

A Health Equity Research Agenda for India: Results of a Consultative Exercise

Ravindran & Seshadri (2018)

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-018-0367-0>

For which topic were research priorities identified?

health equity

In which location was the research priority setting conducted?

Asia - India

Why was it conducted at all?

Programming for health equity calls for robust evidence on the concept, extent and nature of inequities in health, especially in view of scarce resources. However, it is more important to generate evidence that unravels the factors and mechanisms that create, sustain and reinforce inequities. Nevertheless, the current evidence base on health inequities in India does not measure up to this task

What was the objective?

to develop a medium-term agenda for the next decade and identify a short list of immediate priorities for health equity research in India

What was the outcome?

a list of 4 research areas

How long did the research prioritization take?

2014 - 2017

Which methods were used to identify research priorities?

consultation; meeting

How were the priorities for research identified exactly?

Step 1: literature review: to identify public health research studies on health inequities in India. Step 2: meetings: the research gaps identified in literature review were presented to stakeholders, research questions, areas and themes were then gathered in two meetings. Step 3: consolidation: questions/themes were consolidated and organized. Step 4: key-informant consultations: research themes and questions were further consolidated, resulting in list of 231 research questions/themes. Step 5: expert group consultation: to identify immediate priorities for research in health equity

Which stakeholders took part?

Researchers, civil society actors and policymakers. Meeting: approximately 60 researchers, civil society actors and policymakers. Key-informant consultation: at least 5-6 persons for each of the four areas. Expert group consultation: 20 participants.

How were stakeholders recruited?

No information provided.

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.