

# Creating a Locally Driven Research Agenda for the Ethnic Minorities of Eastern Myanmar

Purkey et al. (2019)

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-019-0465-7>

## For which topic were research priorities identified?

public health

## In which location was the research priority setting conducted?

Asia - Myanmar

## Why was it conducted at all?

Research funding and production is inequitably distributed internationally, with emphasis placed on the priorities of funders and international partners. Research capacity development, along with agenda setting for research priorities can create agency and self-sufficiency and should be inclusive of all relevant stakeholders. Myanmar is a fragile state, where decades of conflict have created a weakened healthcare system and health research sector. The population of Eastern Myanmar have long had their healthcare needs met by community-based organisations and ethnic health organisations operating within Eastern Myanmar and the adjoining Thai-Myanmar border. Despite a transition to civilian rule, the current context does not allow for a truly participatory health research capacity development and agenda-setting exercise between the health leaders of Eastern Myanmar and the government in Yangon. In this context, and with a desire to enhance the capacity, legitimacy and agency of their organisations, the health leaders of Eastern Myanmar are seeking to develop their own health research capacity and to take control of their own research agenda.

## What was the objective?

to develop research capacity and interest through a research conference and methods workshop, to use a nominal group technique (NGT) to develop a locally driven research agenda, and to support the development of local research projects through ongoing funding and mentorship

## What was the outcome?

a list of 15 research areas

## How long did the research prioritization take?

No information provided.

## Which methods were used to identify research priorities?

workshop

## How were the priorities for research identified exactly?

Step 1: workshop: participants developed research questions, 25 priorities were identified, participants then engaged in brainstorming exercise to identify potential criteria by which they would rank research priorities, criteria were elicited through secret ballot, followed by small group discussions with nominal group technique to select top 5 priorities, followed by plenary discussion on remaining 20 priorities, final list of 15 priorities established via secret rankings

## Which stakeholders took part?

15 organizations from academia and healthcare providers. 60 participants.

## How were stakeholders recruited?

Participants were recruited via 16 organizations.

## Were stakeholders actively involved or did they just participate?

Stakeholders were mere participants of the research prioritization process; they were not actively involved in the process.