

Supplementary Table 1. Synthesis of data from survey and interviews

How do researchers describe translation?
Survey: No data collected
Interviews: Pre-clinical: described research-to-research translation and research-to-practice translation Clinical: described research-to research translation, research-to-practice translation, research-policy translation
Synthesis: Similarities of scope regarding research translation described by both research groups, albeit with stronger focus from clinical researchers on research-to-practice and research-to-policy translation
How important is research translation?
Survey: Translation of own research is important (86% pre-clinical, 100% clinical) but not all participants' research can be translated (14% pre-clinical, 13% clinical). Translation of research findings beyond publication is not considered a consistent component of a research project – despite many (43% pre-clinical/46% clinical) researchers considering a project complete when findings have led to new research projects, or when findings have been incorporated into policy/practice (43% pre-clinical/65% clinical researchers), the most common marker of completion of a research project (reported by 100% of pre-clinical/77% clinical researchers) is publication of results. Translation is important for impact: when measuring impact, pre-clinical and clinical researchers commonly consider whether research has been incorporated into clinical guidelines, is being used by clinicians and is being used (cited) by researchers.
Interviews: Translation of own research is important for all clinical researchers and majority but not all of pre-clinical researchers. Research-to-research translation to inform/improve future research projects and research-to-practice translation to improve health outcomes is something some researchers aspire to, which can underpin rationale for developing a research project. However, translation reported as a separate process from the research process, and researchers frequently need to move on to new research projects prior to translation activities being completed.
Synthesis: Data from both sources are consistent - all clinical but not all pre-clinical researchers report that translation of their research is important. Although researchers reported that it was important to consider research translation, particularly in terms of generating and measuring impact, there was a sense that while research translation (beyond publication) is desirable, it is a separate entity from the research process, and not core business of a research team. Role identity and funding requirements could result in new research being prioritised over research translation
Who should be responsible for research translation?
Survey: The majority of researchers agreed that they themselves were responsible for translating their research, (57% pre-clinical and 77% clinical researchers). More than half the respondents reported that clinicians (67% clinical, 29% pre-clinical researchers) and researchers with experience/interest in implementation (43% pre-clinical, 52% clinical) should be responsible for research-to-practice translation.
Interviews: Lack of consistent responses between researchers for responsibility beyond publication and dissemination. Marked variation in views regarding who was responsible for translating findings to clinical practice and policy, with nominated parties responsible for translation

including the research team, clinicians, clinical leaders and managers, implementation scientists, a joint clinical-research team, peak bodies such as the Stroke Foundation and state clinical and funding organisations

Synthesis: All pre-clinical and clinical researchers assumed responsibility for publishing and presenting their research to academic audiences. The majority of pre-clinical and clinical researchers were conscious of the responsibility to ensure that their research would have translation potential and be of value to other stakeholder groups. There was considerable inconsistency between researchers (both pre-clinical and clinical) regarding their responsibility to actively support translation beyond publishing the research findings. Numerous researchers advocated that responsibility for research-to-practice translation be handed over to other parties. In contrast, some researchers reported that it was the researcher's responsibility to ensure the evidence was applied in clinical practice, which could occur through liaising with policy makers, senior hospital administrators, or through working collaboratively with clinical teams. The lack of common understanding within CRE-Stroke regarding who should be responsible for translating beyond publication requires attention

Do researchers perceive they have adequate skills and knowledge for research translation?

Survey: 43% of pre-clinical and 40% of clinical researchers knew what strategies to use to translate their research
14% of pre-clinical and 35% of clinical researchers felt adequately skilled to translate their research

Interviews: Research translation deemed to be complex, requiring input and support from experts to devise suitable translation plan. Researchers felt translating findings to other research projects was difficult but was facilitated within CRE-Stroke by collaborative networks and expectations of research translation
Research-to-practice translation required different skill-set from those embodied in research team. Presence of ongoing relationships with clinical teams inconsistent between clinical researchers

Synthesis: While translating research results from one research project to another was acknowledged to be difficult, participants' knowledge and skills were deemed to be adequate by pre-clinical and clinical researchers for research-to-research translation, with this process facilitated by the expectations within CRE-Stroke and by pre-existing interprofessional and interdisciplinary research networks. Further, key parties involved in research-to-research translation are researchers, so have a common understanding and motivation to refine and innovate research plans and ideas.
Research-to-practice translation consistently described as difficult and complex. Pre-clinical and clinical researchers reported a general lack of confidence regarding their own skills and knowledge to be able to oversee research-to-practice translation projects. The lack of confidence was compounded for a number of clinical researchers by the reported lack of structure and support to facilitate collaborations between researchers and clinical teams, whereas researchers who had formal positions within health services were generally more confident in their knowledge and ability to translate evidence to clinical practice.