

Running head: K* SCOPING REVIEW PROTOCOL

1 Knowledge mobilization with and for equity-deserving communities invested in research: A
2 scoping review protocol

3

4

5 Ramy Barhouche^{1¶}, Samson Tse^{1¶}, Fiona Inglis^{2&}, Debbie Chaves^{2&}, Erin Allison³, Tina Colaco³,
6 Melody E. Morton Ninomiya^{3¶*}

7

8 ¹Department of Psychology, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

9 ²Library, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

10 ³Department of Health Sciences, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

11

12 [¶]These authors contributed equally to this work.

13 [&]These authors also contributed equally to this work.

14

15 *Corresponding author

16 Email: mmortonninomiya@wlu.ca (MMN)

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

Abstract

The practice of putting research into action is known by various names, depending on disciplinary norms. Knowledge mobilization, translation, and transfer (collectively referred to as K*) are three common terminologies used in research literature. Knowledge-to-action opportunities and gaps in academic research often remain obscure to non-academic researchers in communities, policy and decision makers, and practitioners who could benefit from up-to-date information on health and wellbeing. Academic research training, funding, and performance metrics rarely prioritize or address non-academic community needs from research. We propose to conduct a scoping review on reported K* in community-driven research contexts, examining the governance, processes, methods, and benefits of K*, and mapping who, what, where, and when K* terminology is used. This protocol paper outlines our approach to gathering, screening, analyzing, and reporting on available published literature from four databases.

Keywords: knowledge translation, knowledge mobilization, implementation science, scoping review, community-based research, equity

33 Introduction

34 Bridging the gap between produced research knowledge and action, policy, and/or practice has
35 been a common goal across disciplines for the past few decades, often involving synthesis,
36 analysis, dissemination, and application (1). However, there has been some confusion in the use
37 of various terms and definitions to represent this goal and its application process. In academia,
38 for example, terms such as *knowledge translation*, *knowledge mobilization*, and *knowledge*
39 *transfer* are widely utilized (2). Similarly, Canada's *Tri-Agencies*, the three main federal funding
40 agencies for research, employ varied terminology and definitions for disseminating research
41 knowledge. For instance, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) (3)
42 defines knowledge mobilization as an umbrella term encompassing activities related to the
43 production and use of research results, including synthesis, dissemination, transfer, exchange,
44 and co-creation by researchers and knowledge users. The Canadian Institutes of Health Research
45 (CIHR), on the other hand, use terms like knowledge translation, integrated knowledge
46 translation (IKT), and end-of-grant knowledge translation, emphasizing a dynamic and iterative
47 process of knowledge synthesis, dissemination, exchange, and ethically-sound application (4).
48 The manuscript will adopt the term K* to collectively refer to these terms (5).

49
50 There has been a recent trend for utilizing research findings to inform practices, policies, and
51 decisions through K* efforts. However, there is still a significant gap in research application, and
52 knowledge derived from research has not effectively translated into health practices and policies
53 (6). The gap between research findings and application can be attributed to sociocultural,
54 organizational, and economic factors that play a significant role influencing the research and
55 mobilization process (1,7). Furthermore, academics may lack readiness to engage in K* work, or

56 if they do, their existing heavy workload limits their capacity to do so (8). This disconnect
57 significantly impacts community members, who are often knowledge users.

58

59 Similarly, community-based participatory research (CBPR) is recognized as a shift in the
60 research paradigm that can enhance the utilization of research knowledge by involving
61 knowledge users more extensively in the research process (9). Like K*, CBPR also includes
62 different aspects of shared and active community engagement in the research process, as well as
63 enhancing community health through the integration of research and action (10). In particular,
64 CBPR complements IKT by emphasizing a democratic process of co-creating knowledge that
65 aligns closely with the needs of knowledge users (9). Thus, CBPR is essential for research that
66 aims to enhance the health and wellbeing of individuals who are systematically marginalized or
67 discriminated against. Traditional research has often been characterized by an unequal power
68 dynamic between researchers and participants, a gap that CBPR can address (11). For example,
69 Christensen (12) and Morton Ninomiya et al. (13) have demonstrated the effectiveness of CBPR
70 in engaging Indigenous communities in a respectful and culturally responsive way that led to
71 impactful research outcomes. The essence of K* lies in the significance it brings to research. To
72 promote equity and sovereignty-deserving communities, it can be argued that it is ethically
73 imperative to ensure that community-driven K* needs are integrated into CBPR.

74

75 **Objectives**

76 With the diverse terminology and definitions used to describe the "knowledge-to-action" gap,
77 there is understandable confusion and potential frustration regarding the operationalization and
78 use of K* terms. A preliminary search of databases revealed no current or ongoing scoping

79 reviews on this topic. The involvement of community members from equity seeking, deserving,
80 or denied groups is essential for research committed to 1) addressing health and wellness
81 inequities faced by different communities and/or 2) “nothing about us without us”. We propose
82 to conduct a scoping review study.

83

84 **Research Questions**

85 The *scoping review* will answer the following questions about research aimed at supporting and
86 serving non-academic equity and/or sovereignty-seeking/deserving/denied communities:

- 87 1. How are terms and concepts around knowledge mobilization (K*) being used, defined, and
88 cited in published literature?
- 89 2. In what ways are community partners involved in K* priorities, planning, and efforts?
- 90 3. What are reported wellbeing-related impacts and outcomes being addressed within
91 communities through K* efforts?

92

93

Methods

94 **Search Strategy**

95 This scoping review protocol was developed using the JBI Manual for Evidence
96 Synthesis (14) and adheres to the PRISMA-ScR as developed by Tricco et al. (15). Our protocol is
97 registered with Open Science Framework (OSF). As a team, we identified 11 papers (16–26) that
98 met all inclusion criteria to use as a test set while we developed our search strategy. After
99 extensive testing, refining, and discussions as a team about concepts and terminology, the initial
100 Medline (ProQuest) search strategy was finalized by two academic librarians [DC, FI]. This

101 search was then translated by [RB] for PsycINFO (ProQuest), CINAHL with Full Text
102 (EBSCOhost), and Web of Science Core Collection (Clarivate).

103
104 The search strategy focuses on four primary concepts: vulnerable populations (i.e., equity and/or
105 sovereignty-seeking/deserving/denied communities), community-based research, knowledge
106 translation, and health and wellbeing. The search terms around the concept of “vulnerable
107 populations” were adapted from four published search strategies (27–29). The terms around the
108 concept of K* search strategy was adapted from Morton Ninomiya et al. (30). We limited the
109 search by date, including publications in 2010 onwards due to the increased international
110 discourse and interest in K* in health and wellness research beginning at that time. Searching for
111 research with equity and/or sovereignty-seeking/deserving/denied communities, often framed as
112 “vulnerable populations”, is challenging because it sometimes includes offensive and outdated
113 terms that are exclusionary. These terms were included in the search strategy to ensure a
114 comprehensive search. The authors acknowledge the harmful nature of these terms and inform
115 the reader of their inclusion. We will conduct a backwards and forwards search of the references
116 in 1) review and discussion papers that do not meet the inclusion criteria, and 2) all included
117 papers after full-text screening – in search of additional K* terms that we may have missed. See
118 supplementary file 1 for the full Medline search strategy.

119

120 **Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria**

121 The scoping review will only include primary studies published in English in which authors
122 identify 1) their understanding of K* terminology with a definition, description, or citation; 2)
123 *how* academic researchers engaged with non-academic communities; 3) *what* K* efforts took

124 place; and 4) *how* K* efforts impacted individual, family, and/or community wellbeing. We will
 125 exclude grey literature sources including reports, books, commentaries, and theses/dissertations
 126 from the scoping review. Because of the rise of international discourse and explicit interest in K*
 127 in health and wellness research that started around the 2010s, the date limit will be from 2010 to
 128 present. Only papers that are about equity and/or sovereignty seeking/deserving/denied
 129 communities will be included. The inclusion and exclusion criteria and their rationale are listed
 130 in Table 1 below.

131 **Table 1. Inclusion/exclusion Criteria and Rationale**

Title and Abstract Screening Phase		
Include	Exclude	Rationale
Printed in English.	Printed in languages other than English.	It is the only shared fluent language of the research team.
Published in 2010 or later.	Published before 2010 or older.	We want the most updated, especially considering the rapid changes in KT literature. We are interested in seeing how it has been developed in the past 15 years or so. Google trends show consistent usage in search terms from 2010 and beyond.
Primary research papers, including case studies.	Discussion papers, autoethnographies, and reviews.	We want papers that are researching and applying K*.
Peer-reviewed and published.	Grey literature.	Interested in community-partnered academic research that often reflects disciplinary training, practice, language, and funding. For a global study, including grey literature would not be feasible.
Use specific terminology to describe K* in their paper.	Papers that do not use a specific term(s) to refer to K* initiatives, even if they describe elements of K*.	We are interested in terms people use to name and describe K* initiatives they facilitate.
The study addresses or supports something that aims to improve wellbeing for equity	Exclude studies focused on capitalistic endeavors for monetary gain and power, or focused on communities that	We are only interested in K* efforts on studies that aim to improve forms of wellbeing for communities

and/or sovereignty-deserving communities.	are not equity or sovereignty-deserving.	who do not have equitable access to health and wellbeing.
Full-text screening (added criteria)		
Authors define or cite K* term(s) being used in the context of the study.	Papers that are unclear how the authors understand or use K* terminology.	This is an essential component of this study.
Authors state how non-academic community research partners were involved in the study, including K* related activities. Were involved in the study beyond being research participants.	Authors of the paper do not indicate how community was involved in the study, including K* related efforts.	Understanding how non-academic communities are involved in the research and K* are key to this study.
Authors state impacts and outcomes from K* efforts, in relation to non-academic research partner needs and priorities.	Papers that do not identify impacts and outcomes from K* efforts in relation to non-academic research partner needs and priorities.	The impacts and outcomes from K* effort on non-academic researchers is the focus of the scoping review.

132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143

Source of Evidence Selection

Search results will be imported into Covidence (31) and duplicate records will be removed automatically. To ensure high inter-rater reliability, four researchers [RB, JK, MM, ZP] involved in the screening process will screen the same 25 randomly selected records, based on the titles and abstracts. If we do not reach a minimum of 75% agreement, we will repeat the process with five more randomly selected records, until 75% agreement has been established.

Each title and abstract will be independently screened by two researchers. If one researcher thinks the record meets the inclusion criteria and the other does not, papers will be put in a “conflict” list. Each item in the conflict list will be resolved with a conversation between the two researchers and if consensus cannot be reached, the record will be included for full-text screening.

144

145 All papers included after the title and abstract screening will be uploaded for the full-text
146 screening. Each full-text will be independently screened by two researchers and again, conflicts
147 will be resolved through a conversation between the two researchers involved. If researchers
148 cannot reach consensus, senior researcher [MMN] will make the final decision. Reasons for full-
149 text exclusion will be tracked within Covidence and reported in the results. Only papers that met
150 the inclusion criteria based on the full-text screening will be included for data extraction and
151 analysis.

152

153 **Data Extraction and Analysis**

154 *Data Extraction*

155 The scoping review extraction fields (Table 2) was developed by ST, RB, and MMN to record
156 key K* information from the literature that will be selected, including author, reference, and
157 relevant results aligned with the study’s research question (32). Data from all included full-texts
158 will be manually extracted and recorded in Covidence (31). Two researchers will read through
159 the K* literature and extract the data separately. The researchers will then meet to discuss and
160 compare the extracted data to ensure accuracy and reliability.

161

162 **Table 2. Data Extraction and Analysis**

Category	Description
General Data	● Publication Year
	● Location of study (region, country)
	● Location of lead/senior researcher affiliation (region, country)
	● Discipline (field of research and/or author affiliation)
Study	● Population studied/served/partnering
	● Research approach, methodology & methods

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Research governance (e.g. role of community partner(s))
	<hr/>
K*	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Authorship inclusion of community involved● K* terminology used● K* definition(s) and/or citations● Community partner involvement in K* prioritizing, planning, implementing● Other non-researcher rights/stakeholders involved in K* prioritizing, planning, implementing● Target group of K*● K* aims● Description of all K* efforts at planning & development stage● Description of all K* efforts at implementing stage
	<hr/>
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Reported impacts or outcomes● Methods of tracking impacts and outcomes
	<hr/>

163

164 ***Data Analysis***

165 We will use thematic analysis as described by Braun and Clarke (33,34) to identify, analyze, and
166 report on themes within the open-ended extracted data. The analysis of extracted open-ended and
167 descriptive K* information and outcomes will be analyzed over six phases: (1) becoming familiar
168 with the data, (2) generating initial codes, (3) searching for themes, (4) reviewing the themes, (5)
169 defining and naming themes, and (6) producing the final report.

170

171 Once the extracted data is approved, the research team will each familiarize themselves with it
172 and conduct an initial analysis independently before discussing and reaching a consensus on
173 themes. After the consensus is reached, the team will re-analyze and revise the data results one
174 more time before sharing them with the rest of the research team. Finally, in the sixth phase, the

175 analysis findings will be incorporated into the results section, supported by quotations from the
176 literature.

177

178

Discussion

179 To our knowledge, this scoping review analysis is the first of its kind. Since 2010, there have
180 been related reviews conducted on *integrated knowledge translation* with health policies (35,36)
181 a realist evaluation of *knowledge transfer* implementation by health researchers (37); *knowledge*
182 *translation* and its supported definitions, theories, models, and frameworks (38); and knowledge
183 translation in Indigenous health research (39), for example. Our scoping review analysis will
184 gather a broader disciplinary scope of literature and terminology than other reviews to date. Our
185 scoping review is unique in that it will focus on studies where non-academic community partners
186 are presented as being clearly invested and engaged in K* efforts – in ways that address
187 inequities and support sovereignty, improving the health and wellness of equity-
188 deserving/seeking/denied communities.

189

190 There is growing interest globally within academic and research institutions, research funding
191 bodies, and government priorities to support research with equity-seeking/deserving/denied
192 communities. Evidence to suggest the growing interest are reflected in university strategic plans,
193 Truth and Reconciliation Calls to Action, targeted funding calls, and government public health
194 frameworks, for example. Despite the increased attention to “applied research” with
195 emancipatory goals, community-based researchers have been writing about limitations,
196 challenges, and the inequitable nature of research funding timelines, accountabilities of
197 researchers and funders to communities – for many years. Given that most scientific research is

198 written, and therefore framed and curated, by academic researchers, it will be interesting to see
199 how authors use K* terminology with vagueness to imply research “value” versus describing in
200 compelling detail how community made informed decisions around K* priorities and activities.

201
202 We assert that research training programs and curriculum in disciplines invested in human health
203 and wellbeing must educate, mentor, and model K*. That said, there is a dearth of training and
204 research in the area of K* with equity or sovereignty-seeking/deserving/denied communities.
205 The asymmetry between potential and actual transformation through research can be addressed,
206 in part, by making exemplary K* research more visible and calling on authors of future papers
207 study and report on how K* was planned, prioritized, implemented, and evidenced.

208 209 **Limitations**

210 A limitation of the scoping review is the lack of uniform terminology on the topic of K*, across
211 disciplines, communities, and geographies. As the topic of K* for research involving equity and
212 sovereignty-seeking/deserving/denied communities remains unexplored, there are no consistent
213 subject headings for the research team to reference or use as a guide for the literature searches.
214 Our analysis will be limited by the keywords we have identified as relevant and introduces bias,
215 as we elucidate additional K* terms being used. We aim to minimize this bias by conducting a
216 backwards and forwards search of the references in review and discussion papers – in search of
217 additional K* terms that we may have missed. In addition, limiting the scoping review to English
218 could create a limitation to explore non-English literature, since this paper is aiming for a global
219 understanding of these terms.

220

221 Our study only includes peer reviewed published literature and therefore excludes grey literature
222 such as study reports, theses and dissertations where K* may be defined, discussed, and
223 described. We excluded grey literature to keep the scoping review feasible. Including grey
224 literature would be unwieldy, given that our scoping review is global and inter/multidisciplinary.
225 It would be near impossible to create a comprehensive and strategic grey literature search unless
226 we severely limited the search by geography, discipline, or date however, we do not have a clear
227 reason to do so. Considering that K* language carries the most currency in academic research
228 and research funding cultures, we feel that limiting the search to peer-review literature is
229 justified.

230

231 For the scoping review portion of our study, we will exclude papers that do not report on
232 outcomes or impacts from K* efforts. Unless a study explicitly includes tracking, reporting, or
233 observing outcomes and impacts from the K* efforts, authors may submit their manuscripts to
234 journals before K* impacts and outcomes are known – and – the life cycle of most research
235 grants are too short to include studying K* impacts and outcomes.

236

237

Conclusion

238 The combination of using a scoping review to gather, examine, and visualize literature reporting
239 on K* terminology, definitions, and priorities in research with equity or sovereignty-
240 seeking/deserving/denied communities globally will paint an aerial view and nuanced summary
241 of impactful research. Our study findings will be used to draw attention to examples of
242 transformative research as well as reveal patterns of K* activities, outcomes, ethics, and
243 accountabilities across geographies and disciplines.

244

245 **Funding statement:** This work is being funded by the Canada Research Chair in Community-
246 Driven Knowledge Mobilization and Pathways to Wellness funding (CRC-2021-00256). The
247 funding body had no role in developing the protocol.

248

249 **Conflict of interest statement:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

250

251 **Acknowledgements:** RB, ST,FI, DC, MEMN contributed to the conceptualization; RB and ST
252 shared project administration; RB, ST, MEMN contributed to the original manuscript drafts; FI
253 and DC facilitated the validation; all but AE and TC were involved in the review and editing of
254 the manuscripts though all co-authors read the manuscript before submission; and all co-authors
255 were involved in the methodology.

256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278

References

1. Turin TC, Chowdhury N, Vaska M, Rumana N, Lasker MAA, Chowdhury MZI. Knowledge mobilisation in bridging community-practice–academia-policy through meaningful engagement: systematic integrative review protocol focusing on studies conducted on health and wellness among immigrant communities. *BMJ Open*. 2020 Apr;10(4):e036081.
2. Azimi A, Fattahi R, Asadi-Lari M. Knowledge translation status and barriers. *J Med Libr Assoc JMLA*. 2015 Apr;103(2):96–9.
3. Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. Knowledge Mobilization of SSHRC [Internet]. 2012 [cited 2024 Jun 25]. Available from: <https://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/programs-programmes/definitions-eng.aspx#km-mc>
4. Canadian Institutes of Health Research. Knowledge Translation at CIHR [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2024 Jun 25]. Available from: <https://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/29418.html#2>
5. Shaxson L, Brien D, Emara S, Phipps D. Expanding our understanding of K* (KT, KE, KTT, KMb, KB, KM, etc.). *U N Univ*. 2012;(88).
6. Grimshaw JM, Eccles MP, Lavis JN, Hill SJ, Squires JE. Knowledge translation of research findings. *Implement Sci*. 2012 Dec;7(1):50.
7. Kothari A, Wathen CN. A critical second look at integrated knowledge translation. *Health Policy*. 2013 Feb;109(2):187–91.
8. Merga MK. The academic labour of knowledge mobilization: What scholarly publishers need to know. *Learn Publ*. 2021 Oct;34(4):655–65.
9. Jull J, Giles A, Graham ID. Community-based participatory research and integrated knowledge translation: advancing the co-creation of knowledge. *Implement Sci*. 2017 Dec;12(1):150.

- 279 10. Community based participatory research for health. Hoboken, NJ, US: Jossey-
280 Bass/Wiley; 2003. xxxiii, 490 p. (Minkler M, Wallerstein N, editors. Community based
281 participatory research for health).
- 282 11. Wallerstein NB, Duran B. Using community-based participatory research to address
283 health disparities. *Health Promot Pract*. 2006 Jul;7(3):312–23.
- 284 12. Christensen J. Telling stories: Exploring research storytelling as a meaningful approach
285 to knowledge mobilization with Indigenous research collaborators and diverse audiences in
286 community-based participatory research. *Can Geogr Géographies Can*. 2012 Jun;56(2):231–
287 42.
- 288 13. Morton Ninomiya ME, Hurley N, Penashue J. A decolonizing method of inquiry: using
289 institutional ethnography to facilitate community-based research and knowledge translation.
290 *Crit Public Health*. 2020 Mar 14;30(2):220–31.
- 291 14. Aromataris E, Lockwood C, Porritt K, Pilla B, Z Jordan, editors. *JB I manual for evidence*
292 *synthesis* [Internet]. Adelaide, Australia: Joanna Briggs Institute; 2024. Available from:
293 <https://synthesismanual.jbi.global>.
- 294 15. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA
295 Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med*.
296 2018 Oct 2;169(7):467–73.
- 297 16. Ahmed N, Limaye RJ, Harlan SV. A multilevel approach to knowledge sharing:
298 Improving health services for families and children. *Ann Anthropol Pract*. 2015
299 Nov;39(2):192–204.
- 300 17. Shields J, Evans B. Building a Policy-Oriented Research Partnership for Knowledge
301 Mobilization and Knowledge Transfer: The Case of the Canadian Metropolis Project. *Adm*

- 302 Sci. 2012 Nov 26;2(4):250–72.
- 303 18. Bullock H, Watson A, Goering P. Building for Success: Mental Health Research With an
304 Integrated Knowledge Translation Approach. *Can J Commun Ment Health*. 2010 Jan
305 1;29(S5):9–21.
- 306 19. Racher FE, Annis RC. Community Partnerships: Translating Research for Community
307 Development. 2005;37(1).
- 308 20. MacKinnon KR, Kia H, Lacombe-Duncan A. Examining TikTok’s Potential for
309 Community-Engaged Digital Knowledge Mobilization With Equity-Seeking Groups. *J Med*
310 *Internet Res*. 2021 Dec 9;23(12):e30315.
- 311 21. Jansson SM, Benoit C, Casey L, Phillips R, Burns D. In for the Long Haul: Knowledge
312 Translation Between Academic and Nonprofit Organizations. *Qual Health Res*. 2010
313 Jan;20(1):131–43.
- 314 22. Murnaghan D, Morrison W, Griffith E, Bell B, Duffley L, McGarry K, et al. Knowledge
315 exchange systems for youth health and chronic disease prevention: a tri-provincial case study.
316 *Chronic Dis Inj Can*. 2013 Sep;33(4):257–66.
- 317 23. Bellman L, Webster J, Jeanes A. Knowledge transfer and the integration of research,
318 policy and practice for patient benefit. *J Res Nurs*. 2011 May;16(3):254–70.
- 319 24. Williams A, Holden B, Krebs P, Muhajarine N, Waygood K, Randall J, et al. Knowledge
320 translation strategies in a community–university partnership: examining local Quality of Life
321 (QoL). *Soc Indic Res*. 2007 Nov 1;85(1):111–25.
- 322 25. Abma TA, Cook T, Rämngård M, Kleba E, Harris J, Wallerstein N. Social impact of
323 participatory health research: collaborative non-linear processes of knowledge mobilization.
324 *Educ Action Res*. 2017 Aug 8;25(4):489–505.

- 325 26. Wathen CN, Sibbald SL, Jack SM, MacMillan HL. Talk, trust and time: a longitudinal
326 study evaluating knowledge translation and exchange processes for research on violence
327 against women. *Implement Sci.* 2011 Dec;6(1):102.
- 328 27. Campbell S. Geoffrey & Robyn Sperber Health Sciences Library, University of Alberta.
329 2020. Filter to Retrieve Studies Related to Medically Underserved Populations in Canada
330 from the OVID MEDLINE Database. Available from:
331 <https://guides.library.ualberta.ca/health-sciences-search-filters/populations>
- 332 28. Campbell S. Geoffrey & Robyn Sperber Health Sciences Library, University of Alberta.
333 2022. Filter to Retrieve Studies Related to Vulnerable Populations in Canada from the OVID
334 Medline Database. Available from: [https://guides.library.ualberta.ca/health-sciences-search-](https://guides.library.ualberta.ca/health-sciences-search-filters/populations)
335 [filters/populations](https://guides.library.ualberta.ca/health-sciences-search-filters/populations)
- 336 29. Cooper C, Levay P, Lorenc T, Craig GM. A population search filter for hard-to-reach
337 populations increased search efficiency for a systematic review. *J Clin Epidemiol* [Internet].
338 2014 [cited 2024 Jun 27]; Available from:
339 https://core.ac.uk/reader/19486047?utm_source=linkout
- 340 30. Morton Ninomiya ME, Atkinson D, Brascoupe S, Firestone M, Robinson N, Reading J,
341 et al. Effective knowledge translation approaches and practices in Indigenous health research:
342 a systematic review protocol. *Syst Rev.* 2017 Dec;6(1):34.
- 343 31. Veritas Health Innovation. Covidence systematic review software [Internet]. Melbourne,
344 Australia; 2023 [cited 2024 Feb 2]. Available from: <https://www.covidence.org/>
- 345 32. JBI Global Wiki. Data extraction - JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis [Internet]. 2022
346 [cited 2024 Feb 24]. Available from: [https://jbi-global-](https://jbi-global-wiki.refined.site/space/MANUAL/4687700/11.2.7+Data+extraction)
347 [wiki.refined.site/space/MANUAL/4687700/11.2.7+Data+extraction](https://jbi-global-wiki.refined.site/space/MANUAL/4687700/11.2.7+Data+extraction)

- 348 33. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol*. 2006 Jan
349 1;3(2):77–101.
- 350 34. Braun V, Clarke V. Toward good practice in thematic analysis: Avoiding common
351 problems and be(com)ing a *knowing* researcher. *Int J Transgender Health*. 2023 Jan
352 25;24(1):1–6.
- 353 35. Zych MM. How Can Researchers and Research Users Initiate Integrated Knowledge
354 Translation (IKT) Partnerships? 2019;
- 355 36. Lawrence L, Bishop A, Curran J. Integrated Knowledge Translation with Public Health
356 Policy Makers: A Scoping Review. *Healthc Policy Polit Santé*. 2019 Feb 28;14(3):55–77.
- 357 37. Middleton LA. A REALIST EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
358 KNOWLEDGE TRANSFER PATHWAYS BY A HEALTH RESEARCH FUNDER. 2017;
- 359 38. Barwick M, Dubrowski R, Petricca K. Knowledge Translation: The Rise of
360 Implementation. 2020;
- 361 39. Morton Ninomiya ME, Maddox R, Brascoupe S, Robinson N, Atkinson D, Firestone M,
362 et al. Knowledge translation approaches and practices in Indigenous health research: A
363 systematic review. *Soc Sci Med*. 2022 May;301:114898.

364
365

Supplementary File 1 – The Search Strategy in Medline (ProQuest)

S1	<p>((MESH.EXACT("Mentally Ill Persons") OR MESH.EXACT("Drug Users") OR MESH.EXACT("Alcoholics")) OR tiab(mental* ill* OR "mental disorder" OR "mental disorders" OR PTSD OR "post traumatic stress" OR "posttraumatic stress" OR "drug user" OR "drug users" OR "drug dependence" OR "drug dependencies" OR "drug dependent" OR addict* OR alcoholi* OR pwud) OR tiab((drug OR substance*) NEAR/3 (abuse* OR use* OR illegal OR illicit OR addict*))) OR ((MESH.EXACT("Sex Workers") OR MESH.EXACT("Prisoners") OR MESH.EXACT("Pregnancy in Adolescence")) OR tiab((prostitute* OR "sex worker" OR "sex workers" OR "released prisoner" OR "released prisoners" OR "formerly incarcerated" OR "pregnant teen*" OR "pregnant youth*" OR runaway* OR "run away"))) OR tiab((traffick* NEAR/3 (youth* OR women OR woman OR child* OR person* OR people*))) OR ((MESH.EXACT("Ill-Housed Persons") OR MESH.EXACT("Homeless Youth") OR MESH.EXACT("Working Poor") OR MESH.EXACT.EXPLODE("Socioeconomic Factors")) OR tiab((poverty OR impoverished OR "working poor" OR unemploy* OR under-employed OR "transportation deficit*" OR "low soci* status" OR "low income*" OR low-SES OR hard-to-house OR homeless* OR under-housed OR underhoused OR "lack of housing" OR squatter* OR homeless* OR vagrant* OR indigent OR "hard to house" OR "inner city" OR "downtown core" OR "city core" OR "skid row" OR rural OR remote OR "low socioeconomic" OR "low SES" OR "poorest poor"))) OR tiab((street NEAR/3 (worker* OR people OR child OR children OR youth))) OR tiab((hous* NEAR/3 (substandard OR insufficien* OR unstabl* OR under OR</p>
----	---

instabil*)))) OR ((MESH.EXACT("Child, Abandoned") OR
MESH.EXACT("Enslaved Persons")) OR tiab(elders OR elderly OR oldest OR old
OR senior citizen* OR shut-in OR house-bound OR neglected OR "older adult" OR
"older adults" OR "battered women" OR "intimate partner violen*" OR "domestic
violence") OR tiab((battered NEAR/3 (spouse* OR wife OR wives OR partner)))
OR tiab((abuse* NEAR/3 (elder* OR child*)))) OR
((MESH.EXACT.EXPLODE("Sexual and Gender Minorities") OR
MESH.EXACT("Bisexuality") OR MESH.EXACT("Transsexualism") OR
MESH.EXACT.EXPLODE("Homosexuality")) OR tiab((LGBT* OR GLBT* OR
2SLGBT* OR 2SGLBT* OR lesbian* OR gay* OR bisexual* OR transgender* OR
queer* OR "gender identit*" OR "gender minorit*" OR SGM OR GSM OR "gender
nonconforming" OR "gender non-conforming" OR genderqueer OR "gender queer"
OR "gender neutral" OR "gender fluid*" OR "gender variant" OR "mixed gender*"
OR bigender* OR agender* OR pangender* OR "gender crossing" OR "sexual
orientation*" OR pansexual* OR asexual* OR demisexual* OR bi-curious OR
"sexual minorit*" OR nonbinary OR non-binary OR homosexual* OR trans-curious
OR transcurious OR trans-sexual* OR transsexual* OR trans-people* OR
transpeople* OR trans-person* OR transperson* OR trans-individual* OR
transindividual* OR trans-woman OR transwoman OR trans-women OR
transwomen OR trans-men OR transmen OR trans-man OR transman OR trans-girl*
OR transgirl* OR trans-boy* OR transboy* OR trans-spectrum* OR transpectrum*
OR "man loving man" OR "men loving men" OR "woman loving woman" OR
"women loving women" OR "men who have sex with men" OR "women who have

sex with women" OR F2M OR M2F OR "male to female" OR "female to male" OR "two spirit*" OR "2 spirit" OR TGNC OR "third gender")) OR (MESH.EXACT.EXPLODE("Disabled Persons") OR tiab((blind OR visual* impair* OR hearing impair* OR deaf OR amputat* OR paraplegic* OR quadraplegic* OR wheelchair* OR disabled OR disabilit*) OR ("brain injured" OR "brain injuries" OR "brain injury" OR "brain damage" OR "brain damaged"))) OR (MESH.EXACT.EXPLODE("Indigenous Peoples") OR tiab((Metis OR Indigenous* OR Aboriginal* OR Amerindian* OR Autochtone* OR "First Nation*" OR Inuit OR Innu OR Inuk OR Inuvialuit OR tribal OR "first people*" OR "American Indian*" OR "native American*" OR "Alaska native*"))) OR ((MESH.EXACT("Ethnicity") OR MESH.EXACT("Transients and Migrants") OR MESH.EXACT("Refugees") OR MESH.EXACT("Cultural Diversity")) OR tiab((diversity OR minority OR minorities OR transient* OR migrant* OR immigrant* OR ethnic* OR racial* OR colonize* OR refugee* OR asylee* OR "war torn")) OR tiab((vulnerable OR migrant OR transient* OR marginal* OR "at risk" OR impoverished) NEAR/2 (population* OR people OR person* OR individual* OR child* OR youth* OR population* OR worker* OR men OR women OR man OR woman))) OR (MESH.EXACT("Vulnerable Populations") OR tiab((vulnerable OR equit* OR inequit* OR inequality OR equality OR disparit* OR discriminat* OR exclude* OR exclusion OR "high risk" OR underserved OR marginalised OR marginalized OR disadvantage* OR underprivileged OR underrepresented)) OR tiab((hard OR difficult) NEAR/2 (reach OR locate OR find OR treat OR engage)))

S2	<p>(MESH.EXACT("Community-Based Participatory Research") OR MESH.EXACT("Community Networks") OR MESH.EXACT("Community-Institutional Relations")) OR tiab((community OR civic) NEAR/3 (based OR participat* OR develop* OR uptake OR engage* OR partner* OR relation* OR driven OR involve* OR collaborat* OR impact OR exchange OR advocate*) OR non-profit OR stakeholder* OR rightsholder* OR "action research") OR (tiab("mode 2 research") OR tiab("engaged scholarship") OR tiab("integrated research") OR tiab("cultural broker*") OR tiab("knowledge broker*") OR tiab(co-production OR coproduction OR co-generation OR cogeneration) OR tiab(research NEAR/3 user) OR tiab(partner*))</p>
S3	<p>(MESH.EXACT("Translational Science, Biomedical") OR MESH.EXACT("Diffusion of Innovation") OR MESH.EXACT("Information Dissemination") OR MESH.EXACT("Implementation Science")) OR (tiab("diffusion of innovation") OR tiab("bench to bedside") OR tiab("implementation of existing research knowledge") OR tiab("linkage and exchange") OR tiab("knowledge to action") OR tiab("implementation science") OR tiab("know-do-gap")) OR tiab((knowledge OR evidence OR research OR information) NEAR/3 (transfer OR translat* OR exchange OR mobilisation OR mobilization OR disseminat* OR linkage OR management OR sharing OR share OR utilization OR utilisation OR distribut* OR diffus* OR realization OR realisation OR embodiment OR implement* OR uptake OR "to action" OR "to practice" OR "into practice"))</p>

S4	(tiab(health* OR wellbeing OR well-being OR recover* OR resilien* OR wellness OR heal OR healing OR trauma-informed OR "harm reduction") OR tiab(clinic* OR hospital* OR ((health OR treatment OR care) NEAR/2 (center* OR centre*))))
S5	[S2] AND [S3] AND [S4] AND [S5]
S6	([S2] AND [S3] AND [S4] AND [S5]) AND yr(2010-2024)

366