

Global Research Priorities to Accelerate Programming to Improve Early Childhood Development in the Sustainable Development Era: A CHNRI Exercise

Tomlinson et al. (2019)

<https://doi.org/10.7189/jogh.09.020703>

For which topic were research priorities identified?

early childhood development

In which location was the research priority setting conducted?

international

Why was it conducted at all?

Approximately 250 million children under the age of five in low and middle-income countries (LMICs) will not achieve their developmental potential due to poverty and stunting alone. Investments in programming to improve early childhood development (ECD) have the potential to disrupt the cycle of poverty and therefore should be prioritised. Support for ECD has increased in recent years. Nevertheless, donors and policies continue to neglect ECD, in part from lack of evidence to guide policy makers and donors about where they should focus policies and programmes. Identification and investment in research is needed to overcome these constraints and in order to achieve high quality implementation of programmes to improve ECD.

What was the objective?

to assess research priorities for improving early childhood development

What was the outcome?

a ranking list of 18 research questions

How long did the research prioritization take?

No information provided.

Which methods were used to identify research priorities?

CHNRI approach

How were the priorities for research identified exactly?

Step 1: identifying context, time-frame, and target population. Step 2: generating systematic list of research questions: experts were asked to submit questions, 406 potential research questions submitted, questions then refined, 54 research questions organized by thematic area. Step 3: scoring: experts were asked to score each of the 54 research options

Which stakeholders took part?

Researchers, healthcare professionals, policymakers. Step 2: 74 participants. Step 3: 69 participants.

How were stakeholders recruited?

Library searches and snowball sampling were used to identify 348 experts.

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.