

Title: Guiding principles for accelerating change through health inequities research and practice: A modified Delphi consensus process

Short Title: Guiding principles for health inequalities research and practice

Ahmed, F.¹, Woodhead, C.^{1,2}, Hossaini, A.³, Stanley, N.¹, Ensum, L.¹, Rhead, R.^{1,2}, Onwumere, J.⁴, Mir, G.⁵, Dyer, J.⁶, HSE Collective., Hatch, S.L.^{1,2}[✉]

1 Department of Psychological Medicine, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK

2 ESRC Centre for Society and Mental Health, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK

3 Department of Engineering, Faculty of Natural, Mathematical & Engineering Sciences, King's College London, London, UK

4 Department of Psychology, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK

5 Leeds Institute of Health Sciences, School of Medicine, The University of Leeds, Leeds, UK.

6 Black Thrive Global, London, UK

[✉] Corresponding author: Dr Rebecca Rhead, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience (IoPPN), 16 De Crespigny Park, London, SE5 8AB. E-mail: Rebecca.rhead@kcl.ac.uk

1 **Abstract**

2 Despite a preponderance of evidence, and considerable resources, health & social inequities persist and
3 there is evidence of widening unfair differences in markers of health and care. While power imbalances
4 created by broader structural and economic systems are major influencing factors, reform within health
5 inequities research, policy and health and social care practice is key to both bottom-up and top-down
6 change. We aimed to develop agreement for an iterative set of guiding principles underpinning ways of
7 working for a newly formed Health and Social Equity Collective comprising researchers, community
8 leaders, policymakers, and health and care professionals, seeking to address inequity by identifying and
9 engaging the levers of change within and across institutions. The principles aim to inform a more
10 inclusive and translational knowledge base through research practices, tackling entrenched inequalities
11 in education, training, and capacity-building; and centring communities affected by health inequities
12 through engagement and advocacy. We carried out a modified Delphi consensus process between
13 March and September 2022 with Collective members and networks through online workshops and
14 surveys. Out of 24 consensus statements developed and refined over a workshop and three successive
15 survey rounds, we identified eleven key principles agreed upon by a majority of respondents. Two of
16 these were rated high priority by over 75% of respondents, four by over 60% and five by over 50%.
17 These could be grouped into three main topics detailing ways of working and change needed within:
18 'Knowledge and framing of health and social inequities, and incorporation into practice', 'Community
19 engagement, involvement and peer research', and 'Organisational culture change'. Given the pressing
20 need to address inequities, these principles offer a grounding for future consensus building initiatives
21 which also incorporate a wider diversity of perspectives, and which should be iteratively updated with
22 ongoing learning from health equity initiatives nationally and internationally.

23 **Introduction**

24 There is an urgent need to accelerate the pace of change in tackling health inequities. For over 20 years,
25 there has been a focus on identifying and tackling health and social inequities in research and
26 policymaking in the UK. However, such inequities persist and are widening [1-3], exacerbated by the
27 COVID-19 pandemic [4]. Translation of the vast industry of health inequalities research into practice is
28 limited at best, self-serving at worst [5,6]. In research and policymaking, current ways of working and of
29 training the next generation across disciplines and sectors contribute to this stagnation, being inherently
30 fraught with inequities and fragmented approaches [7-9].

31 Across research, education, policy, public health, and healthcare sectors, there has been an
32 overwhelming focus on inequalities (i.e., unequal distribution of health and social outcomes), despite an
33 amassing of evidence highlighting a lack of attention to the existing and emerging inequities (i.e.,
34 injustices) experienced by groups within and across institutions and systems [10-12]. Notably, the focus
35 on social determinants and on individualised behaviour change approaches have paid little attention to
36 the main systematic and institutionalised drivers and processes generating, maintaining, legitimising,
37 and perpetuating inequities, such as racism, xenophobia and all forms of discrimination [13-15]. These
38 are experienced, anticipated and witnessed across the life course in different domains, including health,
39 education and research institutions [16]. Moreover, while much deficit-based work has examined the
40 experience of marginalisation on health and well-being, there has been very little acknowledgment of
41 the impact of privilege in creating, maintaining and perpetuating health inequalities [17]. Similarly, a lack
42 of consideration of the impact of norms, behaviours, laws, processes enacted inter/intra-personally,
43 organisationally and structurally which maintain advantage among individuals and groups benefitting
44 from the status quo persists [18,19].

45 By actively disrupting predominant power structures, 'empowering' those affected by health inequities
46 through participation and involvement in research and decision-making is increasingly viewed as a key
47 mechanism of change [20,21]. However, approaches such as 'coproduction' and 'community

48 engagement' in research and practice often fail to achieve the empowerment required for systems
49 change [21-23]. There is a need for more equitable and adequately resourced approaches to
50 engagement which facilitates capacity and relationship building between organisations and community
51 groups affected by health inequalities; spaces for dialogue which explicitly and sensitively attend to
52 power differentials; institutional culture shifts which valorise community voice; and, transparent
53 acknowledgement of historic and contemporary abuses of power which inhibit trust [21,23,24]. The
54 coproduced Patient and Carer Race Equality Framework (PCREF), launched as the NHS' first anti-racism
55 framework, is one example of a nationwide participatory approach to tackle mental health inequities,
56 which has community engagement at its core.

57 Health inequities are also shaped by wider structural social and economic forces; however, processes
58 and practices in research, education, health and social care form part of the system maintaining health
59 inequities in place. There is a need to develop shared agreement on best practice principles for how to
60 initiate alternative, sustainable, and interdisciplinary ways of working and ideological shifts to help
61 tackle the structures which perpetuate inequities in what gets researched, whose voices are heard, how
62 training and career pipelines are navigated and what evidence is valued [8]. As we note, structural
63 inequity relies on political, economic and ideological forces which outmass the sectors we represent.
64 Thus, we aim to change what we can within our domain while searching for points where we influence
65 broader social currents.

66 As a foundation for facilitating such changes in our work we formed the Health and Social Equity
67 Collective (www.hsecollective.org) in November 2021, a group of leading interdisciplinary researchers in
68 the field of health equity, community advocates, policy makers, health and social care professionals and
69 voluntary and community sector organisations with the goal of accelerating the pace of change in
70 tackling health inequalities. The composition of the Collective supported a focus on a broad range of
71 socially excluded groups (e.g., migrant, racialised, religious minority, sexual and gender minority groups,

72 people with mental ill health, learning disabilities and disabled people), as well as research approaches.
73 The first phase of the HSE Collective was an extensive co-design process, during which we developed our
74 priorities, ways of working and public facing resources. As part of the co-design phase, we conducted a
75 modified Delphi exercise which aimed to incorporate the perspectives of people affected by, and
76 working to address, health inequities to build consensus about how best to change the way we work and
77 collaborate to achieve those broader aims across three domains: 1) research, 2) training and capacity
78 building, and 3) engagement and advocacy.

79 **Methods**

80 Ethical approval was obtained 15th February 2022 from the King's College London PNM Research Ethics
81 Panel, reference: RS/DP-21/22-28451.

82 *Convening the collaborators*

83 We undertook a modified online Delphi consensus building process [25] in line with previous approaches
84 within health and social care research [26-28]. A diverse group of collaborators was formed in
85 November 2021 (HSE Collective) with the first workshop being held a month later. Ethics were granted
86 on February 15th, 2022, and the first round of consensus building began on March 1st, 2022. This was a
87 way of integrating geographically disparate expert perspectives (including lived experience) on key areas
88 for change in practice across the research, training and capacity building, and engagement and advocacy
89 domains through successive rounds of prioritisation, rating and iterative refinement of a series of
90 statements. An outline of the approach is detailed in Table 1 below, following that conducted by Mir et
91 al. [27].

92 **Table 1 Main steps in the Modified Delphi exercise**

Expert panel (01/11/21): Convened a group of collaborators with expertise in a diverse range of

professional and disciplinary backgrounds.

Workshop (09/12/21): Collaborators discussed existing work in health and social inequalities, priority areas and examples of equitable working including what worked well/less well. Initial consensus statements developed, refined, and translated into survey format for prioritisation.

Round 1 (01/03/22): Respondents (internal collaborators and wider networks in practice and community) individually ranked how important they thought each statement was to prioritise. Average score from all respondents and their individual responses summarised and circulated in a repeat questionnaire.

Round 2 (31/05/2022): Respondents provided with the option to revise their ranking considering the results from the round 1; individual and average group responses summarised and circulated again with a final, repeat questionnaire.

Round 3 (15/08/2022): Respondents provided with the option to revise their ranking considering the results from round 2, and informed that this is the final round.

Reaching agreement (08/09/2022): Three rounds were sufficient to enable an acceptable degree of agreement amongst respondents.

93

94 Collaborators within the Collective working across academia, policy, health and social care, arts and
95 culture, and community and voluntary organisations in the UK and internationally were identified
96 through professional networks (growing to 76 members). They were invited to attend an online
97 workshop, which consisted of small-group discussions in breakout rooms to discuss: their work relevant
98 to health inequities, priorities for future research and practice, how they have approached the issue of
99 equity and how it is embedded in partnerships and any learning from prior work or experience, e.g., in

100 terms of attending to inherent power dynamics. The key aim of this initial priority-setting workshop was
101 to obtain content that would inform the consensus statements for the Delphi consensus process.

102 *Developing the consensus statements and initial survey*

103 We conducted a rapid data gathering exercise involving an online search of websites and resources from
104 other health equity-based initiatives and comparator organisations nationally and internationally. This
105 information, and content from the initial workshop relevant to the three HSE Collective domains
106 (research, education and capacity building, and engagement and advocacy) was collated and
107 thematically organised by topic. Based on this, we next drafted initial consensus statements (n=23)
108 arranged under six themes: 1) Intersectional training and education; 2) Challenging language and
109 narratives; 3) Capacity building; 4) Equitable career pathways; 5) Shifting power; 6) Data accessibility
110 and transparency. Statements were reviewed to ensure clarity, removing duplicate concepts and/or
111 refining similar concepts into a single statement, removing unnecessary jargon and assessing
112 interpretability and accessibility.

113 Next, we developed an online survey which included the initial consensus statements, asking
114 respondents to score statements in order of priority against a 4-point Likert scale ranging from '1 = not a
115 priority: we should not pursue this', '2 = low priority: we should pursue this when possible and when
116 other issues are addressed', '3 = medium priority: we should pursue this after a high priority is
117 addressed' and '4 = high priority: we should pursue this now'. Each statement also provided the option
118 to make additional free-text comments relating to the statement's clarity, ideas for how to amend or
119 change the statement, or other views on the statement. Questions about socio-demographic
120 characteristics (age group, race, ethnicity, migration status, employment status and sector, sexual
121 orientation, gender, any religious identification, education level, long-term physical, sensory or mental
122 impairment, and caring responsibilities) were included to appraise whose voices were being represented

123 among respondents, and to facilitate targeted dissemination to capture a wider variety of perspectives.
124 Given the inclusion of international collaborators, we refined socio-demographic category terminology
125 to reflect contextual differences.

126 The survey included an embedded information sheet detailing information about data protection,
127 confidentiality and withdrawal procedures. Before starting the survey, respondents were asked to
128 complete a consent form, which also asked for their e-mail address and consent to be e-mailed further
129 survey rounds. Links to the survey and information were sent to existing collaborators, who were invited
130 to complete it themselves and to share information about the survey and the link with their wider
131 networks. We particularly asked if they could share with people or groups with lived experience of
132 health and social inequities and other forms of marginalisation (e.g., via research/staff networks,
133 advisory groups, personal contacts). Each survey round was open for a one-month period.

134 *Data analysis and further rounds*

135 Using the in-built survey reporting function, aggregate descriptive statistics (i.e., number and
136 percentage) were captured across socio-demographic items. Next, open-text comments were extracted
137 and reviewed, revising statements accordingly by rewording, re-ordering, grouping together and
138 removing statements, leaving 21 revised statements.

139 Statements were circulated again in the same survey format via e-mail for round 2 of the Delphi
140 exercise. This time, statements were not separated into themes to enable respondents to think about
141 them independently as standalone items. Each respondent who participated in round 1 received their
142 original score in addition to the average scores for each statement (i.e., the percentage of respondents
143 who scored the statement not a priority, low priority, medium priority and high priority). This provided
144 respondents with the option to re-evaluate their position based on the wider feedback.

145 Round 2 statements and socio-demographic data were analysed and refined in the same way as for
146 round 1. At this stage, the number of statements were increased to 24, based on the suggestions and
147 feedback received in the open-text comments. The round 3 survey was developed and disseminated in
148 the same way, though statements were presented as one list and rearranged so that respondents would
149 view and appraise them in a different order. Using similar methods to prior approaches (e.g., Mir et al.,
150 2012), consensus was initially defined as >75% of respondents ranking the statement as either medium
151 or high priority, and the consensus statements were based on the results of round 3 (the final round of
152 the Delphi exercise), with some minor amendments to wording of the final prioritised statements where
153 open text comments asked for greater clarity.

154 **Results**

155 A total of 21 collaborators attended the initial workshop including representatives from policy (n=1),
156 arts and culture (n=4), and voluntary and community sectors (n=4), health and social care (n=3), and
157 academic researchers (n=9). After developing and disseminating the Delphi survey, a total of 40 people
158 responded to the round 1 survey. The majority of respondents were aged 25-54 years (83%) and
159 identified as female (80%), just under half were from minoritised racial or ethnic groups while over a
160 fifth identified as a sexual minority. Those migrant to the country they currently reside, those identified
161 with any religion and those with any longstanding mental, physical or sensory impairment each made up
162 around a third of respondents. Most were employed and had degree-level education or higher. Just
163 under half were health and social care professionals, with academic researchers comprising over a third
164 of respondents. Subsequent response rates were n = 28 in round 2, and n = 28 for round 3. Those
165 responding to rounds 2 and 3 tended to be older and included a greater proportion of academic
166 researchers than round 1. Round 3 statements and scores are outlined in Table 2, while the final
167 consensus statements following minor amendments to wording are summarised by topic in Table 3
168 below.

169 **Table 2 Summary of round 3 statements and scores**

Consensus statements	<i>n</i>	High priority score (%)	Medium / high priority score (%)
There is a need to advocate for the integration of knowledge about social and structural determinants of health and social inequities (racism, homophobia, transphobia, sexism, ableism, ageism, etc.) in academic and professional training and curricula.	28	82	100
When explaining health inequities, problems should be traced to social and structural systems of oppression rather than located within affected individuals and communities. <i>* Social and structural oppression refers to a combination of prejudice and institutional power (manifested in norms, policies, processes, laws etc.) that regularly and consistently discriminates against some groups and benefits other groups)</i>	28	82	100
Health and social care staff should consider people's intersecting social identities/positions when diagnosing and caring for people, while ensuring that presumptions and stereotypes are not reinforced.	28	64	100
To foster healthier and more equitable ways of working, the capacity (e.g., time, energy, accessibility) needs of socially excluded groups	28	61	100

should be considered prior to consultation and it is important to consult with them before designing their participation or involvement.			
To ensure fair career progression for socially excluded groups, culture change initiatives are required to improve recruitment, retention and promotion and provide better support in work and learning environments that are traditionally exclusionary/hostile.	28	61	93
There is need for higher standards and expectations from funders for inclusive practice within the processes outlined in the above statements, and an acknowledgment that this level of commitment and resources exceeds those linked to traditional/conventional approaches.	28	61	93
There is a need to develop new, and evaluate and share existing tools, resources and methods which help empower communities and amplify the effectiveness of community engagement. <i>*Community engagement means involving communities in decision-making and in the planning, design, governance and delivery of projects and services.</i>	28	57	100
There is a need to embed monitoring and mechanisms of accountability for senior leadership/management to ensure that Equality, Diversity & Inclusion initiatives result in positive change.	28	57	100
Where possible health inequities research should involve and support peer researchers (people with lived experience of the issues	28	57	96

of interest direct and conduct the research) to help ensure it is meaningful and accessible to groups most affected.			
There is a need to provide stakeholders (e.g., community members/organisations, researchers, policy makers, service designers) with training, resources and skills to recognise existing expertise and skills amongst marginalised communities and to challenge hierarchies within decision-making processes.	28	57	93
It is important to understand and explicitly state how narratives, norms, processes and practices systematically benefit advantaged groups, including by focusing health inequities research on privileged as well marginalised groups.	28	54	96
Staff require appropriate support (e.g., with protected time, resource/tools, encouragement & direction) to help them ensure that their policies, practices and decisions are fair, meet the needs of, and are not inadvertently discriminating against any group(s).	28	50	96
To tackle community hesitancy about collaborative research, transparency about data ownership (especially data sovereignty and governance), intellectual property, ethical standards, compensation, accountability mechanisms and the intentions of each stakeholder should be presented from the outset.	28	50	93
There is a need to use a range of types of data and to adapt data presented to specific audiences (e.g., academic, health and social care, and community/voluntary sector) to be most impactful.	28	50	96

There is a need to amplify and acknowledge resistance, agency and everyday thriving as opposed to resilience and deficit-based perspectives when writing about and working with marginalised communities.	28	50	89
Methods for enabling community participation and partnership working should be standard elements of research, policy and practitioner training curricula.	28	46	89
To ensure fair career progression for socially excluded groups, there is a need to develop alternative career pipelines such as apprenticeships, paid internships, professional services secondments and placements, and flexible entry requirements that are equitable, inclusive and shaped around the needs of communities.	28	46	96
There is a need to achieve consensus on a framework underpinning the incorporation of community engagement and participatory approaches into research, policy, and service design. <i>*This includes issues such as equitable working, trust-building, recognising capacity issues such as fatigue, engaging in reciprocity and sustainability of relations and initiating conversations around power and privilege.</i>	28	43	89
There is a need for transparent evaluation of the implementation, monitoring and impact of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (ED&I) initiatives within health and social care, education, research, funding practices and policymaking.	28	43	93

To highlight the extent of inequity affecting marginalised groups, there is a need to mandate and/or incentivise collection of standardised & monitor quality of data on social demographics and where possible use finer-grain, more disaggregated categories relevant to local circumstances.	28	43	93
Creative productions such as photography, drama, video, and public events are an effective way to document and disseminate evidence on health and social inequities.	28	36	89
To ensure fair career progression, health and social care employers and research institutions should adopt explicit proactive measures/actions (e.g., which are anti-racism) that are subject to transparent and accountable evaluation and monitoring with clear communication on the consequences of falling short on these standards.	28	32	93
Creative mediums should complement traditional scientific methods in research about health and social inequity.	28	32	86
Opportunities for sharing knowledge and examples of good practice in reducing health inequities should be embedded within and across sectors, including those which are not directly related to healthcare.	28	29	100

170

171 As shown in Table 2, all 24 statements met consensus criteria (>75% scoring as either medium or high
172 priority). To allow for further prioritisation and to distinguish between these, we therefore examined the
173 proportions scoring each item as a “high” priority only. According to this criterion, only two statements
174 met the threshold. Given the more stringent approach, and in line with other published approaches [29],

175 we expanded the threshold to include those items for which >60% scored as high priority
176 (corresponding to six statements), and those for which over half of respondents scored the statement as
177 a high priority (a further five statements). By presenting statements against each of these tiers (>75%,
178 >60% and >50% scored as high priority), we therefore indicate those statements for which the majority
179 of participants report as high priority.

180 **>75% scored as high priority (n=2)**

181 Two statements in this category referred to increasing knowledge about social and structural
182 determinants of health in professional training and academic curricula, and to ensure that the causes of
183 social inequities are understood as resulting from patterns of social and structural power rather than
184 being located within the affected groups themselves. Open text comments emphasised the need for
185 help in facilitating such learning, to ensure that it is continually reinforced and not part of mandatory
186 one-off tick box training. These statements were viewed as overarching and facilitative of other practice-
187 related consensus statements (e.g., feeding into how health and social care professionals consider
188 people's intersecting identities when caring for them). Understanding the structural forces that shape
189 and pattern health and social inequities was perceived to be essential to move away from individualised
190 approaches to care delivery, service design and public health planning, and to mitigate the harm from
191 poorly framed health inequities research which problematises those affected.

192 **>60% scored as high priority (n=4)**

193 Linked to the first two statements, the next priority referred to integrating understanding about
194 structural determinants and social power linked to people's intersecting identities within their approach
195 to care, while avoiding making assumptions or stereotyping. This approach was seen as important to
196 correcting the assumptions which underpin many decisions and the resources available for appropriate
197 treatment, to mitigate the risk of people refusing or opting out of care that is insensitive to different

198 aspects of their identities, and to support a focus on challenging inequities inherent to current ways of
199 working.

200 While the first three emphasised health and care practices, one statement in this category referred to
201 the need to attend to norms and cultures shaping workforce and career progression inequities within
202 institutions/organisations responsible for research and care delivery. The focus on organisational culture
203 and norms which are exclusionary to people from marginalised groups distinguishes this statement from
204 a related statement on career progression given lower priority, relating to the need for transparent
205 evaluation and monitoring of proactive measures mitigating inequity (e.g., which are anti-racism), with
206 accountability for falling short. Open text comments indicated that the latter was perceived as
207 insufficient alone, lack of clarity about what such measures should be, and that initiatives should be
208 intersectional rather than focused on single identities.

209 The two remaining statements focussed on meaningful and equitable involvement of people with lived
210 experience of social inequities in research, service and policy design, oversight and delivery. They
211 highlight the importance of involvement that is adequately planned to be considerate of their needs and
212 adequately resourced in terms of time and funding - with flexibility to account for people's lived reality
213 rather than adhering to strict timescales. Open text comments emphasised the importance of allowing
214 sufficient time for involvement and participation, and that without consideration of people's capacity,
215 time and energy, and adequate remuneration, any community-led initiatives will be seen as serving the
216 institutions/organisations rather than in their best interests, and thus extractive and counterproductive.

217 **>50% scored as high priority (n=5)**

218 Three of the five statements for which over 50% of respondents scored as high priority also related to
219 involvement of people with lived experience and expertise in research, service and policy design,
220 oversight and delivery. Specifically, in developing and sharing tools to support community engagement

221 and community-led initiatives and working equitably with sufficiently supported and resourced peer
222 researchers adequately supported to take part. Further, one statement emphasised the importance of
223 training and support for those involved in research and decision making to recognise existing expertise
224 and skills amongst marginalised communities and to challenge hierarchies within decision-making
225 processes. Several open text comments indicated that while such efforts are important, they challenged
226 the idea of academic-led community engagement and empowerment. They emphasised the facilitative
227 role of the Collective, such that involvement is community-led, while also facilitating health and care
228 services and organisations to meaningfully involve people with lived experience and expertise
229 themselves. Comments also emphasised the need for tools or resources to support trauma-informed
230 engagement practice and to proactively form more equitable partnerships which meaningfully share
231 power rather than recreate existing power dynamics. Regarding peer-researchers, other considerations
232 emphasised the need for flexibility in relation to their time and capacity as well as sharing credit for
233 work undertaken to avoid tokenistic and exploitative involvement.

234 One statement in this category overlapped with statements in the >75% category, emphasising
235 awareness and acknowledgement of how narratives, norms, processes and practices systematically
236 benefit advantaged groups. Open text comments suggested that this statement should be considered
237 alongside other related statements in an overall approach which shifts perspectives towards the
238 structural and systemic factors creating and maintaining patterns of inequities. This would support
239 moves away from deficit and damage-centred approaches and help identify points for change within
240 processes and practices.

241 Finally, the statement referring to the need to embed monitoring and mechanisms of accountability for
242 senior leadership/management to ensure that Equity, Diversity & Inclusion (ED&I) initiatives result in
243 positive change, was endorsed by over 50% of respondents. Open text comments supported this
244 statement but warned against tick box and tokenistic approaches (e.g., online one-off trainings or poorly

245 designed Equity Impact Assessments) that were overly onerous for organisations. One comment
246 suggested that the impact of ED&I initiatives would be dependent upon accountability frameworks and
247 the extent to which they were embedded into inspectorates with capacity to sanction (e.g., Ofsted, Care
248 Quality Commission). Another emphasised the importance of considering how social class intersects
249 with other forces of oppression and privilege to shape people’s experiences to avoid misleading
250 representation of progress made (e.g., where greater equity for women was only experienced among
251 women from affluent backgrounds).

252 Taking these comments into account with minor refinements to wording, and ordering them according
253 to topic, the final 11 consensus statements are provided in Table 3.

254 *Table 3 Final consensus statements, grouped by topic*

Knowledge and framing of health and social inequities, and incorporation into practice

There is a need to advocate for and facilitate the consistent integration of knowledge about the interplay of structural and social determinants of health and social inequities (racism, homophobia, transphobia, sexism, ableism, ageism, etc.) in academic and professional training and curricula.

When explaining health inequities, problems should be traced to social and structural systems of oppression* rather than located within affected individuals and communities.

Health and social care staff should consider people's intersecting social identities/positions when diagnosing and caring for people, without making presumptions and reinforcing stereotypes.

It is important to understand and explicitly state how narratives, norms, processes and practices systematically benefit advantaged groups and inhibit change, including by focusing health inequities research on privileged as well marginalised groups.

Community engagement, involvement and peer-led research

To foster healthier and more equitable ways of working, the capacity (e.g., time, energy, accessibility) needs of socially excluded groups should be considered prior to consultation. It is important to consult with them before designing their participation or involvement.

There is need for higher standards and expectations from funders for inclusive and equitable practice around community involvement. Also, for funders to acknowledge that the level of commitment, resources, and flexibility needed exceeds those linked to traditional/conventional approaches.

There is a need to develop new, and evaluate and share existing tools, resources and methods which help communities to act to address health and social inequities, and to amplify the effectiveness of community engagement.**

There is a need to provide researchers, policy makers, commissioners and service providers/designers with training, resources and skills to recognise existing expertise and skills amongst marginalised communities and to challenge hierarchies within decision-making processes.

Where possible health inequities research should involve and adequately support peer researchers (people with lived experience of the issues of interest direct and conduct the research) to help ensure research is meaningful and accessible to groups most affected.

Organisational culture change

To ensure fair career progression for socially excluded groups, culture change initiatives are required to improve recruitment, retention and promotion. This includes providing better support in work and learning environments that are traditionally exclusionary/hostile.

There is a need to embed monitoring and mechanisms of accountability for senior leadership/management to ensure that Equity, Diversity & Inclusion initiatives are not tokenistic but result in positive change.

255 * *Social and structural oppression refers to a combination of prejudice and institutional power (manifested in*
256 *norms, policies, processes, laws etc.) that regularly and consistently discriminates against some groups and benefits*
257 *other groups)*

258 ***Community engagement means involving communities in decision-making and in the planning, design,*
259 *governance and delivery of projects and services*

260

261 **Discussion**

262 We gained majority agreement around eleven statements pertaining to high priority ways of working
263 within research, education and policy/advocacy that an expert panel identified as priorities for
264 meaningful change in health inequities. These could be grouped into three main topics: *'Knowledge and*
265 *framing of health and social inequities, and incorporation into practice'*, *'Community engagement,*
266 *involvement and peer research'*, and *'Organisational culture change'*.

267 *Knowledge and framing of health and social inequities*

268 The need to incorporate information about social determinants within health and care professional
269 training and development has been established [30] with evidence for improved knowledge and
270 confidence in addressing social determinants [31]. However, the extent to which this has been
271 implemented is unclear, especially beyond the US context and beyond medical training [31]. Moreover,
272 it is unclear whether, or the extent to which, such training involves reflexive awareness about how
273 individual and organisational power operates to influence health and care inequities, with some notable
274 exceptions [32,33]. Findings suggest that such learning should extend beyond practitioners to include
275 those training in a broad range of health-related disciplines (e.g., epidemiology, statistics, public health).
276 In research, there has been increasing awareness of the need to move away from damage-centred and
277 deficit perspectives (i.e., focusing just on adversity and it's adverse impact on affected groups) in

278 research on health and social inequities [34], and towards approaches which centre thriving, resilience,
279 resistance and joy (e.g., [35,36]). While this serves to mitigate perpetuating vulnerability and inferiority
280 narratives which are discriminatory and prejudicial, our statements support calls for research and
281 practice to go further to explicitly emphasise how social forces of privilege (both historic and
282 contemporary) actively create, maintain and perpetuate inequities; on the ways in which advantaged
283 groups keep others in disadvantaged positions and maintain the status quo [18,19,37-39]; and, to take a
284 social justice perspective [40]. Our statements suggest that such an approach should also be
285 incorporated into professional training and development in areas relating to social determinants of
286 health.

287 *Community engagement, involvement and peer research*

288 One definition of community engagement is “a range of approaches to maximise the involvement of
289 local communities in local initiatives to improve their health and wellbeing and reduce health
290 inequalities. This includes: needs assessment, community development, planning, design, development,
291 delivery and evaluation.” [41], p.13). The importance of community engagement and involvement is
292 increasingly acknowledged, operating on a continuum between consultative (organisation-led) and
293 empowerment (community-led) approaches (e.g., [20]). However, without adequate resource and
294 reflexivity they can risk being tokenistic, reinforcing existing power dynamics, creating burnout, and
295 perpetuating extractive and exploitative relations (e.g., [24, 42]). The statements on these topics were
296 supplemented by open text comments that highlighted how ‘good practice’ in community engagement
297 initiatives require adequate time, training, resources, trust, explicit attention to power dynamics, and
298 honest reflection on how health, care and research institutions drive health inequities through
299 processes such as racism and (neo)colonialism (e.g., [24, 43-46]). Our statements also support calls for
300 decision-makers, researchers and care providers to be supported and trained to take up findings from
301 community-led work and/or to initiate good quality engagement activities [47]. Funders were also called

302 on to take into account of what is needed to support researchers and communities in terms of time,
303 resource and flexibility in order to avoid constraining engagement activities and perpetuating harm [48].

304 *Organisational culture change*

305 Finally, two of our statements relate to greater equity within organisations in terms of both workforce
306 (e.g., career progression) and working environment (e.g., related to Equity, Diversity and Inclusion
307 initiatives). Diversity (e.g., in relation to race and ethnicity) within the caring professions has been linked
308 to reduced inequalities for those being cared for (e.g., through greater concordance, improved access
309 and uptake, greater cultural sensitivity)[49]. Inclusion of minoritised groups within the research
310 community is similarly proposed to help produce research which more effectively addresses health
311 inequities, for instance, via greater understanding of the needs and challenges of marginalised groups
312 through shared life experiences, enhancing recruitment and trust in research, adoption of appropriate
313 research methodologies, and development and implementation of interventions which best meet their
314 needs [50-52]. Given the engrained and ubiquitous nature of organisational culture operating across
315 multiple levels (e.g., shared assumptions, norms, values and beliefs), such culture change initiatives are
316 difficult to implement [53,54]. Our statements emphasise the importance of attending to organisational
317 culture including transparent monitoring of sustained and accountable mechanisms for identifying and
318 enacting change, if efforts at recruiting, retaining, and promoting staff from minoritised groups within
319 health, care, policy and research sectors are to be successful.

320 Areas in which consensus was not achieved may partly reflect the disciplinary backgrounds of
321 respondents, the majority of whom were health and social care professionals and researchers which is
322 likely to have shaped the wording, priority and nature of statements. For instance, two statements for
323 which consensus was not achieved related to use of creative methods for research and dissemination.
324 Respondents commented that they had a lack of experience with such approaches; however, they also

325 suggested that while creative methods may be an important mechanism of capturing information
326 shared by people underrepresented in research, they may not be perceived by decision-makers as
327 sufficiently 'robust', hindering their impact. This suggests that a statement referring to understanding
328 how and such evidence could be translated into decision-making may have been informative. There is
329 evidence that arts-based interventions can work in subtle and complex ways to positively influence
330 knowledge through emotions [55].

331 Further, open-text comments indicated that some of the non-prioritised statements: 1) should already
332 reflect standard practice (e.g., relating to disseminating research in different formats, giving staff time
333 and resources to ensure their work is fair and non-discriminatory), and/or 2) are not sufficiently
334 impactful in themselves, and/or 3) were important but perceived as being downstream of other higher
335 priority statements. Examples of the latter included statements relating to equitable career pipelines
336 which are key but priority-wise would follow statements regarding amending organisational culture such
337 that people are not being recruited into hostile or exclusionary environments. This could be seen as a
338 circular argument in terms of how culture change might be achieved through better representation of
339 those from excluded populations and highlights the complex interplay between institutional, community
340 and individual dynamics [56]. The need to collect and share accurate data was perceived to be necessary
341 for monitoring and equity impact assessments to be meaningful. Also, before sharing best practice,
342 respondents highlighted that there is first a need to learn more about best practice from enacting and
343 learning from other consensus statement-related activities.

344 Comments also suggested caution around statements involving guidance, frameworks, toolkits and so
345 on, reflective of the fact that people can feel overwhelmed with 'resources'. This may also point to the
346 need for top-down action on a structural level to mitigate and/or counterbalance the need for
347 individuals and organisations to take on additional work to address inequities. Finally, several comments
348 reflected on the extent to which initiatives should be academic-led rather than community or service-

349 led. While the statements are not meant to be read as academic endeavours, this perception may
350 reflect the organisation of the HSE Collective, in which the Delphi process was organised and led by
351 academic members, and which may have also influenced engagement with the survey more widely.

352 *Strengths and limitations*

353 Our modified Delphi approach successfully gathered perspectives from a range of health and social care
354 professionals, researchers with expertise across a range of health inequities topics, community
355 organisation representatives, and a smaller number from policy and arts/culture backgrounds. Our
356 approach differed from other prioritisation exercises in relation to health inequalities and public health
357 which focus on agreeing research priorities (e.g., [57-59]). Instead, our statements aim to achieve
358 consensus on ways of working which will help tackle the inherent structural and social forces within
359 research, education and engagement/advocacy processes which serve to maintain and perpetuate
360 inequities in place. The main limitation relates to the range of voices included. While our panel reflected
361 diversity in relation to race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, migration status, health, and religion, the
362 majority were educated to degree-level or higher and worked either as health and social care
363 professionals or academic researchers. While we aimed to broaden the reach of the survey by asking
364 people to share with their networks it is possible that the wording and approach (online survey) were
365 exclusionary. Thus, future work involving sustained and in-person engagement to capture the
366 perspectives of people and groups with lived experience of intersecting forms of social marginalisation
367 (beyond those within research and health/social care fields), and voluntary and community sector
368 organisation representatives is needed to extend and refine these priority ways of working. Another
369 limitation was that only two statements met the 75% threshold, while the remaining nine were included
370 as scoring high priority for over half of participants. We emphasise that future survey rounds
371 incorporating a wider breadth of stakeholder representatives are needed to iteratively refine these

372 principles to reach consensus and that this is also appropriate given shifts in social, funding and policy
373 contexts.

374 *Conclusions*

375 Health inequities persist and are widening despite sustained policy and research attention. The Health &
376 Social Equity Collective's prioritised statements offer a set of guiding principles for ways of working
377 within research, education, and engagement/advocacy which would accelerate the pace of change in
378 addressing health inequities and support the translation of research into practice. These principles
379 complement initiatives which develop priorities for research topics in health and public health sphere,
380 attending to how work is done. They have already informed the Collective's approach in developing
381 applications for research and education initiatives. Given the pressing need to address inequities, the
382 principles provide a starting ground for future consensus building approaches which incorporate a wider
383 diversity of perspectives, and to continually update these while integrating learning from health equity
384 initiatives nationally and internationally such as the Accelerating City Equity Initiative [60]. Given the
385 need to be contextually relevant and sensitive similar approaches could be taken in other geographic
386 and social contexts to inform health inequalities practice.

387 **Acknowledgements**

388 We thank members of the Health and Social Equity Collective for supporting its co-design and for their
389 involvement in creating these guiding principles, to maintain anonymity in this research we have not
390 named Collective members individually. This paper represents independent research carried out by the
391 Health and Social Equity Collective which received funding from the King's Together initiative (King's
392 College London) and from Impact on Urban Health. S. L. H. and J.O. are part-funded by the NIHR
393 Biomedical Research Centre at South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust. C.W., and S.L.H. are

394 supported by the ESRC Centre for Society and Mental Health at King's College London (ESRC Reference:
395 ES/S012567/1). The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the funders.

396 **References**

397 1 The King's Fund. Health inequalities: our position. 2021. Available from:

398 <https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/projects/positions/health-inequalities>

399 2 Finch D, Tinson A. The continuing impact of COVID-19 on health and inequalities. Health Foundation.

400 2022. Available from: <https://www.health.org.uk/publications/long-reads/the-continuing-impact-of->

401 [covid-19-on-health-and-](https://www.health.org.uk/publications/long-reads/the-continuing-impact-of-covid-19-on-health-and-)

402 [inequalities#:~:text=A%20year%20on%20from%20publication,first%20year%20of%20the%20pandemic](https://www.health.org.uk/publications/long-reads/the-continuing-impact-of-covid-19-on-health-and-inequalities#:~:text=A%20year%20on%20from%20publication,first%20year%20of%20the%20pandemic)

403 3 Kapadia D, Zhang J, Salway S, Nazroo J, Booth A, Villarroel-Williams N, Becares L, Esmail A. Ethnic

404 inequalities in healthcare: a rapid review. NHS Race & Health Observatory. 2021. Available from:

405 <https://www.nhsrho.org/research/ethnic-inequalities-in-healthcare-a-rapid-evidence-review-2/>

406 4 Irizar P, Pan D, Kapadia D, Bécares L, Sze S, Taylor H, Amele S, Kibuchi E, Divall P, Gray LJ, Nellums LB.

407 Ethnic inequalities in COVID-19 infection, hospitalisation, intensive care admission, and death: a global

408 systematic review and meta-analysis of over 200 million study participants. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2023 Mar

409 6.

410 5 Smith K. Institutional filters: The translation and re-circulation of ideas about health inequalities within

411 policy. *Policy & Politics*. 2013 Jan;41(1):81-100.

412 6 Smith KE. The politics of ideas: The complex interplay of health inequalities research and policy. *Sci*

413 *Public Policy*. 2014 Oct 1;41(5):561-74.

414 7 Smith KE, Hill SE, Bambra C, editors. *Health inequalities: critical perspectives*. Oxford University Press;

415 2016.

416 8 Garthwaite K, Smith KE, Bamba C, Pearce J. Desperately seeking reductions in health inequalities:
417 perspectives of UK researchers on past, present and future directions in health inequalities research.
418 *Sociol Health Illn*. 2016 Mar;38(3):459-78.

419 9 Stoll N, Yalipende Y, Byrom NC, Hatch SL, Lempp H. Mental health and mental well-being of Black
420 students at UK universities: a review and thematic synthesis. *BMJ Open*. 2022 Feb 1;12(2):e050720.

421 10 Nazroo JY, Bhui KS, Rhodes J. Where next for understanding race/ethnic inequalities in severe mental
422 illness? Structural, interpersonal and institutional racism. *Sociol Health Illn*. 2020 Feb;42(2):262-76.

423 11 Rhead RD, Chui Z, Bakolis I, Gazard B, Harwood H, MacCrimmon S, Woodhead C, Hatch SL. Impact of
424 workplace discrimination and harassment among National Health Service staff working in London trusts:
425 results from the TIDES study. *BJPsych Open*. 2021 Jan;7(1):e10.

426 12 Stopforth S, Kapadia D, Nazroo J, Bécares L. The enduring effects of racism on health: Understanding
427 direct and indirect effects over time. *SSM Popul Health*. 2022 Sep 1;19:101217.

428 13 Razai MS, Majeed A, Esmail A. Structural racism is a fundamental cause and driver of ethnic
429 disparities in health. *BMJ*. 2021 Apr 12;373.

430 14 Yearby R. Structural racism and health disparities: Reconfiguring the social determinants of health
431 framework to include the root cause. *J Law Med Ethics*. 2020;48(3):518-26.

432 15 Yearby R, Lewis C, Gibson C. Incorporating Structural Racism, Employment Discrimination, and
433 Economic Inequities in the Social Determinants of Health Framework to Understand Agricultural Worker
434 Health Inequities. *Am J Pub Health*. 2023 Jan;113(S1):S65-71.

435 16 Wellcome Monitor. Anxiety, Confusion and Distrust: How BAME People in Britain Have Had a Worse
436 Experience of the COVID-19 Pandemic. Wellcome Trust. 2020. Available from:
437 <https://wellcome.org/sites/default/files/wellcome-monitor-2020-covid-19-summary.pdf>

438 17 Ryde J. White privilege unmasked: How to be part of the solution. Jessica Kingsley Publishers; 2019
439 Mar 21.

440 18 Hatzenbuehler ML, Phelan JC, Link BG. Stigma as a fundamental cause of population health
441 inequalities. Am J Pub Health. 2013 May;103(5):813-21.

442 19 Link BG, García SJ. Diversions: how the underrepresentation of research on advantaged groups leaves
443 explanations for health inequalities incomplete. J Health Soc Behav 2021 Sep;62(3):334-49.

444 20 O'Mara-Eves A, Brunton G, McDaid G, Oliver S, Kavanagh J, Jamal F, Matosevic T, Harden A, Thomas J.
445 Community engagement to reduce inequalities in health: a systematic review, meta-analysis and
446 economic analysis. Public Health Res. 2013;1(4).

447 21 Baxter S, Barnes A, Lee C, Mead R, Clowes M. Increasing public participation and influence in local
448 decision-making to address social determinants of health: a systematic review examining initiatives and
449 theories. Local Gov Stud. 2022 Jun 15:1-27.

450 22 Popay J, Whitehead M, Carr-Hill R, Dibben C, Dixon P, Halliday E, Nazroo J, Peart E, Poval S, Stafford
451 M, Turner J. The impact on health inequalities of approaches to community engagement in the New
452 Deal for Communities regeneration initiative: a mixed-methods evaluation. Available from:
453 <https://europepmc.org/article/nbk/nbk321028>

454 23 Chan G. Participatory Visions: "It's not about empowering people, it's about holding space..." 2023.
455 Available from: https://www.coproductioncollective.co.uk/news/participatory-visions-its-not-about-empowering-people-its-about-holding-space?utm_source=Bloomsbury%20Theatre&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=3286565_Co-production%20Newsletter%20May%202023&utm_content=Participatory%20Visions&dm_i=2HJW,1YFXH,68063P,6WM5K,1

460 24 Creary N, Okoroji C, Ibison Y, Kogbara L, and Dyer J. Are we there yet? Co-production and Black
461 Thrive's journey towards race equity in mental health. COVID-19 and Co-production in Health and Social
462 Care Research, Policy, and Practice. In: Beresford P, Farr M, Hickey G, Kaur M, Ocloo J, Tembo D,
463 Williams O, editors. COVID-19 and Co-production in health and social care research, policy and practice:
464 volume 1: the challenges and necessity of co-production. Policy Press; 2021. pp.49-58.

465 25 Hsu CC, Sandford BA. The Delphi technique: making sense of consensus. *Pract Assess Res Evaluation*.
466 2019;12(1):10.

467 26 Jones J, Hunter D. Consensus methods for medical and health services research. *BMJ*. 1995 Aug
468 8;311(7001):376.

469 27 Mir G, Salway S, Kai J, Karlsen S, Bhopal R, Ellison GT, Sheikh A. Principles for research on ethnicity
470 and health: the Leeds Consensus Statement. *Eur J Public Health*. 2013 Jun 1;23(3):504-10.

471 28 Snape D, Kirkham J, Preston J, Popay J, Britten N, Collins M, Froggatt K, Gibson A, Lobban F, Wyatt K,
472 Jacoby A. Exploring areas of consensus and conflict around values underpinning public involvement in
473 health and social care research: a modified Delphi study. *BMJ Open*. 2014 Jan 1;4(1):e004217.

474 29 Diamond IR, Grant RC, Feldman BM, Pencharz PB, Ling SC, Moore AM, Wales PW. Defining consensus:
475 a systematic review recommends methodologic criteria for reporting of Delphi studies. *J Clin Epidemiol*.
476 2014 Apr 1;67(4):401-9.

477 30 National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. A framework for educating health
478 professionals to address the social determinants of health. 2016. The National Academies Press.

479 31 Hunter K, Thomson B. A scoping review of social determinants of health curricula in post-graduate
480 medical education. *Can Med Educ J*. 2019 Jul;10(3):e61.

481 32 Salway S, Piercy H, Chowbey P, Brewins L, Dhoot P. Improving capacity in ethnicity and health
482 research: report of a tailored programme for NHS Public Health practitioners. Prim Health Care Res Dev.
483 2013 Oct;14(4):330-40.

484 33 South London & Maudsely NHS Foundation Trust. Anti-Racism Action Plan. 2023. Available from:
485 <https://slam.nhs.uk/anti-racism>

486 34 Tuck E. Suspending damage: A letter to communities. Harv Educ Rev. 2009 Sep 1;79(3):409-28.

487 35 Robinson BA, Schmitz RM. Beyond resilience: Resistance in the lives of LGBTQ youth. Sociol Compass.
488 2021 Dec;15(12):e12947.

489 36 Bryant J, Bolt R, Botfield JR, Martin K, Doyle M, Murphy D, Graham S, Newman CE, Bell S, Treloar C,
490 Browne AJ. Beyond deficit: 'strengths-based approaches' in indigenous health research. Sociol Health
491 Illn. 2021 Jul;43(6):1405-21.

492 37 Crenshaw, KW. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of
493 Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics." University of Chicago Legal Forum
494 1989:139-67.

495 38 Collins PH. Intersections of race, class, gender, and nation: Some implications for Black family studies.
496 J Comp Fam Stud. 1998 Mar 1;29(1):27-36.

497 39 Woodhead C, Onwumere J, Rhead R, Bora-White M, Chui Z, Clifford N, Connor L, Gunasinghe C,
498 Harwood H, Meriez P, Mir G. Race, ethnicity and COVID-19 vaccination: a qualitative study of UK
499 healthcare staff. Ethn Health. 2022 Oct 3;27(7):1555-74.

500 40 Rogers J, Kelly UA. Feminist intersectionality: Bringing social justice to health disparities research.
501 Nurs Ethics. 2011 May;18(3):397-407.

502 41 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Community engagement: improving health
503 and wellbeing and reducing health inequalities. 2016. Available from:
504 <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng44>

505 42 Carlisle S. Tackling health inequalities and social exclusion through partnership and community
506 engagement? A reality check for policy and practice aspirations from a Social Inclusion Partnership in
507 Scotland. *Crit Public Health*. 2010 Mar 1;20(1):117-27.

508 43 Putland C, Baum F, Ziersch A, Arthurson K, Pomagalska D. Enabling pathways to health equity:
509 developing a framework for implementing social capital in practice. *BMC Public Health*. 2013
510 Dec;13(1):1-2.

511 44 Cyril S, Smith BJ, Possamai-Inesedy A, Renzaho AM. Exploring the role of community engagement in
512 improving the health of disadvantaged populations: a systematic review. *Glob Health Action*. 2015 Dec
513 1;8(1):29842.

514 45 Gerlach AJ, Browne AJ, Greenwood M. Engaging Indigenous families in a community-based
515 Indigenous early childhood programme in British Columbia, Canada: A cultural safety perspective.
516 *Health Soc Care Community*. 2017 Nov;25(6):1763-73.

517 46 Kegler MC, Wolff T, Christens BD, Butterfoss FD, Francisco VT, Orleans T. Strengthening our
518 collaborative approaches for advancing equity and justice. *Health Education & Behavior*. 2019
519 Oct;46(1_suppl):5S-8S.

520 47 Ortiz K, Nash J, Shea L, Oetzel J, Garoutte J, Sanchez-Youngman S, Wallerstein N. Partnerships,
521 processes, and outcomes: A health equity–focused scoping meta-review of community-engaged
522 scholarship. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2020 Apr 1;41:177-99.

523 48 Sprague L, Afifi R, Ayala G, El-Nasoor ML. Participatory praxis as an imperative for health-related
524 stigma research. *BMC Med.* 2019 Dec;17:1-8.

525 49 Williams SD, Hansen K, Smithey M, Burnley J, Koplitz M, Koyama K, Young J, Bakos A. Using social
526 determinants of health to link health workforce diversity, care quality and access, and health disparities
527 to achieve health equity in nursing. *Public Health Rep.* 2014 Jan;129(1_suppl2):32-6.

528 50 Valantine HA, Davis AF. Workforce diversity and capacity building to address health disparities. *Sci*
529 *Health Dispar Res.* 2021 Feb 12:445-54.

530 51 Yanagihara R, Berry MJ, Carson MJ, Chang SP, Corliss H, Cox MB, Haddad G, Hohmann C, Kelley ST,
531 Lee ES, Link BG. Building a diverse workforce and thinkforce to reduce health disparities. *Int. J. Environ.*
532 *Res. Public Health.* 2021 Feb;18(4):1569.

533 52 Chaudhuri KR, Podlowska A, Lau YH, Gonde C, McIntosh A, Qamar MA, O'Donoghue S, Larcombe K,
534 Adeeko M, Gupta A, Bajwah S. Addressing the gap for racially diverse research involvement: the King's
535 Model for Minority Ethnic Research Participant Recruitment (doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-2374782/v1).

536 53 Scott TI, Mannion R, Davies HT, Marshall MN. Implementing culture change in health care: theory and
537 practice. *Int J Qual Health Care.* 2003 Mar 1;15(2):111-8.

538 54 Mannion R, Davies H. Understanding organisational culture for healthcare quality improvement. *BMJ.*
539 2018 Nov 28;363.

540 55 Parsons J, Heus, L, Moravac, C. Seeing voices of health disparity: Evaluating arts projects as influence
541 processes. *Eval Program Plan.* 2013 36(1), pp.165-171.

542 56 Mir G, Karlsen S, Mitullah WV, Bhojani U, Uzochukwu B, Okeke C, Mirzoev T, Ebenso B, Dracup N,
543 Dymiski GA, Duong DT. Achieving SDG 10: a global review of public service inclusion strategies for ethnic

544 and religious minorities. UNRISD Occasional Paper-Overcoming Inequalities in a Fractured World:
545 Between Elite Power and Social Mobilization; 2020.

546 57 Turner S, Ollerhead E, Cook A. Identifying research priorities for public health research to address
547 health inequalities: use of Delphi-like survey methods. Health Res Policy Syst. 2017 Dec;15(1):1-0.

548 58 Addison M, Kaner E, Johnstone P, Hillier-Brown F, Moffatt S, Russell S, Barr B, Holland P, Salway S,
549 Whitehead M, Bamba C. Equal North: how can we reduce health inequalities in the North of England? A
550 prioritization exercise with researchers, policymakers and practitioners. J Public Health. 2019 Dec
551 20;41(4):652-64.

552 59 Taylor A, McMellon C, French T, MacLachlan A, Evans R, Lewis R, McCann M, Moore L, Murphy S,
553 Simpson S, Inchley J. Defining research priorities for youth public mental health: reflections on a
554 coproduction approach to transdisciplinary working. Health Res Policy Syst. 2022 Jun 20;20(1):72.

555 60 International Society for Urban Health. Accelerating City Equity (ACE) Project. 2023. Available from:
556 <https://isuh.org/projects/accelerating-city-equity-ace-project/>

557
558
559