

## **Important conclusions workshops A + B**

Ahmet, Seyhan, Taliha, Anita, Frank, Gert, Lutgart, Maurits, Laurie,  
04-11-16

### **Ideas workshop**

- 1) How to evaluate.
- 2) Time for improvement of the research proposal.

### **Observations**

- good working spirit, good alertness about political issues, stakeholder involvement.
- Cross-fertilization would be very fruitful.
- Great if participants could be part of the structure of the workshops.
- Group A are generally aware of working conditions and risk factors.

### **Take home messages for the participants of trainers A/B**

- 1) Make dependent, independent and confounding variables explicit.
- 2) Make more use of literature on risk factors, outcome variables + instruments, used confounders (age, smoking, gender, education). Aim for 10-15 international and 5 Turkish references.
- 3) make sure to incorporate risk factors in research proposal in order to give proper advises after research is over.
- 4) in addition to 3), this is especially important when aiming for specific objectives.
- 5) aim for objective measurements, also in exposure rate. What is the difference between hazard and risk? Are their objective measures?
- 6) Use of PPE? With superficial survey (e.g. do you wear PPE yes/no) there is chance on information bias. Instead, make for example use of observations or numbers from purchases.
- 7) Aim for a high response/participate rate: like 70/80%, work with reminders. When study population is 200, invite 2x200.
- 8) Use pilotstudy and questionnaires and instruments to test unforeseen circumstances (mainly practical hick-ups) and new risks. E.g. hold focus groups.

- 9) Make decision before on how to go about the confidentiality of the interviews/data. For example; what will you do with data from a worker who has cancer, which you found out through your study?
- 10) Train interviewers to ask open questions. Check their quality regularly.
- 11) Aspects to consider are: gender issues, informal sector/subcontractors, young people, SME's, healthy worker effect.
- 12) Make titles short and powerful: running titles.

### **Feedback participants**

Input group A brings: more use of articles & good practices.

Input group B brings: practical approach of the study protocol.

### **Matching**

Matching strong multidisciplinary groups → strong exchange of different angels → enriched proposals

Matching poor multidisciplinary groups → poor exchange → more blurry proposals. Risk of science, as practice is what people know.

### **So?**

- 1) Each group improve proposals with feedback trainers.
- 2) Mixed group A + B give feedback to eachother.

Achievements: for doctors with medical background incorporate working conditions (especially for B).

### **Follow-up**

Messages for A

- What can PHIT offer as support (data management, getting literature, logistics) to trained scientists.
- There should be contact with universities.
- Instruments should be translated.

Messages for B

- Ahmet wants a 10 day training course on surveillance.
- Ahmet has given a 2 day course on epidemiology.

All

- Find options to continue with research proposals outside ESPrIT?
- Option 1 government officials can apply each year for international exchange (2yrs).