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**Supplemental Table #1, Table 3. Predictors of importance of scientific resources among LHD practitioners in U.S.**

**Importance of scientific resources**1

**Characteristic OR (95% CI) (Full sample of 849)**

**OR (95% CI) (restricted sample of 517)**

*Individual*

Job position

Top executive\* 1.0 1.0

Manager or other staff\*\* **0.6 (0.4, 0.8) 0.4 (0.2, 0.7)**

Administrator, deputy or assistant director **0.5 (0.3, 0.7) 0.4 (0.3, 0.7)**

Age

20-39 1.0 1.0

40-49 0.9 (0.6, 1.4) 0.8 (0.4, 1.5)

50-59 1.2 (0.8, 1.9) 1.0 (0.6, 1.9)

60 or older 1.4 (0.9, 2.2) 1.1 (0.6, 2.2) Highest degree

Bachelors or less 1.0 1.0

Nursing 1.4 (0.9, 2.2) 1.8 (0.9, 3.4) Other masters degree **2.9 (1.9, 4.3) 3.5 (1.9, 6.3)** MPH/MSPH\*\*\* **2.7 (1.7, 4.2) 3.8 (2.0, 7.2)** Doctoral degree **6.9 (4.1, 11.4) 9.0 (4.7, 17.4)**

Gender

Female 1.0 1.0

Male 1.3 (0.96, 1.7) **1.6 (1.1, 2.3)**

*Health Department*

Population of jurisdiction

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| <25,000 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 25,000 to 49,999 | **2.2 (1.4, 3.5)** | **2.1 (1.2, 3.6)** |
| 50,000 to 99,999 | **2.8 (1.7, 4.5)** | **2.8 (1.6, 4.9)** |
| 100,000 to 499,999 | **3.8 (2.4, 5.9)** | **3.7 (2.2, 6.5)** |
| 500,000 or larger | **5.3 (3.2, 8.8)** | **6.2 (3.3, 11.7)** |

Governance structure

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Locally governed | 1.0 |  |
| State governed | 0.9 (0.6, 1.5) | 0.7 (0.4, 1.4) |

Shared governance 0.9 (0.6, 1.4) 1.2 (0.6, 2.1) Census region

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Northeast | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Midwest | 0.7 (0.5, 1.1) | 1.0 (0.6, 1.6) |
| South | 0.8 (0.5. 1.3) | 0.9 (0.5, 1.6) |
| West | 1.3 (0.8, 2.1) | 1.7 (0.9, 3.2) |
| *Leadership structures/practices5* |
| Ability to lead efforts in EBDM | **1.4 (1.1, 1.8)** | **1.6 (1.1, 2.2)** |
| Encourages EBDM use | **1.9 (1.5, 2.6)** | **2.6 (1.8, 3.8)** |
| Fosters participation of staff in decision-making | 1.1 (0.8, 1.5) | 1.4 (0.9, 2.3) |
| Important to hire people with a public health degree | **1.8 (1.3, 2.4)** | **2.0 (1.4, 2.9)** |
| Important to hire people with public health experience | **1.4 (1.05, 1.8)** | **1.6 (1.1, 2.3)** |

\*Includes top executives, health directors, health officers, commissioners, or equivalent in "Office of the Director"

\*\*Includes managers of a division or program, program coordinators, technical expert positions, or other staff

\*\*\*MPH (Master of Public Health); MSPH (Master of Science in Public Health)

Notes: 1 Perceived importance of scientific resources defined as: Systematic reviews of the body of scientific literature, scientific reports, general literature reviews, or one or a few scientific articles; 2 Perceived importance was dichotomized based on whether or not a respondent ranked the resource in any of their top 3 (first, second, or third most important);

3Row percentages are shown; 4Adjusted odds ratio (95% confidence interval): Variables that were significant at the p<0.2 level in unadjusted analyses were retained in the final

model to calculate adjusted odds ratios. The odds ratios represent the odds of perceiving a resource to be important; 57-point Likert-scale response option; frequency shown is those
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