MR. Prevention and health promotion from the-
704 ory to practice: The interprofessional MeMPE Summer University for students of Medicine, Master of
705 Public Health and Epidemiology. *GMS journal for medical education* 2016; 33(5):Doc72.
- 706 59. Jansen MWJ, Hoeijmakers M. A masterclass to teach public health professionals to conduct prac-
707 tice-based research to promote evidence-based practice: a case study from The Netherlands. *J Public
708 Health Manag Pract* 2013; 19(1):83–92.

- 709 60. Könings KD, Jong N, Lohrmann C, Sumskas L, Smith T, O'Connor SJ et al. Is blended learning and
710 problem-based learning course design suited to develop future public health leaders? An explorative
711 European study. *Public Health Reviews* 2018; 39:13.
- 712 61. Ramsay A, Harries AD, Zachariah R, Bissell K, Hinderaker SG, Edginton M et al. The Structured Op-
713 erational Research and Training Initiative for public health programmes. *Public health action* 2014;
714 4(2):79–84.
- 715 62. Baxter M, Islam G, Parsons H, Enoch DA, Fry C, Kiernan M et al. A new infection trainee education
716 programme from the Healthcare Infection Society. *J Hosp Infect* 2016; 93(2):157–8.
- 717 63. Dey P, Brown J, Sandars J, Young Y, Ruggles R, Bracebridge S. The United Kingdom Field Epidemi-
718 ology Training Programme: meeting programme objectives. *Euro Surveill* 2019; 24(36).
- 719 64. Diem G, Brownson RC, Grabauskas V, Shatchkute A, Stachenko S. Prevention and control of non-
720 communicable diseases through evidence-based public health: implementing the NCD 2020 action
721 plan. *Global health promotion* 2016; 23(3):5–13.
- 722 65. Peik SM, Mohan KM, Baba T, Donadel M, Labruto A, Loh LC. Comparison of public health and pre-
723 ventive medicine physician specialty training in six countries: Identifying challenges and opportuni-
724 ties. *Medical Teacher* 2016; 38(11):1146–51.
- 725 66. van de Venter E, Bracebridge S, McCulloch J, Oliver I, Thompson M. Developing capacity in field
726 epidemiology in England; 2014 2014.
- 727 67. McCulloch J, Bracebridge S, Thompson M, van de Venter E, Oliver I. Developing capacity in field
728 epidemiology in England. *Perspectives in public health* 2014; 134(5):297–9.
- 729 68. Smith T, Stankunas M, Czabanowska K, Jong N, O'Connor S, Fowler Davis S. Principles of all-inclu-
730 sive public health: developing a public health leadership curriculum. *Public Health* 2015; 129(2):182–
731 4.
- 732 69. Gillam S, Rodrigues V, Myles P. Public health education in UK medical schools-towards consensus.
733 *J Public Health (Oxf)* 2016; 38(3):522–5.
- 734 70. Turner-Wilson AL, Mills AM, Rees K. Can nurses rise to the public health challenge? How a novel
735 solution in nurse education can address this contemporary question. *Nurse education today* 2017;
736 57:65–7.
- 737 71. Buunaaisie C, Manyara AM, Annett H, Bird EL, Bray I, Ige J et al. Employability and career experi-
738 ences of international graduates of MSc Public Health: a mixed methods study. *Public Health* 2018;
739 160:62–9.

- 740 72. Chastonay P, Vu NV, Humair J-P, Mpinga EK, Bernheim L. Design, implementation and evaluation
741 of a community health training program in an integrated problem-based medical curriculum: a fif-
742 teen-year experience at the University of Geneva Faculty of Medicine. *Medical education online*
743 2012; 17:16741.
- 744 73. Bennetts C, Elliston K, Maconachie M. Continuing professional development for public health: an
745 andragogical approach. *Public Health* 2012; 126(6):541–5.
- 746 74. Gerhardus A, Schilling I, Voss M. Public Health als anwendungsorientiertes Fach und Multidisziplin
747 – „Forschendes Lernen“ als Antwort auf die Herausforderungen für Lehren und Lernen? *Gesund-*
748 *heitswesen* 2017; 79(3):141–3.
- 749 75. Tran A. In-house peer supported literature search training: a public health perspective. *Health in-*
750 *formation and libraries journal* 2017; 34(3):258–62.
- 751 76. Salway S, Piercy H, Chowbey P, Brewins L, Dhoot P. Improving capacity in ethnicity and health re-
752 search: report of a tailored programme for NHS Public Health practitioners. *Primary health care re-*
753 *search & development* 2013; 14(4):330–40.
- 754 77. WHO. European Action Plan for Strengthening Public Health Capacities and Services. Malta: Re-
755 gional Committee for Europe. Sixty-second session; 2012 EUR/RC62/12 Rev.1 +
756 EUR/RC62/Conf.Doc./6 Rev.2 [cited 2021 Jun 18].
- 757 78. WHO. The Helsinki Statement on Health in All Policies. Helsinki: The 8th Global Conference on
758 Health Promotion, Helsinki, Finland, 10-14 June 2013; 2013 [cited 2019 Oct 10]. Available from: URL:
759 <https://www.who.int/healthpromotion/conferences/8gchp/en/>.
- 760 79. Verschuuren M, van Oers H. *Population Health Monitoring*. Cham: Springer International Publish-
761 ing; 2019.
- 762 80. WHO-ASPHER Competency Framework for the Public Health Workforce in the European Region.
763 Copenhagen; 2020.
- 764 81. Bornioli A, Evans D, Cotter C. Evaluation of the UK Public Health Skills and Knowledge Framework
765 (PHSKF): implications for international competency frameworks. *BMC Public Health* 2020; 20(1):956.
- 766 82. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Core competencies in applied infectious dis-
767 ease epidemiology in Europe; 2022 [cited 2022 Nov 15]. Available from: URL: [https://www.ecdc.eu-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/core-competencies-applied-infectious-disease-epidemiology-europe)
768 [ropa.eu/en/publications-data/core-competencies-applied-infectious-disease-epidemiology-europe](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications-data/core-competencies-applied-infectious-disease-epidemiology-europe).
- 769 83. Catalogue of Learning Objectives Epidemiology: Basics of Epidemiology [cited 2022 Nov 14]. Avail-
770 able from: URL: <http://www.epiteaching.org/Catalogue-Learning-Objectives-Epi.pdf>.

- 771 84. European Education Area. European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS); 2023 [cited
772 2023 Aug 5]. Available from: URL: <https://education.ec.europa.eu/education-levels/higher-education/inclusive-and-connected-higher-education/european-credit-transfer-and-accumulation-system>.
- 774 85. Sell K, Hommes F, Fischer F, Arnold L. Multi-, Inter-, and Transdisciplinarity within the Public
775 Health Workforce: A Scoping Review to Assess Definitions and Applications of Concepts. *Int J Environ*
776 *Res Public Health* 2022; 19(17):10902.
- 777 86. Gershuni O, Orr JM, Vogel A, Park K, Leider JP, Resnick BA et al. A Systematic Review on Profes-
778 sional Regulation and Credentialing of Public Health Workforce. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2023;
779 20(5):4101.
- 780 87. Currie CA, Nottage C, Spurrier N, Madden DL. Comparison of public health specialty training in
781 Australia and England. *Public Health* 2020; 188:35–41.
- 782 88. University of Bielefeld. Promotionsstudiengang Doctor of Public Health - Universität Bielefeld;
783 2022 [cited 2022 Jul 3]. Available from: URL: [https://www.uni-bielefeld.de/fakultaeten/gesund-](https://www.uni-bielefeld.de/fakultaeten/gesundheitswissenschaften/studiengaenge/drph/)
784 [heitswissenschaften/studiengaenge/drph/](https://www.uni-bielefeld.de/fakultaeten/gesundheitswissenschaften/studiengaenge/drph/).
- 785 89. Pettenkofer School of Public Health, Munich Medical Research School. Ph.D. Program - Medical
786 Research in Epidemiology & Public Health - IBE - LMU München; 2022 [cited 2022 Jul 3]. Available
787 from: URL: <https://www.ibe.med.uni-muenchen.de/phd-studiengang/index.html>.
- 788 90. Hecker K, Moritz K. Ärztemangel – Hamburg geht neue Wege. *Gesundheitswesen* 2018;
789 80(04):390.
- 790 91. Dagmar Starke, Simone Weyers. Wie werde ich Master of Science (M.Sc.) in Public Health?; 2019
791 [cited 2021 Nov 22]. Available from: URL: [https://www.akademie-oegw.de/programm/aus-und-](https://www.akademie-oegw.de/programm/aus-und-weiterbildung/master-of-science-public-health.html)
792 [weiterbildung/master-of-science-public-health.html](https://www.akademie-oegw.de/programm/aus-und-weiterbildung/master-of-science-public-health.html).
- 793 92. RWU Hochschule Ravensburg-Weingarten University of Applied Sciences. Master Angewandte
794 Gesundheits-wissenschaft | Studiengänge | RWU Hochschule Ravensburg-Weingarten University of
795 Applied Sciences; 2022 [cited 2022 Jul 3]. Available from: URL: [https://www.rwu.de/stud-](https://www.rwu.de/studieren/studiengaenge/angewandte-gesundheits-wissenschaft)
796 [ieren/studiengaenge/angewandte-gesundheits-wissenschaft](https://www.rwu.de/studieren/studiengaenge/angewandte-gesundheits-wissenschaft).
- 797 93. Schloemer T, Schröder-Bäck P. Criteria for evaluating transferability of health interventions: a sys-
798 tematic review and thematic synthesis. *Implement Sci* 2018; 13(1):88.
- 799 94. APHA. Supporting Research and Evidence-Based Public Health Practice in State and Local Health
800 Agencies; 2017 Nov 7. APHA Policy Statement 20171 [cited 2023 Feb 24]. Available from: URL:
801 [https://apha.org/policies-and-advocacy/public-health-policy-statements/policy-data-](https://apha.org/policies-and-advocacy/public-health-policy-statements/policy-data-base/2018/01/18/supporting-research-and-evidence-based-public-health-practice)
802 [base/2018/01/18/supporting-research-and-evidence-based-public-health-practice](https://apha.org/policies-and-advocacy/public-health-policy-statements/policy-data-base/2018/01/18/supporting-research-and-evidence-based-public-health-practice).

- 803 95. Kneale D, Rojas-García A, Thomas J. Obstacles and opportunities to using research evidence in lo-
804 cal public health decision-making in England. *Health Res Policy Syst* 2019; 17(1):61.
- 805 96. Kneale D, Rojas-García A, Raine R, Thomas J. The use of evidence in English local public health de-
806 cision-making: a systematic scoping review. *Implement Sci* 2017; 12(1):53.
- 807 97. Orton L, Lloyd-Williams F, Taylor-Robinson D, O'Flaherty M, Capewell S. The use of research evi-
808 dence in public health decision making processes: systematic review. *PLoS ONE* 2011; 6(7):e21704.
- 809 98. Hanney SR, Gonzalez-Block MA, Buxton MJ, Kogan m. The utilisation of health research in policy-
810 making: concepts, examples and methods of assessment. *Health Res Policy Syst* 2003; 1:2.
- 811 99. Petticrew M, Whitehead M, Macintyre SJ, Graham H, Egan M. Evidence for public health policy on
812 inequalities: 1: the reality according to policymakers. *JECH* 2004; 58(10):811–6.
- 813 100. MacVarish K, Kenefick H, Fidler A, Cohen B, Orellana Y, Todd K. Building Professionalism Through
814 Management Training: New England Public Health Training Center's Low-Cost, High-Impact Model. *J*
815 *Public Health Manag Pract* 2018; 24(5):479–86.
- 816 101. Dopson SA, Griffey S, Ghiya N, Laird S, Cyphert A, Iskander J. Structured Mentoring for Work-
817 force Engagement and Professional Development in Public Health Settings. *Health Promot Pract*
818 2017; 18(3):327–31.
- 819 102. Bogaert K, Castrucci BC, Gould E, Rider N, Whang C, Corcoran E. Top Training Needs of the Gov-
820 ernmental Public Health Workforce. *J Public Health Manag Pract* 2019; 25 Suppl 2, Public Health
821 Workforce Interests and Needs Survey 2017:S134-S144.
- 822 103. Ablah E, Weist EM, McElligott JE, Biesiadecki LA, Gotsch AR, Keck CW et al. Public health prepar-
823 edness and response competency model methodology. *Am J Disaster Med* 2013; 8(1):49–56.
- 824

825 Additional Information

826 Author Contributions:

Contributor Role	Role Definition	Authors
Conceptualization	Ideas; formulation or evolution of overarching research goals and aims.	LA
Data Curation	Management activities to annotate (produce metadata), scrub data and maintain research data (including software code, where it is necessary for interpreting the data itself) for initial use and later reuse.	LA
Formal Analysis	Application of statistical, mathematical, computational, or other formal techniques to analyze or synthesize study data.	LA, SB
Funding Acquisition	Acquisition of the financial support for the project leading to this publication.	LA, DS
Investigation	Conducting a research and investigation process, specifically performing the experiments, or data/evidence collection.	LA, SB
Methodology	Development or design of methodology; creation of models	LA, SB
Project Administration	Management and coordination responsibility for the research activity planning and execution.	LA
Supervision	Oversight and leadership responsibility for the research activity planning and execution, including mentorship external to the core team.	LA, TC, HB, DS
Validation	Verification, whether as a part of the activity or separate, of the overall replication/reproducibility of results/experiments and other research outputs.	LA, SB
Visualization	Preparation, creation and/or presentation of the published work, specifically visualization/data presentation.	LA, SB
Writing – Original Draft Preparation	Creation and/or presentation of the published work, specifically writing the initial draft (including substantive translation).	LA, SB
Writing – Review & Editing	Preparation, creation and/or presentation of the published work by those from the original research group, specifically critical review, commentary or revision – including pre- or post-publication stage	LA, SB, TC, HB, DS

827 **Funding:** The project is part of the funding priority "Strengthening Collaboration between Public Health
828 Services and Public Health Research" of the Federal Ministry of Health and was funded by the federal
829 government. Number: ZMI1-2521FSB201

830 **Institutional Review Board Statement:** The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration
831 of Helsinki and data collection was approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee of Faculty of Med-
832 icine at the Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf, protocol code 2021-1646_1 (2021-12-16).

833 **Informed Consent Statement:** Written Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in
834 the qualitative study.

835 **Data Availability Statement:** The transcripts of the qualitative interviews are not available in full text
836 for privacy reasons. An overview of the coding tree underlying the scoping review and a tabular sum-
837 mary of the included studies can be found in the appendix. The authors are pleased to provide further
838 results upon request. The learning objectives catalog and the associated handbook will be published
839 as open access after completion of the evaluation of the pilot phase.

840 **Conflicts of Interest:** none

841 **Supporting Information (Appendix)**

842 **Table S1.** Search strategy for the database PUBMED

843 **Table S2.** Search strategy for the database LIVIVO

844 **Table S3.** Overarching coding tree structure

845 **Table S4.** Sampling plan

846 **Table S5.** Characteristics of the studies included in the scoping review.

What **tasks and activities** are required for working at the interface? (RQ-1)

Resulting in a list of tasks and activities


What are the **skill-sets and competencies** are needed for working at the interface? (RQ-2)

Resulting in a list of competencies and skills

What **training programs** are available? What are their defining characteristics? (RQ-3)

Resulting in a list of existing training programs

Qualitative Interviews (1) and Scoping Review (2)



Triangulation and Synthesis (4)

Development of a **framework** to design tailored training programs

Resulting in a toolbox with short guidance for application

Stakeholder Workshop (3)

SWOT analysis of available training programs

Resulting in a list of aspects relevant to determine a suitable training format

Critical appraisal of pre-defined tasks and activities

Resulting in a list of prioritized fields of activity at the interface

Identification of studies via databases and registers

Identification

Records identified from:
PubMed (n = 1,468)
LIVIVO (n = 238)

Records removed before screening:
- Duplicate records removed (n = 67)

Screening

Records screened in Title-Abstract
Screening (n = 1,639)

Records excluded in the Title-Abstract
Screening

- wrong outcome (n = 1,252)
- wrong population (n = 253)
- context (n = 83)
- wrong language (n = 2)

Records screened in Full-Text
Screening (n = 49)

Records excluded in the Full-Text Screening

- wrong outcome (n = 3)
- wrong population (n = 3)
- context (n = 18)

Included

Records included in review
(n = 25)


Step 1: Initiation

- (1) Form a core team
- (2) Reflect on activities and structures of evidence transfer at the interface between academia and practice
- (3) Define goals, needs, resources and competencies for all institutions represented in the core team

Step 2: Preparation

- (1) Map goals, interests & needs, resources & competencies, as well as necessary (pre-) conditions of institutions represented in the core team
- (2) Resolve potential conflicts
- (3) Perform a stakeholder analysis based on the results of step 2.1 & 2.2
- (4) Engage relevant stakeholders, expand the core team and form a program advisory group
- (5) Determination of a development plan including time and milestone planning

Step 3: Development



Step 4: Refinement

- (1) Consolidate a first version of the qualification model in the core team
- (2) Present the results to the program advisory group, including future participants, policy makers and experts so far not involved in step 1-3
- (3) Adapt the model according to gathered feedback

Step 5: Implementation

- (1) Pilot the model to test feasibility and practicability
- (2) Adapt the model accordingly
- (3) Implement the model in the respective setting

Step 6: Evaluation

- (1) Develop an evaluation and quality assessment strategy for the program
- (2) Implement the defined quality assurance tools
- (3) Adapt the model accordingly

Step 7: Advancement

- (1) Develop a strategy for continuous development to update and maintain the program over time
- (2) Assess transferability of the adapted model to other contexts and settings
- (3) Define a dissemination strategy