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**Objectives/aims**

The pathway from the research to practice is fraught with challenges. Researchers complain that practitioners do not use their tested interventions, or do not use them as intended. Practitioners complain that the researchers produce research that is hard to translate into practice and does not help them figure out what works for whom when. The aim of this presentation is to offer suggestions of how these challenges can be addressed up-stream; that is, what researchers can do in order to increase the usefulness of the evidence of effect evaluation studies.

**Methods**

To guide researchers in increasing the usefulness of evidence, we have developed the Useful Evidence Typology. The typology guides systematic research on four features of interventions: (1) its logic or theory, and core components; (2) implementation strategy; (3) contextual factors that moderate effectiveness; and (4) outcomes. These features can be studied at three levels: (a) describing what is important to end-users; (b) analyzing why the core components work, as implemented, in context (mechanisms); and (c) using study designs to increase understanding of the four features over time.

**Main findings**

Whereas there is no single method or approach that can ensure the that effect evaluations produce useful research evidence, there are approaches that are promising. In this presentation, we draw from the literature across fields such as primary and secondary prevention, quality improvement in healthcare, behavioral medicine, and interventions to social determinants of health to offer inspiration in how this can be done. Our hope is that the Useful Evidence Typology will help to balance rigorous tests of outcomes with greater ability to generalize about those outcomes.