

Academic Writing in Health Policy and Management

Asadullah Dero¹, Muhammad Fayyaz Awan², Asad Pervez³, Ashique Hussain⁴, Maqsood Alam⁵, Rizwan Ali Shah⁶

^{1,2,3,4,5,6} Jinnah College of Nursing Sohail University Karachi

Corresponding author: Asadullah Dero¹

Abstract

The dissemination of findings from research and the guidance of decision-making processes are two major functions of academic writing, which are vital in the development of health policy and management. The necessity of evidence-based policy is critical in a time of fast breakthroughs in healthcare. Policymakers and medical professionals can obtain reliable and pertinent information thanks to academic writing's assistance in disseminating study findings through peer-reviewed publications and policy briefs. Efficient health policy formulation is guided by comprehensive insights obtained from the synthesis of evidence from various research through systematic reviews and meta-analyses. Moreover, theoretical frameworks are used in academic writing to contextualize health-related issues, facilitating a greater comprehension of the socioeconomic factors influencing medical outcomes. Thorough analyses of current policies aid in identifying successful strategies and provide guidance for new ones. Furthermore, academic writing offers novel approaches to urgent health problems, taking into account the opinions of stakeholders to guarantee that policies are grounded in facts and applicable to the community. In addition to providing policymakers with the tools to allocate resources effectively, economic evaluations also include budgetary effects and cost-effectiveness studies. To sum up, academic writing is critical to converting research findings into practical health policy and management strategies. Academic writing greatly advances public health activities and improves health outcomes by offering a solid research base, synthesizing findings, and offering well-informed solutions.

Introduction

Academic writing encompasses a wide range of subjects, but health policy and management are among the most crucial (Armstrong et al., 2012). In order to better understand diseases and illnesses and to discover therapies and cures, this branch of study is essential. First and foremost, scholarly writing in health policy and management aids in the discovery of novel medical therapies. To provide scientists and medical experts with the most recent study findings so they can create novel medications and treatments, academic writing in this sector is crucial. Research in this area of academic writing is continuously seeking novel approaches to treat potentially fatal conditions like cancer, Type 2 diabetes, and cardiovascular diseases (Wimmelmann, 2017). It would be challenging for scientists to expand on current knowledge and develop fresh, innovative therapies if the research findings weren't published in academic literature.

Improving public health is aided by academic writing in management and health policy studies. By identifying patterns in diseases and medical conditions, researchers in this subject can create public health strategies aimed at stopping the propagation of these disorders. The outcomes of health and medical research can assist decision-makers in making well-informed choices on public health concerns, including immunization campaigns, illness prevention initiatives, and health outreach initiatives (Wimmelmann, 2017). Patient care is enhanced by academic writing in health policy and management. In order to give their patients, the best possible treatment, medical professionals need to be up to date on the most recent research results in their sector. In order to create therapeutic strategies for the people they treat, healthcare practitioners can utilize the most recent data and research that is available to them thanks to academic writing in this sector.

Robust study findings are one kind of data that is now being aggressively pushed for application in health-related decision-making. Every year, the private and public sectors of the global economy spend billions of dollars to further health care, clinical, and medical services study as well as to continually improve healthcare-related policies, programs, and services. It is frequently observed that not all findings from studies are being implemented into procedures and regulations as advised, even with this significant investment (Cairney, 2017). It has been discovered, for instance, that the process of translating and integrating academic research outcomes into actual practices and policies that are implemented takes about 17 years when it comes to the setting of personal patient care. This is because the results of research are first published before being disseminated through publications, reviews, and guidelines for clinical

practice. In the past few years, there has been an increasing focus on how important it is to better comprehend or characterize research evidence in order to bridge the gap between policy, practice, and research. The research has also addressed the idea of "use for educational writing." The utilization of research evidence can be divided into three categories: instrumental, conceptual, and symbolic, according to numerous academics in the knowledge translation (KT) discipline. The direct, practical application of research findings to modify policies, programs, and healthcare practices is referred to as instrumental use (sometimes called "problem-solving" or "structural" usage) (Tricco et al., 2015; Woolf et al., 2016). Conceptual usage, commonly referred to as "enlightenment," is the tacit use of research findings to modify end users' perceptions, knowledge, or attitudes. The tactical application of data from studies to support, legitimize, and justify established procedures is referred to as symbolic usage, sometimes called "political" or "strategic" use. Comprehending academic writing and its application in health policy and management decision-making is particularly crucial when discussing the frequently complicated issues and solutions related to public health. Decisions made in the field of public health by managers, practitioners, and politicians impact the overall health of communities as opposed to a select few people (Zardo & Collie, 2015). Decisions regarding the planning, creation, and execution of public health initiatives and policies are involved. Policies are implemented through local programs, and health policy is considered to include actions (or inactions) that impact the variety of institutions, organizations, services, and financial arrangements that make up the health system. According to Francis et al. (2015), it consists of both private sector and public sector (government) policy. Policies may involve a range of stakeholders, which includes the general public, patients, health care managers, and medical professionals, as well as other industry sectors like primary medical care or the voluntary sector, depending on the situation and issue at hand. Policies may also take the form of rules, laws, rules, instructions, judiciary orders, and/or directions (Woolf et al., 2016). As a result, it has been stated that choosing public health policies is extremely complicated and context-dependent. As a result, recommendations have been made that when deciding on health policy for the public, different pertinent elements and data sources—including research findings—be taken into account (Cairney, 2017). There is a significant research-policy-practice gap for the application of research findings in public health policy because dealing with population-level health is far more complicated than treating individual patients, and because there is less research on operational population measures than on measures aimed at expanding individual patient experiences (Cairney, 2017). (Brownson et al, 2006). Recent research indicates that underlying political processes, disagreements, how the evidence is framed, and

institutional agendas may also play a role in the discrepancy between research findings and their use in public health policy. According to a Scottish case study on the application of evidence, officials select among three relatively incompatible approaches for obtaining, interpreting, and using information: "improvement scientific research," "the narrative telling," and "policy simulation" (Cairney, 2017). The political environment and the beliefs of individuals involved with policymaking affect these decisions, which are frequently very political. Such political decisions then affect the selection of evidence and how it affects policy (Cairney, 2017). The standards of evidence used by various governmental levels might vary as well (Wimmelman, 2017). For instance, the struggle between upward (national recommendations) and bottom-up (local policy) effects have influenced what evidence is used and, consequently, which strategies are adopted when it comes to the adoption of Danish national public health standards (Wimmelman, 2017). It was additionally accepted that connections or interpersonal relationships have a role in finding facts and the way it is employed in policy. According to Oliver and de Vocht (2015) and Oliver et al. (2015), public health officials frequently view those working in the policy field as more reliable and reputable sources of knowledge compared to those operating in educational settings or other organizations. A related Australian case study that looked at local community wellness and health plans highlighted how various stages of the strategy lifecycle used academic writing evidence differently (Browne et al., 2017). According to Browne et al. (2017), their research showed that academic writing was mainly theoretically used for establishing policies or identifying medical conditions. Better utilization of data must be encouraged at various points of the policy-making process, or for finding solutions, by generating evidence that is important to the local community. The gap between research, policy, and practice is still very large, even though it is clear that a variety of factors influence how research findings are incorporated into public health policies. This knowledge gap makes it imperative to further synthesize existing research on the use of academic writing by public health decision-makers in policymaking in order to have comprehensive and up-to-date knowledge. A systematic evaluation examining the application of research findings in the procedures used to make healthcare policy decisions was one of the research investigations that addressed this issue. A narrative review was produced by Orton and colleagues (2011) based on the synthesis of findings from 15 qualitative and 3 quantitative research with varying degrees of methodological competence. There were 1,309 participants all of who played a role in deciding public health policy in these research projects, which were carried out in nations having universal healthcare coverage. There were five major findings published: Using evidence from studies in making decisions varied

according to the circumstances and the various kinds of decision-makers involved. 1) there has been little empirical proof regarding the degree to which academic writing research evidence was used in making decisions; 2) health-related decision-makers tend to use various types of academic writing research evidence (e.g., primary research studies, systematic literature reviews, program evaluations, local and regional best actions); 3) the method of using research evidence in choice making varied; 4) In addition to studying findings, a variety of factors (such as budgetary limitations and public opinion) influenced the formulation of public health policies; and lastly, 5) a number of facilitators (like conducting pertinent studies and developing capacity) and barriers (like opinions on the evidence and a lack of connections between academics and policymakers) affected the use of research findings in public health policy. In order to enable the effective execution of research-informed health policies, this study was useful in highlighting issues that had to be handled immediately by researchers and elected officials. A different systematic review that examined a summary of 56 research and health policy decision-making centered on characterizing and classifying the many political elements that impact the utilization of evidence. Masood et al. (2020) conducted a systematic review that revealed factors that are crucial in shaping the utilization of research in public health policy. These factors include outside sources and businesses, the structure and function of government agencies, the nature of power dynamics (centralized versus democratized), and the degree of alignment between research findings and political objectives or social norms (Liverani et al, 2013). The objective of the comprehensive review conducted by Masood et al. (2020) that is being presented here was to bring Orton and colleagues (2011) work up to date by looking for, locating, and analyzing newly published research on this subject after 2011. The explosion of knowledge translation (KT) papers after 2010 made this update necessary. For instance, in 2010 there were 1,816 publications pertaining to human health found on PubMed using the keywords transfer of knowledge and public health; in 2013, there were 4,607 articles, and in April 2016, there were 8,457 articles. Therefore, in order to preserve the systematic review's validity, utility, and applicability for making decisions about public health policy, it was imperative that it be updated by synthesizing the new data. The knowledge that more studies are being conducted and that authorities are investing heavily to support the use of methodological reviews in advising healthcare policy decisions are additional reasons to keep the comprehensive analysis current. Academic research syntheses are also regarded by numerous research financiers as a crucial mechanism for the exchange of information between decision-makers and researchers.

The Importance of Academic Writing in Health Policy and Management

Decisions about health care and policy are heavily influenced by academic literature. Academic publications can give policymakers and healthcare leaders the information they need to make educated decisions by synthesizing study findings, analyzing data, and suggesting evidence-based solutions (Brownson et al., 2009). The main channel through which researchers share their discoveries with the general public is through academic publications. Effective health policy and management practices are supported by the evidence basis that academics supply through publishing robust, comprehensive research in peer-reviewed publications. According to Brownson et al. (2009), policymakers depend on these articles to comprehend the present level of knowledge regarding significant topics. Research findings can significantly influence policy decisions when they are well presented in academic literature (Brownson et al., 2009). Studies establishing the efficacy of particular interventions, like campaigns to quit smoking or vaccinate, for instance, can have a direct impact on the creation of health regulations meant to enhance the overall health of the population.

Analyzing Health Issues

Many scholarly publications offer in-depth analyses of health issues and possible solutions, going beyond merely summarizing study findings. Academic studies provide an all-encompassing perspective on complicated health difficulties by investigating issues from several disciplinary viewpoints, such as public health, medicine, economics, and the social sciences. According to Solar and Irwin (2010), this level of analysis is essential for creating management plans and policies that work. Policymakers and healthcare executives can benefit from academic writing that examines health issues from a systems-level perspective, taking into account the social, economic, and political aspects that impact health. This type of writing can assist in developing treatments that target the underlying causes of health problems. Research on the relationship between socioeconomic determinants of health and health disparities, for example, can help shape public policies that support health equity.

Synthesizing Research Evidence

Given the vast amount of research being conducted, one of the most important contributions of academic writing is the synthesis of existing evidence to answer specific policy and management questions. Systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and other types of evidence synthesis papers distill large bodies of research into actionable insights. Policymakers and healthcare leaders can then use these syntheses to guide their decisions (Bashshur et al., 2016).

Evidence syntheses are particularly valuable for policymakers because they provide a comprehensive overview of the effectiveness of interventions, enabling them to make informed decisions about resource allocation. For example, a meta-analysis on the impact of telemedicine on patient outcomes can guide policymakers in expanding telehealth services in response to emerging healthcare needs.

Proposing Policy Solutions and Providing Economic Analysis

Many academic papers go beyond analysis to propose specific policy or management interventions. By drawing on their research findings and expertise, academics can suggest innovative ways to address health issues. These proposed solutions, when based on rigorous evidence, can inform the policy development process and help healthcare organizations improve their practices (Sommers et al., 2017). Academic papers that propose evidence-based policy solutions can directly influence the decisions made by policymakers. For instance, studies proposing community-based health initiatives or integrated care models can inspire policymakers to adopt new approaches that enhance healthcare delivery and improve population health. Given the resource constraints faced by health systems, economic analysis is a crucial component of academic writing for policy and management. Papers that model the costs and benefits of different interventions or that estimate the economic burden of diseases can help policymakers and managers allocate resources more effectively. Economic evidence is particularly important for justifying new policies or management approaches (Neumann et al., 2016; Sullivan et al., 2014). Academic papers that include cost-effectiveness analyses or budget impact analyses can provide policymakers with the information needed to understand the financial implications of different health interventions. This economic evidence can help policymakers make informed decisions about resource allocation and justify investments in public health initiatives.

Conclusion

To put research into practice in health policy and management, academic writing is crucial. Academic papers contribute to ensuring that health decisions are grounded in the best available knowledge by disseminating discoveries, analyzing problems, synthesizing evidence, offering remedies, and giving economic analysis. Because of this, it is the duty of academics to provide papers that are accurate, timely, and understandable to decision-makers in the healthcare industry.

To sum up, academic writing is an essential component of health policy and management development and execution. It offers a methodical and systematic framework for sharing research results, examining intricate health problems, combining data, coming up with workable solutions, and carrying out cost analyses. Academic writing ensures that policymakers and healthcare professionals have access to the best available evidence to make decisions that will ultimately affect population health by effectively communicating study outcomes. It is impossible to overestimate the significance of succinct and clear communication since it allows researchers to interact productively with a wide range of stakeholders, such as legislators, medical professionals, and members of the community. Researchers may ensure that their results are translated into significant policy changes and better health outcomes by bridging the gap between research and practice by customizing their writing to these audiences' needs.

Furthermore, the process of directing health policy decisions involves synthesizing data through the use of systematic reviews and meta-analyses. These scholarly contributions assist policymakers in determining the most effective interventions and budget allocation by offering thorough summaries of the current research. Economic studies add even more value to academic writing by enabling decision-makers to evaluate the relative cost-effectiveness of different health interventions and support funding for public health programs. In the end, it is the duty of researchers to write scholarly articles of superior quality and readability that contribute to the development of health policy and management. Academics can increase the effect of their study by utilizing techniques including stakeholder involvement, good communication, and wide distribution of findings. Academic writing will continue to play a crucial role in creating efficient health policies and management techniques as the healthcare industry changes, helping to handle the intricate problems that health systems throughout the globe confront.

References

- Armstrong, R., Pettman, T., Burford, B., Doyle, J., & Waters, E. (2012). Tracking and understanding the utility of Cochrane reviews for public health decision-making. *Journal of public health, 34*(2), 309-313.
- Bashshur, R., Doarn, C. R., Frenk, J. M., Kvedar, J. C., & Woolliscroft, J. O. (2016). Telemedicine and the COVID-19 pandemic, lessons for the future. *Telemedicine and e-Health, 22*(5), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1089/tmj.2020.29040.rb>
- Browne, G. R., Davern, M., & Giles-Corti, B. (2017). What evidence is being used to inform municipal strategic planning for health and wellbeing? Victoria, Australia, a case study. *Evidence and Policy, 13*(3), 401-416.
- Brownson, R. C., Chiriqui, J. F., & Stamatakis, K. A. (2009). Understanding evidence-based public health policy. *American Journal of Public Health, 99*(9), 1576–1583. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2008.156224>
- Cairney, P. (2015). How can policy theory have an impact on policymaking? The role of theory-led academic–practitioner discussions. *Teaching Public Administration, 33*(1), 22-39.
- Cairney, P. (2017). Evidence-based best practice is more political than it looks: a case study of the ‘Scottish Approach’. *Evidence and Policy, 13*(3), 499-515.
- Cuijpers, P., Karyotaki, E., Reijnders, M., & Ebert, D. D. (2019). Was Eysenck right after all? A reassessment of the effects of psychotherapy for adult depression. *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences, 28*(1), 21–30. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2045796018000057>
- Francis, D., Turley, R., Thomson, H., Weightman, A., Waters, E., & Moore, L. (2015). Supporting the needs of public health decision-makers and review authors in the UK. *Journal of Public Health, 37*(1), 172-174.
- Grimshaw, J. M., Eccles, M. P., Lavis, J. N., Hill, S. J., & Squires, J. E. (2012). Knowledge translation of research findings. *Implementation Science, 7*(1), 50. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-7-50>
- Jagosh, J., Macaulay, A. C., Pluye, P., Salsberg, J., Bush, P. L., Henderson, J., Sirett, E., Wong, G., Cargo, M., Herbert, C. P., Seifer, S. D., Green, L. W., & Greenhalgh, T. (2012). Uncovering the benefits of participatory research: Implications of a realist review for health research and

practice. *The Milbank Quarterly*, 90(2), 311–346. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0009.2012.00665.x>

Masood, S., Kothari, A., & Regan, S. (2020). The use of research in public health policy: a systematic review. *Evidence & Policy*, 16(1), 7-43.

Neumann, P. J., Sanders, G. D., Russell, L. B., Siegel, J. E., & Ganiats, T. G. (Eds.). (2016). *Cost-effectiveness in health and medicine* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Oliver, K. A., de Vocht, F., Money, A., & Everett, M. (2017). Identifying public health policymakers' sources of information: comparing survey and network analyses. *The European Journal of Public Health*, 27(suppl_2), 118-123.

Orton, L., Lloyd-Williams, F., Taylor-Robinson, D., O'Flaherty, M., & Capewell, S. (2011). The use of research evidence in public health decision making processes: systematic review. *PloS one*, 6(7), e21704.

Solar, O., & Irwin, A. (2010). *A conceptual framework for action on the social determinants of health*. World Health Organization.

Sommers, B. D., Gawande, A. A., & Baicker, K. (2017). Health insurance coverage and health—What the recent evidence tells us. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 377(6), 586–593. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMs1706645>

Sullivan, S. D., Mauskopf, J. A., Augustovski, F., Jaime Caro, J., Lee, K. M., Minchin, M., Orlewska, E., Penna, P., Barrios, J. M. R., & Shau, W. Y. (2014). Budget impact analysis—principles of good practice: Report of the ISPOR 2012 Budget Impact Analysis Good Practice II Task Force. *Value in Health*, 17(1), 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2013.08.2294>

Tabak, R. G., Eyler, A. A., Dodson, E. A., & Brownson, R. C. (2015). Accessing evidence to inform public health policy: a study to enhance advocacy. *Public Health*, 129(6), 698-704.

Tricco, A. C., Cardoso, R., Thomas, S. M., Motiwala, S., Sullivan, S., Kealey, M. R., ... & Straus, S. E. (2015). Barriers and facilitators to uptake of systematic reviews by policy makers and health care managers: a scoping review. *Implementation Science*, 11, 1-20.

Wimmelmann, C. L. (2017). Performing compliance: The work of local policy workers during the implementation of national health promotion guidelines. *Evidence and Policy*, 13(3), 417-432.

Woolf, S. H., Zimmerman, E., Haley, A., & Krist, A. H. (2016). Authentic engagement of patients and communities can transform research, practice, and policy. *Health Affairs*, 35(4), 590-594.

Zardo, P., & Collie, A. (2015). Type, frequency and purpose of information used to inform public health policy and program decision-making. *BMC public health*, 15, 1-12.