



**HAL**  
open science

## Living Labs and other participatory approaches applied to research on multiple environmental exposures and chronic risks

Olivier Laurent, Yara Carrejo Gironza, Sophie Ancelet, Olivier Armant, Denis Bard, Katia Baumgartner, Sylvie Bortoli, Céline Boudet, Philippe Chamaret, Michel Chartier, et al.

### ► To cite this version:

Olivier Laurent, Yara Carrejo Gironza, Sophie Ancelet, Olivier Armant, Denis Bard, et al.. Living Labs and other participatory approaches applied to research on multiple environmental exposures and chronic risks. ISEE 2021 - 33rd Annual Conference of the International Society for Environmental Epidemiology, Aug 2021, New York (Virtual), United States. , 2021, Promoting Environmental Health and Equity in a Shifting Climate. hal-03326515

**HAL Id: hal-03326515**

**<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-03326515>**

Submitted on 26 Jun 2023

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License



# Living Labs and other participatory approaches applied to research on multiple environmental exposures and chronic risks



Olivier Laurent<sup>1</sup>, Yara Carrejo Gironza<sup>2</sup>, Sophie Ancelet<sup>1</sup>, Olivier Armant<sup>1</sup>, Denis Bard<sup>3</sup>, Katia Baumgartner<sup>4</sup>, Sylvie Bortoli<sup>5</sup>, Céline Boudet<sup>6</sup>, Philippe Chamaret<sup>7</sup>, Michel Chartier<sup>1</sup>, Stéphanie Cormier<sup>8</sup>, Arthur David<sup>9</sup>, Hélène Desqueyroux<sup>10</sup>, Mariette Gerber<sup>11</sup>, Rodolphe Gilbin<sup>1</sup>, Sonia Grimbuhler<sup>12</sup>, Stéphane Grison<sup>1</sup>, Lionel Larqué<sup>13</sup>, Dominique Laurier<sup>1</sup>, Christian Mougin<sup>14</sup>, Laurence Payrastra<sup>15</sup>, Sylvie Platel<sup>4</sup>, Alain Rannou<sup>1</sup>, Arnaud Vanzemberg<sup>1</sup>, Simon Schraub<sup>16</sup>, Sylvie Supervil<sup>1</sup>, Eric Thybaud<sup>6</sup>, Brigitte Trousse<sup>17</sup>, Sylvie Charron<sup>1</sup>

1. IRSN; 2. IRSET; 3. SFSE; 4. FNE; 5. INSERM UMRs 1124 - Université de Paris; 6. Ineris; 7. Institut Ecocitoyen pour la Connaissance des Pollutions; 8. CPIE des Pays de l'Aisne, pour l'UNCPPIE; 9. Université de Rennes, EHESP, Inserm, IRSET - UMR S 1085; 10. ADEME; 11. Experte scientifique auprès de l'ANCCLI; 12. INRAE, UMR ITAP, (INRAE/Institut Agro); 13. ALLISS; 14. INRAE, UMR ECOSYS, Pôle Ecotoxicologie; 15. INRAE, UMR 1331, TOXALIM, INRAE/ENVTEI Purpan/UPS; 16. Ligue Nationale contre le cancer; 17. Inria Centre de Sophia Antipolis – Méditerranée / France Living Labs

LILAS has allowed, through a cross-acclturation process and the co-construction of an analytic matrix of research methods, to develop consolidated grounds for the co-construction of future participatory research projects on multiple environmental exposures

## Background

- The objectives of **environmental health research** are diverse (e.g.: identifying situations at potential risk, estimating exposures and effects, testing the effectiveness of preventive actions)
- Related methods are diverse as well.
- Opportunities for greater implication of the civil society and related challenges differ at each step of such research activities.**

These aspects **need to be better identified and shared among academic, institutional researchers and civil society representatives.**

As a **preparatory step toward the co-construction of participative research projects** on multiple exposures and disease risks, the LILAS project **aimed to :**

- co-construct**, among institutional researchers, academics and civil society representatives, **a mutual understanding** of the main problematics and **research methods in environmental health**, their stakes for different actors, but also the requirements, strengths and limitations of these methods
- identify expected benefits and points of vigilance related to stronger degrees of participation** as part of such environmental health research projects.

## Materials and Methods

- 33 institutional researchers, academics and civil society representatives** interested in multiple environmental exposures (chemical, radiological).
- 5 meetings** to collectively identify different types of study (including environmental epidemiology studies) and reflect about the added value, limitations, and methodological principles related to the introduction of growing participation as part of such studies.
- Bibliographic search** to identify relevant examples,
- Analysis matrix co-constructed and filled by participants**, as in a « Living Lab mode » project.



## Results

For **different types of studies** (studies for assessment of environmental exposures, identification of their determinants, interventions on these exposures, development of sensors, quantitative risk assessment, environmental epidemiological studies, experimental research, studies on the health of ecosystems...), the **matrix** (available here : <https://hal-irsn.archives-ouvertes.fr/irsn-03222498> **lists**

- expected benefits** for several categories of **stakeholders**,
- fundamental methodological principles** and **practical constraints**,
- advantages and limitations related to the use of participatory or more “classical” research approaches.**

This matrix can be **displayed as a poster in rooms where participants will be co-creating research new projects, to help reflexion and ensure the feasibility** of proposed projects.

## Additional Results

**Table 1. Extract from the full matrix: line dealing with prospective analytic epidemiological studies**

General issue being addressed	Expected benefits for:				Fundamental methodological requirements	Practical constraints	Classical approaches (without co-création)			Approches involving higher participation (ex : Community-Based Participatory Research, Living Labs)		
	Researchers	Authorities	People	Other stakeholders (e.g.: physicians)			Expected contributions from people	Avantages of using a classical approach	Limitations of using a classical approach	Expected contributions from people	Avantages of using a participatory approach	Limitations of using a participatory approach
Lack of knowledge or proper quantification of health risks associated with some current or future exposures	Improve knowledge on the relationship between exposures and health risks	Middle to long term: Responding to people's concerns about health effects related to some exposures	Contribute to science	Middle to long term: Responding to people's concerns about health effects related to some exposures	Clear and homogeneous inclusion and follow-up criteria Lack of selection, information and confounding biases Sufficient statistical power to detect effects Use of adequate statistical methods for analysis	Standardized and adequate estimates or measures of exposures, health and potential confounders Sufficient sample size and follow-up length and contrasts in exposures to get enough statistical power for analysis Ethical agreements Long-term funding Support from experienced specialists (biostatisticians, exposure scientists...)	Easier to get large samples Directly standardized collection of data Lower costs	Risk of missing important aspects of exposures that people are aware of Missing richness of data that participative approaches can provide Some designs purely record-based largely avoid recruitment biases	Cross-acclturation Understand requirements of epidemiological studies and considerations leading of not to causality judgements on exposure-health relationships. Integrate curret knowledge on the exposure-health relationships of interest Propose research questions, collectively evaluate their relevance and the ability of various rearch designs to answer these questions Participate to the development and implementation of the protocol, and possibly to analyses (depending on their technicity) and interpretations, with help from specialists.	Implication of populations Richer information /data Improved match between people's expectations or questions and research, provided that some methods are adequate to address these questions (see practical constraints column - local studies may not be sufficient in many cases). Larger societal vision of studied problems, opportunities to identify solutions collectively Possibly more sustained participation over the long term thanks to stringe direct interest	Heavier and probably more expensive work (coordination, authentication and standardisation of data, protocol evolutions as new research questions arise...) Potentially smaller populations than in classical cohorts due to the intense ressource requirements of participatory research Possible impact on representativity of having the most concerned and available people	

## Conclusions

LILAS has allowed, through a cross-acclturation process, to **develop consolidated grounds for the co-construction of future participatory research projects** on multiple environmental exposures. **Such a community-based research projects is now being developed**, in the Dunkerque area (France) : the **ORRCH-IDEeS** project.