Factors Limiting the Management of Technological Platforms ("Core Facility") to Support Scientific Health Research

André Browne Ribeiro Oliveira[1,2*], Marcelo Santos Ramos[1,2], Roni Dias Vinhas[1,2], Cristiano Vasconcellos Ferreira[3], Claudio Damasceno Pinto[4], Bruna Aparecida Souza Machado[2]

[1]Oswaldo Cruz Foundation; Salvador, Bahia; [2]SENAI CIMATEC University, Industrial Management and Technology, Salvador, Bahia; [3]Federal University of Santa Catarina; Joinville, Santa Catarina; [4]Oswaldo Cruz Foundation - IOC; Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

This study aimed to identify the main limiting factors in managing technological platforms—health research support units equipped with multi-user equipment and specialized staff. A review of the scientific literature was conducted, covering three thematic blocks: multi-user units, core facilities, and technological platforms, searched in the PubMed database. To correlate the limitations identified with management practices adopted in various organizations, analysis categories related to management and outcomes were developed. Based on the literature, key limitations were identified in the operation of these specialized research support units, allowing for the definition of essential analytical points for establishing a management model.

Keywords: Multi-User Units. Core Facilities. Technological Platforms.

The sustained and rapid development in recent decades of core technologies that underpin life sciences research has transformed biological science into an increasingly multidisciplinary field. This transformation has made it technically and economically unfeasible for individual health research laboratories to master all these technologies independently. Many institutions have adopted multi-user infrastructures to address this challenge and support competitive science. These platforms are especially well-suited to keeping pace with the sector's rapid technological advancements [1–3].

In light of a global economic slowdown, declining research and development (R&D) funding, and rising equipment costs, research institutions have been compelled to plan their budgets more strategically, especially regarding the management of technological platforms. This context has driven the shift toward centralized research support infrastructures that facilitate the sharing of resources. These centralized platforms offer access to multi-user equipment, technologies, and services more robustly and sophisticatedly than traditional independent laboratory structures [4,5].

Initial funding for a technological platform typically covers the acquisition and installation of equipment. However, long-term operational expenses are rarely accounted for, making sustainability a complex challenge. These ongoing costs include equipment maintenance, service upgrades, technology development, and specialized personnel recruitment and training [1,6].

Given the scarcity of resources, efficient management of technological platforms has become essential. The starting point for this efficiency is identifying the operational challenges these units face. Therefore, this paper aims to review relevant literature and outline the primary limiting factors in the management of technological platforms.

Materials and Methods

This study is based on a review of the scientific literature, focusing on three thematic search blocks: multi-user units, core facilities, and technological platforms. As the study focuses on health research institutions, the PubMed database—home to over

Received on 18 January 2025; revised 20 March 2025.

Address for correspondence: André Browne Ribeiro Oliveira. Rua Waldemar Falcão, 121 - Candeal, Salvador, Bahia, Brazil. Zipcode: 40296-710. E-mail: andre.browne@fiocruz.br.

J Bioeng. Tech. Health 2025;8(2):210-216

36 million articles and publications in the health sciences—was selected for the literature search.

The search was performed in April 2024, with no restrictions on publication date. Exclusion criteria included articles written in languages other than English, duplicates, and those unrelated to the research topic. After the selection process, the full texts of the included articles were reviewed to identify the limiting factors and to develop analysis categories relevant to the management of technological platforms.

Results and Discussion

By analyzing a range of conceptual perspectives in the literature, ten categories of analysis relevant to the management of technological platforms were identified. These were further consolidated into seven broader management areas, grouped under two overarching dimensions: management practices and results. This framework enabled the correlation of these categories with the operational limitations observed.

Analysis Categories

Understanding the relationships between specific management practices, their outcomes, and their correlation with known limitations is essential for improving the functionality and sustainability of technological platforms.

Table 1 presents the analysis categories identified, highlighting both commonalities and differences among the authors. For instance, financial management and technical research staff are recurring categories across all reviewed studies, while infrastructure, noted by Lejeune and colleagues [7], is mentioned by only one author.

In this study, the ten categories of analysis were reduced to seven and classified into management processes and results, as shown in Table 2. Thus, a new standardization and closer approximation to current business management practices were proposed [8].

Management Limitations

The literature review on the management of technological platforms identified limitations in managing these specialized support units for scientific research. Table 3 shows the limitations mentioned by the authors, correlating them with the categories of analysis proposed in this study. The authors also referred to the limitations in the texts analyzed as challenges, problems, or barriers.

A.1. Resources (Capital and Intellectual)

Regarding partnerships with other public research institutions or the private sector, the following limitations were identified: weak relationships between universities and companies [4]; conflicts of interest between public research institutions and the private sector [9,10]; and the short lifecycle of new technologies, coupled with diverse methodologies and the burden of specialized knowledge, which can overwhelm institutional capacity. This challenge reinforces the need to share R&D infrastructure among public research institutions [11,12].

Challenges related to equipment maintenance and availability include limited financial resources for equipment maintenance and updates [13,14], and the variability in service quality and response time from equipment maintenance providers, which often depends on the region [15,16]. Another important infrastructure-related challenge is adequate data storage and management systems [17,18].

Furthermore, fully leveraging the potential of available equipment depends on the expertise of the personnel operating it, which requires ongoing training [12]. A recurring issue is the presence of unqualified personnel, which has been identified as a key factor in the lack of rigorous research procedures [14,19].

A.2. General Administration

Within the general administration category, several structural limitations were identified,

Table 1. Analysis categories identified in the literature review.

N	Turpen et al (2016)	Hockberger et al (2018)	Lejeune et al (2020).
1	General administration	General management	-
2	Research and technical staff	Research and technical staff	Highly qualified personnel
3	Financial management	Financial management	Finacial Performance
4	Resource management	-	Resources
5	-	-	Infrastructure
6	Communication	Communication of services	-
7	Strategic planning	Self-assessment	-
8	Customer base and satisfaction	Customer base and satisfaction	Technological platforms performance
9	Institutional impact	Customer publications and grants	Collaboration
10	-	Educational and outreach activities	Public visibility

Table 2. Proposed analysis categories.

Item	Analysis Categories	Dimension
A.1	Resources (Capital/Intellectual)	Management
A.2	General administration	Management
A.3	Financial management	Management
A.4	Communication	Management
A.5	Strategic Planning	Management
B.1	Customer base	Results
B.2	Institutional impact	Results

such as the absence of formalized procedures for proposing, establishing, evaluating, and renewing technological platforms [20,21] and the lack of a standardized set of policies to ensure their efficient and sustainable operation [15,20]. Additionally, the need to develop a business model focused on the long-term sustainability of technology platforms was highlighted [1,20,22], along with the importance of advisory committees capable of setting targets and guiding institutional research investments [20,23]. A particular challenge is the lack of standardized processes for assessing the lifecycle of each technology, which is problematic given the short lifespan of many new technologies. This hinders both strategic and operational management of these high-investment assets [1,11]. Staff turnover also poses a significant limitation, leading to a loss of institutional knowledge and exposing the organization's inability to retain highly qualified personnel [5,12,13,17,24].This challenge is often linked to dissatisfaction among technical staff regarding their status and career recognition

Table 3. Limitations of technology platform management.

Analysis Categories	Limitations / Challenges / Barriers / Problems	Authors
A1. Resources (Capital/Intellectual)	Limited relations between universities and companies.	[4]
	Existence of a conflict of interest in partnerships between research centers and the private sector.	[9,10]
	No sharing of infrastructure between platforms.	[11, 12]
	No resources for maintenance and replacement of equipment.	[13, 14]
	No quality assurance in the provision of equipment maintenance services.	[15, 16]
	Lack of data storage/management infrastructure.	[17, 18]
	No training for the technical team to make full use of the equipment's potential / No development of specialized personnel.	[12, 14,19]
A.2. General administration	No business model for the research area.	[1, 20, 22, 25, 34]
	Lack of formalized rules for using the technological platform structure.	[20, 15]
	A lack of systematization of the presence and use of advisory committees and other organizational structures.	[20, 23]
	No formal process for evaluating and renewing platforms.	[14, 21]
	No formal process for acquiring a new platform.	[20, 21]
	No monitoring of the life cycle of new technologies.	[1, 11]
	High staff turnover.	[5, 12, 13, 17, 24]
	No recognition for the careers of technical staff.	[7, 11, 25, 26, 27]
	Lack of management knowledge among the team.	[18, 23, 27, 28, 29, 30]
A.3. Financial management	No costing and pricing models.	[11,13, 18, 20]
	No good funding systems in place for platforms.	[11]
	No system for financing and managing the budget.	[1, 6, 7, 31]
	No system for attracting external funding.	[22, 32]
A.4. Communication	No access to reliable information on technological platforms	[4, 20, 26, 33]
	Difficulty in communication between the platform team and the user	[3]
A.5. Strategic Plannin	No definition of the presence and role of technology platforms in strategic research planning.	[20, 33]
B.1.Customer base	Insufficient qualification of users to use equipment / No training of users.	[13, 16, 19]
B.2. Institutional impact	No tools for institutional evaluation of technological platforms. No performance indicators.	[1, 7, 23, 25, 30, 32]

within the institution [7,25], reinforcing the need for a work environment that offers competitive salaries, career stability, a respectful culture, and formal recognition for staff contributions [11,26,27]. Other personnel-related issues include a shortage of human resources, excessive workload, and difficulties hiring skilled labor [24].

Technology platforms function simultaneously as research laboratories and small business entities. Therefore, effective management is essential; however, most scientific health research institutions lack the necessary managerial competencies to perform these duties adequately [18,23,27–30].

A.3. Financial Management

One of the primary challenges in financial management is developing sustainable pricing models that make technological platforms attractive to both academic and private-sector users [11,18,20]. Institutions must define mechanisms that support comprehensive cost-recovery models over time [16]. Additional issues include covering operational costs, securing and managing diverse funding sources, poor budget management, and inadequate financial support [6,7,13,20,31].

An underexplored area in current planning is the strategic pursuit of donations with fewer restrictions, given the inherently high risk associated with research activities [22]. Another barrier to attracting investment is the limited development of automated methodologies capable of demonstrating the real impact of technological platforms within research environments [32].

A.4. Communication

Information about technological platforms and their available resources is often either inaccessible or incomplete, indicating a need for improved communication strategies to enhance visibility [20,26,33]. A particular barrier to industry engagement is the lack of clear information on the availability and application of these resources within research institutions [4]. Communication is also critical in facilitating interactions between platforms and their users. Many platforms consider communication a sensitive issue, and engaging with users remains a persistent challenge [3].

A.5. Strategic Planning

One notable limitation is the exclusion of technological platforms from the strategic planning processes of their host institutions [20]. Additionally, many platforms lack strategic plans [33], hindering their ability to align operations with institutional goals.

B.1. Customer Base

A critical challenge for technological platforms is ensuring that potential users are adequately trained to conduct experiments independently [16]. One of the most frequently reported problems is the misuse of equipment by unqualified users, which reflects insufficient training and undermines the quality and reproducibility of research [13,19].

B.2. Institutional Impact

Evaluation tools that can assess the necessity and effectiveness of technological platforms within institutions are urgently needed. These tools are essential for informed strategic decision-making and investment planning [23,30]. The absence of performance indicators significantly impedes the strategic and operational management of these platforms [1].

One of the most pervasive management challenges is assessing the institutional impact of technological platforms [24]. This is hampered by the lack of specific performance indicators and the inherent difficulty in measuring both quantitative and qualitative outcomes [7,32].

Conclusion

Technological platforms have become essential to health research development across multiple countries, driven by continuous advancements

and the increasing sophistication of scientific equipment. The fast pace of technological progress requires substantial initial investments and careful planning to ensure the sustainability and excellence of services offered by these units.

This study on the management limitations of technological platforms confirms a direct relationship between the proposed analysis categories and the challenges identified.These findings allow for the identification of key areas for managerial intervention to improve service quality and efficiency.

This article's potential contributions lie in supporting the identification of connections between existing management limitations and the practical strategies that can be adopted to create a tailored management model for these complex research infrastructures.

Refereences

1. Grieb T, Horwitz R, Keiser K, Friderici K, Shea K, Olson S, et al. Optimizing institutional approaches to enable research. J Res Adm. 2014;45(2):46–60.
2. Rahmoon MA, Atanasov I, Fricker MD, Lippens S. More than just 'added value': The perils of not establishing shared core facilities in resource-constrained communities. J Microsc. 2024.
3. Kos-Braun IC, Gerlach B, Pitzer C. A survey of research quality in core facilities. Elife. 2020;9:e62212.
4. Ito Y. Importance of inclusive service for corporate use of university research infrastructure in Japan. Technol Soc. 2015;43:240–4.
5. Ravindran S. Core curriculum: learning to manage a shared microscopy facility. Nature. 2020;588(7837):358–60.
6. Gibbs G, Holten J, Routh M. Cost (non)-recovery by platform technology facilities in the Bio21 Cluster. J Biomol Tech. 2010;21(1):29.
7. Lejeune L, Gofflot F, Staes A, Martens L, Thomas I, Gevaert K. Impact of scientific platforms on research success. 2020.
8. Slack N, Chambers S, Johnston R. Administração da produção. 3rd ed. São Paulo: Atlas; 2017.
9. Hockberger P, Skarupski K, Grayhack J, Petraitis P, Rabinowitz J. Best practices for core facilities: handling external customers. J Biomol Tech. 2013;24(2):87.
10. Rappoport JZ. 'Branded' microscopy core facilities – Mutually beneficial partnerships between academia and industry. J Microsc. 2022.
11. Meder D, Van Minnebruggen G. Position paper excellence alliance core facilities. Core for Life [Internet]. 2011 [cited 2025 May 6]. Available from: https://coreforlife.sites.vib.be/sites/coreforlife.sites.vib.be/files/2020-11/C4L_%20position%20paper.pdf.
12. Meder D, Morales M, Pepperkok R, Schlapbach R, Tiran A, Van Minnebruggen G, et al. Institutional core facilities: prerequisite for breakthroughs in the life sciences. EMBO Rep. 2016;17(8):1088–93.
13. Riley MB. University Multi-User Facility Survey—2010. J Biomol Tech. 2011;22(4):131.
14. Tchounwou PB, Campbell AG, Glass J, Howard J, Lee S, Sempertegui F, et al. Research Infrastructure Core Facilities at Research Centers in Minority Institutions: Part I—Research Resources Management, Operation, and Best Practices. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2022;19(24):16979.
15. Ferrando-May E, Almouzni G, Savchenko A, Houtsmuller AB, Spehner D, Kessler P, et al. Advanced light microscopy core facilities: balancing service, science and career. Microsc Res Tech. 2016;79(6):463–79.
16. Bell L, Andrews L, Lim R. Challenges and opportunities for biological mass spectrometry core facilities in the developing world. J Biomol Tech. 2018;29(1):4.
17. Lilley KS, Deery MJ, Gatto L. Challenges for proteomics core facilities. Proteomics. 2011;11(6):1017–25.
18. Dragon JA, McLaughlin WA, Pokorny JL, Mastroianni B, Daniels J, Bonner A, et al. Bioinformatics core survey highlights the challenges facing data analysis facilities. J Biomol Tech. 2020;31(2):66.
19. Knudtson KL, Vartabedian BS, Ibrahim MM, Tagle DA. Survey on scientific shared resource rigor and reproducibility. J Biomol Tech. 2019;30(3):36.
20. Haley R. A framework for managing core facilities within the research enterprise. J Biomol Tech. 2009;20(4):226.
21. Carter JR, Gant J, Gardner D. Operational and fiscal management of core facilities: a survey of chief research officers. J Res Adm. 2019;50(3):14–31.
21. Haley R, Champagne TJ Jr. Research Strategies for Academic Medical Centers: A Framework for Advancements toward Translational Excellence. Res Manag Rev. 2017;22(1):n1.
22. Hockberger P, Skarupski K, Vaughan J, Winter J. Building a sustainable portfolio of core facilities: a case study. J Biomol Tech. 2018;29(3):79.
23. Waters JC. A novel paradigm for expert core facility staff training. Trends Cell Biol. 2020;30(9):669–72.
24. Smith DB, Salgado J, Monaghan AP, Freeman T. Data Management Tools to Measure the Impact of Core Facilities. J Biomol Tech. 2021;32(2):63.
25. Farber GK, Weiss L. Core facilities: maximizing the return on investment. Sci Transl Med. 2011;3(95):95cm21.

26. Adami V, Gatto L, Musacchio A. An international survey of training needs and career paths of core facility staff. J Biomol Tech. 2021.
27. Reeves L, Brigham K, van Buren J, Thompson W. Partnership between CTSI and business schools can promote best practices for core facilities and resources. Clin Transl Sci. 2013;6(4):297–302.
28. Gould J. Core facilities: shared support. Nature. 2015;519(7544):495–6.
29. Turpen PB, Pielke-Lombardo H, Fisher S, Roberts D. Metrics for success: Strategies for enabling core facility performance and assessing outcomes. J Biomol Tech. 2016;27(1):25.
30. iLab Solutions. The 2016 core facility benchmarking study [Internet]. Available from: https://www.agilent.com/cs/library/whitepaper/public/2016_Benchmarking_Study.pdf
31. Zwick ME. Organizing core facilities as force multipliers: strategies for research universities. J Biomol Tech. 2021;32(1):36.
32. Chang M, Grieder FB. Sharing core facilities and research resources—an investment in accelerating scientific discoveries. J Biomol Tech. 2016;27(1):2.
33. Lippens S, Fricker MD, Rahmoon MA, Wilms C, Gofflot F, Lejeune L, et al. One step ahead: innovation in core facilities. EMBO Rep. 2019;20(4):e48017.