Episode 70: "Secondary Research Helps Us Map & Understand the Evidence"

with Stina Grant, Methods Specialist with the BC Behavioural Insights Group (BC BIG)

Stina Grant joins us for a deep dive on secondary research. Stina walks us through the importance of understanding the existing evidence base -- what has been done in which context and to what effect. She shares tips for how to conduct good literature reviews, how to synthesize information from across sources, and how to feed in primary research. As Stina says, conducting secondary research is like finding the pieces to a puzzle and solving the mystery.

Transcript:

KIRSTIN APPELT, HOST: Welcome to this edition of Calling DIBS. I'm your host, Kirstin Appelt, Research Director with UBC Decision Insights for Business and Society, or DIBS for short. Today we're calling DIBS on Stina Grant.

Stina is a Methods Specialist with the BC Behavioural Insights Group, and she comes to BI from a behavioural medicine background. She's also someone I've had entirely too few opportunities to chat with. So, I'm excited for our chat today and getting to know Stina a little better. So welcome to the podcast, Stina.

STINA GRANT, GUEST: Thank you. I'm so excited to be here and honoured to be invited. And I'm just excited to get to know you a bit better. Like you said, we haven't had a lot of chances to work together, so I'm looking forward to our conversation.

APPELT: Awesome. Well, since we already established that we don't know each other too well, can you start by just telling us a little bit about yourself?

GRANT: Yeah. You bet. So, I have been with the BC Public Service for about three years now. And as you mentioned, I'm a Methods Specialist with BC BIG. So, I've been with the team for about a year and I initially joined on a temporary assignment, but more recently became permanent, which is exciting. And so far, I've been involved in several projects, all at various stages.

But throughout the year I've been involved in all phases of the BI project. So, I've gotten to take part in scoping, research, solution development, data collection and evaluation, and I've just really enjoyed my time with the team and glad to have the chance to deepen my BI knowledge and interest in my practitioner skills.

APPELT: Yeah, so exciting to have you now be part of the permanent team. Its always amazing the calibre of folks that BC BIG brings in and then when they're on temporary assignments like, "No, we don't want to lose them, make them permanent." So glad that has worked. I was also wondering if you could tell us a little bit about your path to behavioural insights. How did it get on your radar? How did you become interested? What made you take the leap?

GRANT: Oh yeah, I love this question. It's always fun to hear about how folks get into the field, so I'll try to share the short version of my story, but I guess it starts with my undergrad. So, I did my undergraduate in

psychology and I was always really passionate about health and wellness, and I toyed with pursuing a few different things, but I hadn't really found the perfect fit, as I was nearing the end of my degree and I was always kind of more interested in positive psychology and then how we can function optimally and fulfill our potential through lifestyle behaviours.

And so, I was fortunate to discover the Behavioural Medicine Lab at the University of Victoria, kind of towards the end of my degree. And it was exciting because it just perfectly married my love of physical activity and health with some really fascinating research that they were doing. So, I dabbled in a few different things after my degree, but I always kind of kept a foot in the door at the lab, and I progressively became more and more involved.

So eventually I became a full-time Research Coordinator and in that role I managed the large scale randomized controlled trials, mostly investigating physical activity promotion. And I gained such awesome experiences that I decided to pursue grad study. And it was during that time that I got a bit more interested in how to move research into action, kind of out of the lab, into the real world.

So, I was really keen to have more real-world impact and start moving evidence into practice. So, when a position in knowledge mobilization came up at the Ministry of Health, I jumped at the opportunity and there I was a lead for a corporate service that supported evidence-informed decision-making. So, we had different evidence products that we offered to program areas across the ministry, specifically we would facilitate and develop rapid evidence reviews and jurisdictional scans.

But coincidentally, while it helped, I think it was even within the first month or two, I attended what was then called BI Bootcamp in Policy School hosted by BC BIG and this is how I learned about the field of BI and really got to see it in action. It was just so exciting to see many concepts that I was already familiar with in this applied setting with really obvious social impact. So, from then on, BC BIG was on my radar and I vowed to go in for any opportunities that came up with the team. And that's kind of what led me to where I am today. And I'm just so thrilled to be working in such an exciting and dynamic field.

APPELT: Awesome. I love to hear about that. That's so interesting. And I actually am not that familiar with behavioural medicine, and I imagine that might be true for some listeners as well. So, can you tell us a little bit about what behavioural medicine is?

GRANT: Yeah. Absolutely. So behavioural medicine or BMED for short, it's a multidisciplinary field and it looks at strategies for improving health behaviours for individuals and communities. So, we know that many health challenges have behavioural causes and can be helped by behavioural solutions. So, things like smoking and a sedentary lifestyle, these contribute to disease. And conversely, behaviours like exercising or eating right can prevent disease.

So BMED looks to promote those types of behaviours ultimately for disease prevention. But I'd say many of the studies out of the BMED lab would fall under the umbrella of health psychology. So, we were largely focused on the theory and practice of behaviour change.

APPELT: So interesting. So what would you say are some of the similarities and differences between behavioural medicine and behavioural insights? Because it seems like there's quite a lot of overlap.

GRANT: Yeah, I'd say there's tons of overlap and crossover, so specifically around kind of the concepts and methods and techniques and tools that are used. So, for example, many of the studies I was involved in

focused on turning good intentions into action by using theories of behavioural change to inform interventions that are made up of relevant to behaviour change techniques.

So, of course, this is very similar to Applied Behavioural Science. And you know, the Intention-Action Gap is often at the core of many policy challenges. So often we'll map solutions according to the theory or framework of behaviour. Yeah, and I'd say maybe the other kind of obvious similarity is behavioural medicine or health psychology also prioritize rigorous research methods like randomized controlled trials.

But that said, in my experience, there's also a lot more emphasis on developing the chain of evidence in these fields. So, we look to kind of conducting these early phase research like pilots and feasibility studies if we're really diving into effectiveness trials and this is something I haven't seen as much of within the BI space but I imagine this is because behavioural sciences and applied fields and because it's addressing practical problems and it looks to improve outcomes in very specific contexts, on the whole, it's just moving a lot quicker. So yeah, overall I'd say that the fields are related in many ways, but some notable differences and distinctions there.

APPELT: Yeah, it's an interesting area and I think there's more and more interplay between the health sphere and the BI sphere right now, and I think it's just such an exciting space to be working in because like you said, there are so many elements of behaviour involved in health outcomes and the barriers and the solutions. So it's a really exciting place.

Well, changing gears almost completely, one of the things I was hoping we could talk about was exploratory research, which actually is a through line between behavioural medicine and behavioural insights. Exploratory research is one of the key phases of every BI undertaking, whether it's a something that goes to a full randomized controlled trial or it's something that's just going to be a lens providing BI advice.

And we've talked on the podcast before about the value of the primary research techniques or user research surveys, focus groups, interviews, but we've never really done a deep dive into the other part of exploratory research, which is secondary research. And maybe we should start with a definition of terms. What is meant by secondary research?

GRANT: Yeah, absolutely. I can get into this a bit and I alluded to this earlier, but this is definitely an interest area for me. And I also see secondary research as equally critical to understanding a problem and a really great first step, like you said. So, in terms of what it is, secondary research is also known as desk research, and we can think about desk research methods, reviewing existing data or evidence.

And we do this by focusing on what's already been collected and published by other folks. And we can do this without leaving the comfort of our own desks or having to go out in the field to gather fresh data and insights. So that's kind of in a nutshell what we mean by secondary research.

APPELT: That is a very clear definition. I like it. Sometimes I get bogged down in the specifics, but that was perfect. And so you started to allude to, you know, the ideas of looking at published research, but I thought maybe we could break in the different types of secondary research. So what are some of the types and how are they different from one another?

GRANT: Yeah. So maybe I'll highlight just a few different methods. So first off, we have kind of your standard academic literature review. And generally, this involves exploring peer reviewed literature related to a question or problem.

So, typically you approach this by defining your scope, identifying relevant literature, critically analyzing the literature, and then summarizing your findings. Be something you might be interested in exploring barriers around a desired behaviour, or perhaps investigating behaviour change strategies that have been used and how effective those have been in the past. And while these types of literature reviews are usually kind of well thought out and organized, there's some flexibility in how you gather, evaluate, and synthesize your sources.

So, another type of literature, which is my preferred approach, when possible, is what we call rapid evidence reviews. So, these are an accelerated form of evidence synthesis, and they summarize research evidence on a particular issue by looking at what's been done and kind of recording the main outcomes. So, they're really a modified or streamlined systematic review which omit or simplify some certain processes. And what this means is they're as rigorous as possible on tight timelines. So, it's a really quick and useful way of gathering, consolidating information. And this makes them really practical for policymakers and decision makers.

So, in terms of how we conduct a rapid evidence review we would first develop a narrow research question as well as a specific search strategy, and then we would develop inclusion criteria for articles. We have really specific parameters and documentation for how we found articles and how we chose to include them.

Next, we would screen papers for eligibility and extract data, and then we would end by analyzing and integrating those results. So, our goal with this type of review is to provide kind of an overall view of the state of the literature, highlight any gaps in knowledge, and also identify future directions. And now with rapid evidence reviews, there are some interim Cochrane guidelines on the methods for carrying them out. And so, it makes it a bit different from your standard lit review because there's a bit more methodology behind it.

And then lastly, we have jurisdictional scans. So, these look at what other places in the world have done in response to a similar question or issue. So, we might examine how problems have been framed, what strategies have been proposed or implemented, and also what's worked or not worked for different jurisdictions. In terms of methods, jurisdictional scans can be pretty flexible, but I'd say it's important to choose comparable locations.

For example, we want to focus on places with similar political or geographic contexts, or perhaps even certain population considerations. And that way, the findings are applicable to our unique setting. And with these, they're primarily focused on gray literature. So often this means that the sources aren't peer reviewed, and it might include things like reports or working papers, government documents, white papers, evaluations, these types of things. Yeah. And then I guess with this type of review, the search needs to be kind of bit more targeted as opposed to through your typical academic database. So that's a bit of a difference when it comes to conducting these.

APPELT: That's such a helpful walkthrough. Yeah, it was funny in class a few weeks ago actually, someone was asking about is there a sole source for cross jurisdictional scans, which in academic literature you know, you can use like your Google Scholars and things where they'll help you look across journals, but cross jurisdictional scans, a lot of organizations just post things to their own websites. And as of yet, there's not a good aggregator. So that's a really good flag, is that they are super useful, but they can be hard because it kind of relies on knowing where to look, who's doing what and who might be good.

And I also just wanted to flag that I loved what you brought up about rapid evidence reviews and how those can be a really helpful way to do a good scan in a short amount of time. And things like COVID crisis were a perfect example of when you're trying to learn really quickly about state of the art, but not get so bogged down that you can't respond to important timelines.

GRANT: Yeah, definitely. Those are such good points. And with respect to the jurisdictional stance, I think that's when we're kind of defining the jurisdictions of interest or even the organizations of interest from the get go can be really helpful just so that you know where to search. Because like you said, it can be really tricky to turn up those documents.

APPELT: Absolutely. We're trying to make things easier by putting top sources on the Wiki, but new sources are proliferating faster than we can add them. So, it's tough. There's so many good sources of BI research these days.

GRANT: Very true. Yes.

APPELT: And I think we've probably already alluded to this, but maybe if we can just restate it a bit more concretely, what is the value of secondary research? Why do we do it?

GRANT: Yeah. So, I think in my view, secondary research really is crucial and it means that we're starting to work with the firm foundations and the really strong working knowledge of the challenge. And so, it allows us to build on what's already been done and also kind of make use of what's worked in similar contexts or situations perhaps where there's been similar barriers or that sort of thing. So, leveraging sound evidence means we can ultimately strengthen our solution development.

And then the other kind of important piece is it often paves the way for primary research. So often it provides hypotheses or assumptions that we might want to then go and validate with primary research, or maybe there's gaps in our understanding, and then we might want to explore our own unique context through some of those methods that you mentioned, like surveys, interviews and focus groups.

APPELT: Yeah. And I think that's one of the reasons why the exploratory research phase is often a bit more iterative, because the secondary research often generates, like you said, hypotheses that we want to test in our surveys or interviews or focus groups. But then also as we learn more from those surveys, focus groups, etc., we often then want to go back into the literature and say, “Oh, now that we know that this barrier is really key, what other research has been done on this barrier?”.

And so the primary research often gives us a deeper dive into our specific context and the nuances of this problem, whereas the secondary research is often letting us look across different contexts to see what else has been done so that we're not reinventing the wheel, if someone else has already come up with a good solution for this problem.

GRANT: Yeah, that's such a good point. And I love this idea. It can be a bit iterative, and you can go back and forth to kind of revisit the literature based on what you're finding. And yeah, I think that's a really great way of thinking about it.

APPELT: So now that we know the value, and we've talked about some of the different methods, what tips do you have for how to do secondary research well? What are some of the lessons from the so-called desktop trenches?

GRANT: Yeah, this is such a good question. I have so many tips and I actually don't really know where to start. So maybe I'll just start at the beginning. So I think the first step, it's super essential to start with a really strong research question. And this is where I've actually seen lots of folks have challenges, so we want our research question to be clear and answerable so that our search is focused and manageable.

And this helps us just be realistic and ultimately saves lots of valuable time and headaches down the road. So unless we have those really specific parameters from jump, it can be easy for your scope to explode and you might get overwhelmed, and the amount of literature that you have to review just is too much for one person. So, in terms of how to develop a strong research question, there's tons of great tools and frameworks out there.

One framework that I really like to use is what we call PICO. So, it stands for Population, Intervention, Comparison and Outcome, and this just helps us define what we're really looking for and get specific about the types of studies that we're looking for. So, it just helps us get set up for kind of a smooth and successful review.

I think my next tip would be to get kind of systematic in your searching and documentation before you dive too deeply into anything. So I really like to set up systems in advance just to help keep me on track and help me record findings as I go. And this can also help just have an accurate assessment of all the evidence on the topic and helps to avoid cherry picking of information that we like, or that in particular really resonates. And so before I dive too deep into the literature, I just like to set up a spreadsheet which has columns for the type of information that I want to be able to extract as I go.

The last thing I just want to emphasize is that searching and understanding evidence isn't always straightforward and does require a degree of training and expertise. So don't get discouraged if you're feeling like you're a bit lost. I would say just maybe make use of all the tools that are out there. Your university library probably has all sorts of things that you can leverage, and there's organizations like the National Collaborating Center for Methods and Tools, and they have some amazing resources that can help you learn more about different research designs and how to critically appraise resources and how to assess the applicability and transferability of your findings. So if you can, just make use of all these amazing tools and resources.

APPELT: Yeah, I think having a strong research question is such an important piece and I think is one that sometimes in our excitement we overlook, we just say, “Oh, this is cool, let me go see what else has been done?”. And then we don't get really crisp on what we're looking for. And then like we've said, there's just so much out there that you can just get deluged and lose sight. And we've talked before about scope creep for a whole BI project, but even just scope creep within the lit-review can be, it can just be mind-boggling.

And then I also like what you said about being systematic and taking notes as you go, because often I think this is one of those behavioural quirks of humans, is that while we're exposed to the information, we're like, “Oh, I'm definitely going to remember what I learned and where I learned it”. But then, you know, seven articles later, we're like, “Who said what about this and that?”. So just keeping a good record so that you are clear and you know which sources you might want to go back to.

And then also just for academic integrity, because we want to be clear about where our ideas came from. And over time we may forget which sources had which ideas, or we might have taken notes verbatim, and we weren't clear about which notes were quotes and which were paraphrased. And so it can get ourselves into hot water unintentionally. So being very good about our framework and how we approach it, I think is a really good tip.

GRANT: Yeah, I've definitely been there for both themes. I've been down some major rabbit holes and I've also forgotten where I read something. And there's nothing worse than trying to go back and find the source after the fact. So, live and learn, I suppose.

APPELT: Totally. Well, I think when I approach secondary research, I often think about it as having the two phases, this collecting phase, which we've just been talking about, where you're trying to get the information. But then there's this other phase where now you've got lots of information from different sources and different channels, different phrasing, different context, and you have to synthesize across those sources to understand what the takeaways are. So what is your advice for that part of things, the synthesis phase?

GRANT: Hmm. Yeah, this is such a good question because this is definitely the trickiest part, and there's definitely a bit of an art form to it. So. once we conducted our research, we collected and reviewed lots of great information. We need to be able to make sense of it and find a way to kind of relay our findings in a way that makes sense for folks.

So, I like to think of this as looking for patterns. So, we're kind of noting the similarities or differences and identifying those gaps that come up. And I'd say the easiest way to summarize the results in a meaningful way is through an evidence table that's just structured in a way that really highlights those similarities and differences. But synthesis usually also involves kind of creating a narrative around the findings. And I like to do this by creating a bit of a scaffold structure for myself, just trying to note my main points and the key things that came up and then incorporating all the different findings from those evidence tables as I build that out.

So, I made the sound simple, but I just let it emphasize that it can feel complex and challenging when you're trying to make sense of stuff. And it also just gets better with practice. So, if you're stuck, it's always helpful just to look at examples of what other folks have done, and that can be a good way to think about it.

APPELT: Absolutely. That's such a good point. And I think the idea of the narrative is really helpful. But it's also one of those things that's so interesting because we want the narrative to be driven by what we found and not us imposing a narrative. So I find that that phase is often tricky because doing it from as an objective point of view as possible can be a bit tricky because sometimes, you know, we have our pet theories that we've seen and so how to do it in a balanced way. I think that's a really important piece.

And then I think building on that idea is as we start to have a grasp of the secondary research and the take aways across sources, we're usually also wanting to feed in the results from our primary user research, and often those feel quite different. The secondary research may be feeling more like dry articles where if you've sat in on an interview, it feels like, you know, this really crisp, important anecdote. And so here I think the synthesis is even harder because the types of information and how impactful they feel is quite different, even if their value is quite similar. So how do you combine and synthesize across the two different types of exploratory research?

GRANT: This was such a good observation. And I definitely agree that these two streams can feel somewhat different, but ultimately, I think they're both really complementary and they both contribute to deepening our understanding of certain issues. So, like you said, we kind of need to place equal value in both of them.

But I would say kind of once we've completed our secondary research, we're left with possibly some unchecked assumptions or knowledge gaps or maybe we're lacking that context specific information, that primary research can really augment those secondary research findings, like you said, and provide that nuance.

So yeah, I think both of these types of research get us closer to a better solution, but I think we need to kind of interpret and situate our field research in the context of a literature review to get a more wholesome picture of the challenge at hand and in terms of how it might go about synthesizing these various inputs, I can imagine, or at least for me it's been helpful to kind of sketch out this picture using a mind map or a digital

whiteboard just to account for kind of all the various learnings and the results and things to think about. And this helps us to kind of make connections and think about implications and start turning the wheels for intervention design.

APPELT: Yeah. And I think for me, talking about this idea of like physical or virtual whiteboards or whatever. For me, I think another key piece for this is often having multiple folks involved in the synthesis, because I find that different folks have different take aways. And like if you're sitting in on an interview or reading an article, different things will stand out at you or you'll see different connections.

So, I find that that often helps to have different perspectives, which I guess is another type of synthesis. So, we're having this very multilayered synthesis across sources, types and minds. Do you often do this part quite collaboratively?

GRANT: Yeah, certainly. I think it's so helpful to hear from other folks. And of course, we all bring kind of our own biases to this. So just having input and different perspectives, at the table is so helpful. I'm a big fan of Miro and just kind of mapping all these things out and kind of thinking about associations and connections. So, yeah, I think the more minds, the better, the stronger the output.

APPELT: Yeah. This is one where I actually often do go old school and I use literal Post-It notes because I just like that physical mapping of the space and different ways. And they're just so movable, those Post-It notes.

Well, once you have the insights from the research and you synthesize them, the next piece is that communication. And there's so many different ways you can communicate. And I was wondering how you tackle that, whether it's words or visually, multiple or other methods. And particularly, I was wondering in the cases where you're reporting to folks who aren't as deep into the problem as you are, so you're kind of extracting from all of the depths of details to folks who want more of the takeaways than the nitty gritty.

GRANT: That's such a good question. And in short, I think I use lots of different methods, but my preference is to first communicate findings by way of a brief report. And I just find that the process of actually writing up the findings helps me to consolidate my ideas and takeaways. And usually these reports will include appendices with more detail where needed, like those evidence tables or maybe details around any qualitative data or survey results, that sort of thing.

But I recognize reports aren't for everyone and readers are busy, so it's my practice to then try to kind of translate key insights into a more digestible format. And often that looks like a one page kind of executive summary.

But then in terms of summarizing all of the exploratory findings and kind of relaying those back to our partners, I usually go for just a brief PowerPoint presentation and I just find this provides a bit more of a cohesive story about kind of what we found and how it all fits together. And yeah, this usually lands pretty well with our clients and they always have the option of diving deeper into their approach if they want to.

APPELT: Yeah. I feel like you've done a good job when you've captured their interest enough that they actually do want to go deeper. And I find that often the exploratory research there's often surprises that do catch people off guard or things they weren't expecting. And so it does capture their interest to have them go into the next level. So the other thing we do besides communicating is we want to pull our insights and put them into our actual solution design. So how do you start that process of transitioning from the gathering, analyzing and synthesizing information to moving towards the actual solution design?

GRANT: Hmm. Yeah. This is the fun part. So, once we have all those insights from the exploratory phase, we can really start to interpret and adapt our findings. And this really requires some creativity, and it's become one of my favorite parts of the project is it's designing that intervention.

So, we might start designing the solutions just by really like we already talked about looking at the full picture of what we've collected and thinking about how those puzzle pieces all fit together. And this is where mind map might come in handy and we can kind of use those recommendations that came out of a report as the basis for a solution.

I'm also thinking in projects that I've been involved in, it's useful to kind of map our findings using frameworks like COM-B just to ensure we have all the puzzle pieces in place and all the elements that are required there. But we also need to feed in other inputs like feedback from stakeholders and that sort of thing. So if I think of this visually, I just see a solution in the middle and it's shaped by all these various inputs. So yeah, it's I don't know if I have a straightforward answer, but it's a fun part for sure.

APPELT: Yeah. And I think absolutely one of the most fun parts because you get to actually think about solutions and you're pulling on all the different types of evidence. And it's actually that phase that we all want to jump to. So in some ways it's just been restraining ourselves so that we don't solution to soon. And when you get there, it's like, “Yay, finally we get to work on the solution”. And then I do find that for me it can sometimes be iterative because as you start to build out the BI solution, sometimes it raises questions for the exploratory research that you didn't previously address. So sometimes it might make you want to see like, “Oh, has someone combined these two?”.

Maybe you realize that both a pre-commitment and then reminders would work and you want to see if those have been used together before. Or maybe you have some ideas for a BI solution and you want to start feeling them out and seeing how the population of interest will respond to them. So it can be, in addition to feeding in the research and the partner voices, it can also be helpful to take it back to research and see what else can apply. Well, as we lean towards wrapping up, what might you have for a message for our new BI practitioners and training?

GRANT: Yeah, maybe continuing on with this theme of fun, I would say just try to have fun with the exploring phase. If I'm being totally honest, sometimes desk research can feel like a bit of a slog and it can definitely get overwhelming. But I like to try to just think of myself as like a detective collecting clues or hunting for treasure. And this can just make it a bit more enjoyable.

And it also feels really good when things just kind of start to click and all those pieces come together like we've talked about. Yeah, I mean, just I find it really rewarding to become like a mini expert in a topic that you're researching. Yeah. So, I guess maybe last thing on this theme of enjoyment. The behavioural scientist in me just wants to recommend like finding an awesome focus playlist and lighting a candle and just trying to make it as pleasant as possible. We're going into the fall season, so anything to make it cozy helps.

APPELT: I like that. Yeah, our little library set ups to make ourselves feel like we're cozy while we're in the desktop trenches. Yeah, and I think your point, too, is really good about the fact that it's partly just how you frame the activity. If you think of, “Oh, I got to go dust off the proverbial library books”, it doesn't sound as enticing, but if you think of it like a puzzle you're solving, then it makes it a lot more fun if you're looking for pieces to the puzzle.

GRANT: Absolutely.

APPELT: Well, any last thoughts? Questions I should have asked and didn't that you can think of?

GRANT: Yeah, I think that's it for me. It's just been so lovely to chat and I appreciate the opportunity to speak with you. And this is definitely a bit of a passionate area for me, so it's been fun to chat about it.

APPELT: Well, I totally agree. It has been really nice to chat with you and get to know you better, but also to talk about secondary research, which in addition to sometimes feeling like dusty library books, I think we often kind of gloss over because it just feels like, “Oh, you know, you just go look it up” and there's a lot more to it than that. Like you said, there's an art to it, but there's also a bit of a science to it and there's frameworks. And so, it is a really important step that people have figured out ways to do better. And just tackling it without any preparation isn't the best way.

So, it's been so helpful to walk through it with you and you've been such a fantastic addition to the BC BIG team. I'm really excited to see what new projects you'll be working on and getting more chances to chat. So thank you for joining us today and sharing your wisdom.

GRANT: Yeah. Thanks so much, Kirstin. This has been really fun.

APPELT: And thanks to our listeners for joining another episode of Calling DIBS.