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Background

What are jurisdictional scans?

- Decision-making tools used by governments and organizations to:
  - Consider how problems have been *framed* in other jurisdictions
  - Compare and *evaluate options* based on action taken in other jurisdictions in response to similar problems
  - Identify and anticipate *implementation considerations* associated with options
Background

Gaps in the literature

- Jurisdictional scans have not been systematically reviewed
- Limited research exists to guide conduction and interpretation of jurisdictional scans

Purpose

- Conduct a critical interpretative synthesis of jurisdictional scans to:
  - Understand benefits, limitations, methodologies
  - Guide their use in a policy making setting
Methodology

Critical interpretative synthesis

- Systematic search of grey and published literature → purposive sample
  - Jurisdictional scans
  - Publications about jurisdictional scans
- Data extraction
- Conceptual mapping of:
  - Benefits
  - Limitations
  - Roles
  - Methodologies
Methodology

Database search
N=564

Website search
N=668

Title and abstract review
N=1232

Full text review
N=108

Articles excluded based on title and abstract review
Duplicates removed
N=1124

Articles excluded based on full text review
N=25

Relevant articles
N=83
# Results

## Sample characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th># of jurisdictional scans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of origin</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social sector</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy/Environment</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance/Economics</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results

### Sample characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th># of jurisdictional scans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact with stakeholders only</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature review only</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpublished (grey) literature</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published literature</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature review and contact with stakeholders</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentations from members from various jurisdictions</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unclear</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

Characteristics of jurisdictional scans based on a purposive sample

- **Purpose of jurisdictional scans**
  - Primary purpose: Identification of best practices (N=58, 70%)
    - No evaluation of policies
  - Not explicitly used to consider how problems are framed in other jurisdictions

- **Methodology of jurisdictional scans**
  - Data collection methods were varied, inconsistent between and within jurisdictional scans
  - Criteria guiding the selection of jurisdictions for inclusion not presented (N=32, 39%)
    - Jurisdictions selected based on availability of information (N=11, 14%)
## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Information on  
  • Options  
  • Implementation strategies/considerations  
  • Framing (inferred) | • Process: non-systematic |
| • Comparisons between jurisdiction  
  • Common themes across jurisdictions  
  • Identification of most like comparators | • Lack of evaluation of policies considered |
| | • Jurisdictional scans often examine policies without considering health systems/political system |
Elements that strengthen a jurisdictional scan

- The inclusion of a **literature review**
  - Facilitates framing of the problem
  - Allows comparison of evidence to practice

- **Evaluation of policy options** in order to inform the determination of best practices

- **Standardized data collection** across all jurisdictions scanned

- **Contact** with relevant stakeholders
Contexts in which benefits outweigh limitations

- When the problem being addressed is a **wide spread issue** that affects multiple jurisdictions
- When **contact** can be made with stakeholders from jurisdictions being examined
- When policy alternatives to address a “problem” have **not been systematically reviewed** or the systematic review is outdated
Strengths and Limitations

Strengths:
- Systematic CIS methodology
  - Integration of evidence from a wide range of sources

Limitations:
- Searches not mapped to subject heading
- The country of origin for the majority of included studies was Canada
  - Conclusions made may not be as applicable outside of the Canadian policy-making setting
- Analysis did not consider the policy making process as a whole
Policy Implications

These results have the potential to:

- **Inform the conduction and use** of jurisdictional scans by outlining appropriate contexts

- Promote **standardization of methodology** across documents and jurisdictions
  - Improve use of evidence presented in jurisdictional scans by other jurisdictions

- Promote **policy evaluation** in order to determine best practices