

## Research priorities for improving menstrual health across the life-course in low- and middle-income countries

Marina Plesons,<sup>1</sup> Belen Torondel,<sup>2</sup> Bethany A. Caruso,<sup>3</sup> Julie Hennegan,<sup>4</sup> Marni Sommer,<sup>5</sup> Jacqueline Haver,<sup>6</sup> Danielle Keiser,<sup>7</sup> Anna M van Eijk,<sup>8</sup> Garazi Zulaika,<sup>8</sup> Linda Mason,<sup>8</sup> Penelope A. Phillips-Howard.<sup>8^</sup>

1. Sexual Reproductive Health, World Health Organization, Geneva; ORCID 0000-0003-3224-618X
2. Department of Infectious Diseases, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Keppel St, London WC1 7HT, United Kingdom; ORCID-0000-0001-6081-2156
3. Hubert Department of Global Health, Rollins School of Global Health, Emory University, 1518 Clifton Rd NE, Atlanta GA 30322, USA; ORCID: 0000-0001-9738-9857
4. Maternal, Child, and Adolescent Health Program, Burnet Institute, 85 Commercial Road, Melbourne, VIC 3004, Australia; ORCID: 0000-0003-2011-1595
5. Department of Sociomedical Sciences, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, 722 W 168<sup>th</sup> St, Room 537, New York NY 10032, USA; ORCID: 0000-0001-7442-9270
6. Save the Children US, School Health and Nutrition, Department of Education and Children Protection, 899 North Capitol St NE, #900, Washington, DC 20002, USA; ORCID: 0000-0003-2727-9905
7. Menstrual Health Hub, Address: Rheinsbergerstr. 76/77, 10115 Berlin, Germany; ORCID 0000-0002-5654-1880
8. Department of Clinical Sciences, Liverpool School of tropical Medicine, Pembroke Place, Liverpool L3 5QA, United Kingdom; AMvE: ORCID: 0000-0003-1635-1289; GZ: ORCID-0000-0003-1452-6225; LM: ORCID 0000-0003-1568-9261; PPH: ORCID: 0000-0003-1018-116X.

<sup>^</sup> Corresponding author: Prof Penelope Phillips-Howard, Department of Clinical Sciences, Liverpool School of tropical Medicine, Pembroke Place, Liverpool L3 5QA; [Penelope.Phillips-Howard@lstm.ac.uk](mailto:Penelope.Phillips-Howard@lstm.ac.uk)

## Abstract

**Background:** Research on menstrual health is required to understand the needs of girls, women, and others who menstruate; and to strengthen programmes with evidence-based interventions to improve health, wellbeing, and productivity. The identification of research priorities is an important process to help researchers, policymakers, programmers, and funding agencies decide where to invest their efforts and resources.

**Methods:** A modified version of the Child Health and Nutrition Research Initiative (CHNRI) approach was utilized to reach consensus on a set of research priority questions. Multisector stakeholders with expertise in policy, programming, financial support, and/or research relating to menstrual health were identified through networks and the literature. Individuals were invited to submit priority questions through survey monkey online on i) understanding the problem; ii) designing and implementing interventions; iii) integrating and scaling up interventions. Responses were consolidated and individuals were then invited to rank these questions based on i) novelty; ii) potential for intervention; and iii) importance/impact. Research priority scores were calculated from these responses and analyzed to evaluate associations with social and occupational characteristics of participating respondents.

**Results:** Eighty-two participants, of whom 89% were female and 39.0% from low- and middle-income countries (LMIC), proposed a total of 1135 research questions: 45.9% on understanding the problem, 39.7% on designing and implementing interventions, 12.7% on integrating and scale-up, plus 1.5% on other aspects. Questions were consolidated into a final list of 91 unique research questions. Sixty-six participants, of whom 80.3% were women and 39.4% from LMIC, ranked these questions. Top ten-ranked research priority questions comprised four questions on 'understanding the problem', four on 'designing and implementing interventions', one on 'integrating and scaling up', and one on 'measurement and research'. Academics gave higher prioritization to 'designing and implementing interventions,' and lower prioritization to questions on 'understanding the problem,' 'integrating and scaling up,' and 'measurement and research.

**Conclusions:** Use of CHNRI generated unique research priority questions from expertise internationally. The top-ranking research priorities can be utilized by policymakers, programmers, researchers, and funders to guide future research in menstrual health.

## Introduction

Menstrual health has received increased attention in recent years as an important component of public health.<sup>1,2</sup> Research in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) – largely descriptive studies – has identified the impacts of poor menstrual health on girls’ health, wellbeing, and education.<sup>3,4</sup> A small number of recent trials have evaluated the impact of menstrual products and puberty education on girls’ school attendance, educational performance, sexual and reproductive health (SRH), and wellbeing.<sup>5-8</sup> Other studies have focused on understanding the menstrual self-care practices and menstrual health challenges of women and girls in humanitarian contexts, as well as the acceptability of specific menstrual products in such settings.<sup>9-11</sup> More recently, studies have started to describe challenges for adult women,<sup>12-15</sup> marginalized populations in high income countries (HICs),<sup>16-20</sup> mental health,<sup>21</sup> and to develop measures for menstrual health research.<sup>22,23</sup> The evidence on menstrual health has been consolidated in a growing body of systematic reviews, including reviews focused on specific geographies,<sup>24-26</sup> populations (e.g. girls with disabilities,<sup>27</sup> those who are displaced),<sup>24,28</sup> measures of exposures and outcomes,<sup>29-33</sup> interventions (e.g. menstrual cups, reusable menstrual pads),<sup>30</sup> (van Eijk, 2021 #3976) and outcomes (e.g. knowledge and understanding, health, and social wellbeing).<sup>4,26,31-33</sup>

The identification of research priorities is an important process to help researchers, programmers, policymakers, and funding agencies decide where to invest their efforts and resources. In 2014, research priorities on menstrual hygiene management (MHM) among school-going girls in LMICs were identified by an expert group as part of “MHM in Ten,” an initiative that sought to set the agenda for overcoming challenges related to menstrual health faced by this population and for identifying the evidence needed to improve girls’ experiences of menstruation and education.<sup>1,3</sup> As evidenced by its extensive citation and the substantial number of relevant research outputs since 2014, it is clear that the prioritization effort has positively impacted the trajectory of the field, which has developed rapidly in the eight years since. Several identified priorities have been acted upon, including the need for strengthening the evidence base. A review of qualitative studies on menstrual health reported that 50% of the studies were published between 2015 and 2019.<sup>4</sup> Other priorities have also seen progress, including the need for standardized menstrual measures<sup>34</sup> and definitions,<sup>23,35,36</sup> and the need for a research consortium, which has begun to take shape under the umbrella of the Global Menstrual Collective. Given the evolution of the field, it is therefore timely to reassess the research priorities for improving menstrual health to guide the field. Further, as the focus of efforts to address menstrual health has expanded beyond school-going girls to include girls who are out-of-school, as well as women and others who menstruate, there is a need to identify research priorities to address the needs of all who menstruate across the life-course in varying contexts around the world.<sup>37</sup>

Thus, the objective of this study is to identify research priorities for menstrual health across the life-course in LMICs, in consultation with a range of stakeholder groups from a variety of geographic regions. This study additionally aims to understand if and how research priorities differ across sectors, stakeholder groups, and years working in menstrual health.

## Methods

This research was undertaken by members of the Global Menstrual Collective’s Research and Evidence Group, comprising researchers, stakeholders, and implementers with experience working in the field of menstrual health. The Global Menstrual Collective is a collaborative network whose aim is to bring

together partners in menstrual health to amplify efforts and reduce duplication for mainstreaming menstrual health across health, education, gender, and water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH).

We used a modified version of the Child Health and Nutrition Research Initiative (CHNRI) approach to reach consensus on a set of research priority questions. The CHNRI approach is a transparent and structured process for ranking the relative importance of competing research priorities to help decision-makers effectively allocate limited resources to address a health problem, e.g. by reducing morbidity and mortality, improving wellbeing and quality of life, and addressing inequities.<sup>38,39</sup> It has been used to reach consensus on research priorities for numerous health topics, including adolescent health,<sup>40</sup> adolescent sexual and reproductive health,<sup>41</sup> and family planning.<sup>42</sup> The adapted CHNRI approach used in this study involved three phases, described in detail below:

### **Phase 1: Identification of individuals with expertise in menstrual health**

First, individuals from various stakeholder groups with expertise in policy, programming, financial support, and/or research relating to menstrual health were identified. This was achieved by disseminating information about the study to (i) menstrual health panels, coalitions, and consortia (e.g., the Menstrual Health Hub, the African Coalition for Menstrual Health Management, the MHM in Ten Expert network, Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council and the GMC Collective, the Menstrual Cup Collaboration, and Water Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) United's Menstrual Hygiene Day), (ii) published researchers, and (iii) funders identified through past or current funding calls. Snowballing was then used to circulate the invitation to relevant others who may have been missed by the above methods.

### **Phase 2: Identification of research questions on menstrual health**

The individuals identified in Phase 1 were invited to propose research questions on menstrual health across the life-course, using an electronic survey (SurveyMonkey, Palo Alto). An invitation email was sent in September 2020 with two reminders sent fortnightly. The survey was closed in October 2020.

After reading an information sheet explaining the nature and purpose of the exercise, consenting to participate, and providing demographic information including sector of work (e.g., academia, UN-agency, non-governmental organization) and geographic areas of residence and work, participants were prompted to propose research questions. These spanned three domains (each with several sub-domains), as guided by the CHNRI approach:

1. *Understanding the problem*: questions to illustrate the experiences of those who menstruate, explore risk and protective factors for menstrual health, and test impacts and consequences of poor menstrual health. Such questions could utilize a range of methodologies, from descriptive epidemiology to ethnographic research.
2. *Designing and implementing interventions*: questions which relate to (i) discovery of new interventions, (ii) development and testing of interventions/programmes, and (iii) evaluations of the effectiveness, acceptability, adoption, appropriateness, feasibility, fidelity, cost, coverage, and sustainability of interventions to address menstrual health. Such questions could utilize intervention effectiveness research and implementation research.
3. *Integrating and scaling up interventions*: questions which relate to integrating menstrual health interventions into health, education, WASH, or social services and to taking menstrual health interventions to scale. Such questions could include implementation research and policy and systems research.

Exemplar questions for each domain and sub-domain were provided to provide further clarity for the participants.

Participant responses were downloaded into spreadsheets, and free texts were collapsed to aggregate group data. A core team of four members of the Global Menstrual Collective’s Research and Evidence Group then iteratively categorized and consolidated the questions based on themes (Tables S1). Further bracketing of questions between domains and sub-domains was undertaken where relevant. Duplicates were removed, as were questions covering unrelated topics. An extra domain, *Measurement & Research*, was included as numerous questions pertaining to this topic were suggested by participants. Similar questions were condensed together to derive a smaller number of amalgamated research questions (Table S1). Once the full set of consolidated questions was developed, a meeting with the Global Menstrual Collective’s Research and Evidence Group was held to review and agree upon a final list of research questions to be used in Phase 3.

### Phase 3: Prioritization of the proposed research questions on menstrual health

Discussion among the Global Menstrual Collective’s Research and Evidence Group raised concerns about the length of the survey, the clarity of these criteria for this specific topic, and potential confounding due to explicit mention of equity in multiple questions. To address these concerns, the five criteria originally proposed by the CHNRI approach (clarity, answerability, importance/impact, implementation, equity) were modified. The modifications were in line with the CHNRI approach, which suggests that the priority setting process should list possible criteria appropriate to their specific context and may merge criteria, where appropriate.<sup>39</sup> Thus, three criteria – novelty, potential for implementation, and importance/impact (Table 1) – were agreed upon, with the CHNRI approach’s standard scoring system of *yes, no, or undecided*. Due to its length, the survey was split into two sections comprising 40 and 51 research questions.

**Table 1. Criteria used to score the proposed research questions and their definitions**

	Understanding the problem	Designing and implementing interventions	Integrating and scaling-up interventions	Measurement & research
<b>Novelty</b>	Will the answer to this question fill a key gap?			
<b>Potential for implementation</b>	Will the answer to the question contribute to tailored interventions?	Will the answer to the question result in an intervention that can be implemented?	Could the answer to the question be implemented?	
<b>Importance/impact</b>	Will the answer to this question be important to know?	Will the answer to the question result in an intervention that would have an important impact?	Will the answer to the question have an important impact?	

The individuals identified in Phase 1 were then invited to score the proposed research questions, again using an electronic survey (SurveyMonkey, Palo Alto). An invitation email was sent in June 2021 with two reminders sent fortnightly. The survey was closed in July 2021.

Participant responses were downloaded into spreadsheets, cleaned, and imported into IBM SPSS version 28 (Armonk). A variable was created to indicate if participants had responded to individual research priority questions. The number of responses per participant and per research question were counted. For participant demographic information, frequency distributions of characteristics of the participants were conducted. For ranking of the research questions, a score of 100 points was attributed to “yes”, 50 points to “undecided”, and 0 points to “no”. A total Research Priority Score (RPS) was then assigned for each research question by computing the mean score across the three criteria. RPSs were then ranked from highest to lowest, overall and within each domain. RPSs were also assessed based on the profile of the participants, e.g., by their sector of work, stakeholder group, and years working in menstrual health.

### Ethical Considerations

The project was approved by the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine’s Research and Ethics Committee (ID# 20-055), as exemption given by the Human Reproduction Programme Research Protocol Review Panel and the WHO Ethics Review Committee (ID# ERC.0003407). Potential respondents were informed that their participation was voluntary, and they were free to stop responding to questions at any time. Written consent was obtained through the provision of a participant information sheet and consent on the online webpage. Participants had to tick that they consented to join the study before they could access the survey.

## Results

### Characteristics of Phase 2 participants

A total of 82 participants responded to the Phase 2 survey and proposed research questions on menstrual health (Table 2). The majority were female (89%) with 33% and 28% aged 25-34 years and 35-44 years respectively. The highest proportion (61%) originated from HICs, with 29% from Europe; LMICs were represented, with 27% of participants from sub-Saharan Africa. The highest proportion of respondents worked in non-government organization (NGO) and international NGO (43%) or in academia (35%). A third of participants worked globally, over half (58%) worked in sub-Saharan Africa, and 35% worked in east and southern Asia. Sixty-two percent of participants reported their area of expertise lay in sexual and reproductive health (SRH). Over one third (38%) of participants had worked in the field of menstrual health for 7 years or longer.

**Table 2 Participant characteristics (n=82)**

		<b>Participants of Phase 2 (n=82)</b>	<b>Participants of Phase 3 (n=66)</b>
<b>Age</b>	18-24	4 (4.9%)	0
	25-34	27 (32.9%)	17 (25.8%)
	35-44	23 (28.0%)	16 (24.2%)
	45-54	15 (18.3%)	18 (27.3%)
	55-64	7 (8.5%)	6 (9.1%)
	65+	6 (7.3%)	8 (12.1%)
<b>Gender</b>	Female	73 (89.0%)	53 (80.3%)
	Male	9 (11.0%)	12 (18.2%)
	Non-binary or gender not listed above	0	1 (1.5%)

<b>Region of world where the participants reside</b>	Europe	24 (29.3%)	21 (31.8%)
	North America	19 (22.2%)	17 (25.8%)
	Sub-Saharan Africa	22 (26.8%)	11 (16.7%)
	Asia	8 (9.8%)	12 (18.2%)
	Australasia	7 (8.5%)	2 (3.0%)
	Middle East	2 (2.4%)	0 (0%)
	Latin America	0 (0%)	3 (4.5%)
	<b>High or low-middle income country residence</b>	HIC	50 (61.0%)
LMIC		32 (39.0%)	26 (39.4%)
<b>Sector of work</b>	Academia	29 (35.4%)	22 (33.3%)
	NGO	19 (23.2%)	14 (21.2%)
	International NGO	16 (19.5%)	11 (16.7%)
	International Agency	10 (12.2%)	7 (10.6%)
	Entrepreneur	7 (8.5%)	6 (9.1%)
	Funding Agency	2 (2.4%)	7 (10.6%)
	Government	2 (2.4%)	4 (6.1%)
	Other	12 (14.6%)	7 (10.6%)
<b>Region of world where the participants work</b>	Sub-Saharan Africa	38 (58.5%)	25 (37.9%)
	Global	30 (36.6%)	26 (39.4%)
	Asia	29 (35.4%)	20 (30.3%)
	North America	12 (14.6%)	11 (16.7%)
	Europe	12 (14.6%)	12 (18.2%)
	Pacific	11 (13.4%)	6 (9.1%)
	Middle-East	8 (9.8%)	0 (0%)
	Latin America	7 (8.5%)	8 (12.1%)
	North Africa	7 (8.5%)	0 (0%)
<b>Areas of expertise*</b>	SRH	51 (62.2%)	43 (65.2%)
	Adolescent Health/Development	39 (47.6%)	33 (50.0%)
	WASH	35 (42.7%)	27 (40.9%)
	Gender	32 (39.0%)	24 (36.4%)
	Policy/Advocacy	30 (35.6%)	21 (31.8%)
	Education	26 (31.7%)	20 (30.3%)
	Mental Health	11 (13.4%)	6 (9.1%)
	Other	17 (20.7%)	11 (16.7%)
<b>Years of experience working on menstrual health</b>	<12m	5 (6.1%)	1 (1.5%)
	1-3y	18 (22.0%)	11 (16.7%)
	4-6y	28 (34.1%)	19 (28.8%)
	7-9y	16 (19.5%)	12 (18.2%)
	10y+	15 (18.3%)	22 (33.3%)

\*More than one area of expertise could be answered

### Proposed research questions

A total of 1135 research questions were proposed by the 82 participants that responded to the Phase 2 survey, with an average of 13.8 (standard deviation [sd 9.9]; median 11) research questions proposed per participant (Table 3 and Table S2). The greatest number of research questions proposed were on understanding the problem (521 by all participants; average 6.4 per participant), followed by designing and implementing interventions (451 by 69 participants, average 6.5 per participant). Participants with

more years of experience in menstrual health (7 years or more) proposed considerably more research questions (average 17.6), compared with those with fewer years of experience (average 11.7) (Table S3). Participants working in the mental health sector proposed significantly more research questions (average 19.7) than those working in other areas (combined average 13.17). The differences among stakeholder groups were less pronounced.

**Table 3. Overview of the proposed research questions**

Domain	Total number of research questions proposed	Number of participants that proposed at least one research question	Average number of research questions proposed per participant
Understanding the problem	521 (45.9%)	82	6.4
Designing and implementing interventions	451 (39.7%)	69	6.5
Integrating and scale-up	145 (12.7%)	54	2.7
Other	18 (1.6%)	15	1.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>1135</b>		<b>13.8</b>

As previously described, the proposed research questions were consolidated into a final list of 91 unique research questions. A breakdown of the number of research questions per domain and sub-domain is provided in Table 4.

**Table 4. Overview of the consolidated list of research questions**

Domain	Sub-domain	Number of research questions
Understanding the problem	Experiences related to menstrual health	7
	Factors affecting menstrual health	9
	Impact and consequences	7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>
Designing and implementing interventions	Discovery of new interventions	12
	Developing and testing the effectiveness of interventions/programmes	18
	Evaluations of the costs of interventions/programmes	6
	Evaluations of the delivery (including acceptability, adoption, appropriateness, feasibility, fidelity, coverage, and reach) of interventions/ programmes	10
	Evaluations of the sustainability of interventions/programmes	6
	<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>
Integrating and scale-up	Integration	6
	Scale-up	5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>
Measurement & Research		<b>5</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>91</b>



### Characteristics of Phase 3 participants

A total of 66 participants completed the Phase 3 survey, contributing to the prioritization of the proposed research questions (Table 2). The majority were female (80%), with 26% and 27% aged 25-34 years and 45-54 years respectively. The highest proportion (61%) resided in HICs, with 32% of the participants from Europe; LMICs were represented by 39%, with 18% of the participants from Asia. The highest proportion of respondents worked in NGO or international NGO (38%) and academia (33%) sectors. Over a third (39%) of participants worked globally, 38% worked in Sub-Saharan Africa, and 30% worked in east and southern Asia. Sixty-five percent of participants reported working in SRH. Over one third (36%) had worked in the field of menstrual health for 7 years or more.

### Prioritized research questions

The highest ranked research question by RPS among all participants was ‘What indicators are optimal for assessing menstrual health over time (e.g., related to norms, education, health, rights, etc.)?’ It was ranked highest according to non-academic participants, and second highest according to academic participants.

The top ten-ranked research questions are listed in Table 5. They include four questions on ‘understanding the problem’, four on ‘designing and implementing interventions’, one on ‘integrating and scaling up’, and one on ‘measurement and research’. We found a high level of agreement on these ten questions, with total RPS ranging from 0.913 to 0.956 (out of a possible 1). Of note, the difference in RPS between the top ten-ranked research questions and those subsequent was not substantial, pointing to the high prioritization of many questions beyond those included only in this abbreviated list (Figure 1). Thus, the top five-ranked research questions in each domain, ranked according to their RPS, are listed in Table 6.

### Figure 1. Research Priority Scores and Overall Rank

When examining the top five-ranked research questions by individual scoring criteria, as opposed to the overall RPS, it is notable that the top five-ranked questions in the criteria ‘potential for implementation’ are in the overall top ten ranked questions by RPS, as are the top five-ranked questions in the criteria ‘importance/impact’ with the exception of one question (Table 7). In both criteria, three out of the top five-ranked questions are in the domain ‘understanding the problem.’ Additionally, it is noteworthy that the top five-ranked questions in the criteria ‘novelty’ include no questions from the domain on ‘understanding the problem’ and include instead questions from the domains on ‘designing and implementing interventions,’ ‘integration and scale-up’ and ‘measurement and research.’

When examining the average RPSs by domain, we found a similar level of prioritization of the domains among all participants, with average RPSs ranging from 0.833 to 0.862 (Table 8). However, when comparing the average RPSs by domain among academics vs. non-academics, it is notable that academics gave higher prioritization to ‘designing and implementing interventions,’ and lower prioritization to questions on ‘understanding the problem,’ ‘integrating and scaling up,’ and ‘measurement and research’.

When comparing the top ten-ranked research questions among academics and those not working in academia, there are notable differences (Figure 2). First, the lists have only three questions in common (out of a total of 18 unique questions in the two lists): one regarding the optimal indicators for assessing menstrual health, one regarding interventions to address norms and attitudes about menstruation, and

one regarding interventions to manage menstrual pain. Second, the top ten-ranked questions among non-academics included more questions in the domain on 'understanding the problem' (n=4) than those among academics (n=1). The top ten-ranked questions among academics, meanwhile, included more questions in the domain on 'designing and implementing interventions' (n=7) than those among non-academics (n=4).

**Figure 2. Comparison of the top ranked research questions, among academics vs. non-academic**

**Table 5. Top 10-ranked research questions, by Research Priority Score**

Rank	RPS	Question	Domain	Unique ID
1	0.956	What indicators are optimal for assessing menstrual health over time (e.g. related to norms, education, health, rights, etc.)?	Measurement and research	M1
2	0.932	What are the experiences of girls, women, and others who menstruate in relation to menstrual pain and disorders (e.g. what proportion experience them, what are their perceptions about them, how do they manage them, and what support do they seek and receive for them)?	Understanding the problem	U1
3	0.93	What new interventions could be developed to address harmful attitudes, norms and stigma and improve communication related to menstruation?	Designing and implementing interventions	D1
4	0.924	Are girls, women, and others who menstruate able to access and afford their preferred menstrual product/materials; what is the quality of these products/materials; where do they obtain them; and how do they use and dispose of them?	Understanding the problem	U2
5	0.921	What is the impact of unmet menstrual health needs (e.g. products/materials, WASH infrastructure/services) on the participation and engagement of girls, women, and others who menstruate in school and work and their self-esteem and agency?	Understanding the problem	U3
6	0.919	What are the experiences and challenges of girls, women, and others who menstruate with particular needs and circumstances (e.g. those living with HIV, those with disabilities, those who are incarcerated, those experiencing homelessness, those who have experienced FGM, trans and gender non-binary persons) in relation to their menstrual health?	Understanding the problem	U4
7	0.915	What characteristics of menstrual health interventions/programmes enable them to be sustained over time?	Designing and implementing interventions	D2
8	0.915	How can interventions to address menstrual health (e.g. education, social norm change, distribution of menstrual products/materials, improvements in WASH infrastructure/services, provision of health services for menstrual pain and disorders) be scaled up with quality and equity?	Integrating and scaling up	I1
9	0.913	What new interventions could be developed to manage menstrual pain?	Designing and implementing interventions	D3
10	0.913	What are the impacts of unconditional and conditional cash transfer interventions on the menstrual health of girls, women, and others who	Designing and implementing interventions	D4

		menstruate, and consequently on their education, work, and social participation?		
--	--	--	--	--

**Table 6. Top five-ranked research questions in each domain, by Research Priority Score**

Domain	Rank within domain	Overall rank	RPS	Question	Unique ID
<b>Understanding the problem (n=25)</b>	1	2	0.932	What are the experiences of girls, women, and others who menstruate in relation to menstrual pain and disorders (e.g. what proportion experience them, what are their perceptions about them, how do they manage them, and what support do they seek and receive for them)?	U1
	2	4	0.924	Are girls, women, and others who menstruate able to access and afford their preferred menstrual product/materials; what is the quality of these products/materials; where do they obtain them; and how do they use and dispose of them?	U2
	3	5	0.921	What is the impact of unmet menstrual health needs (e.g. products/materials, WASH infrastructure/services) on the participation and engagement of girls, women, and others who menstruate in school and work and their self-esteem and agency?	U3
	4	6	0.919	What are the experiences and challenges of girls, women, and others who menstruate with particular needs and circumstances (e.g. those living with HIV, those with disabilities, those who are incarcerated, those experiencing homelessness, those who have experienced FGM, trans and gender non-binary persons) in relation to their menstrual health?	U4
	5	18	0.895	How do financial barriers impact the ability of girls, women, and others who menstruate to manage their menstruation?	U5
<b>Designing and implementing interventions (n=53)</b>	1	3	0.93	What new interventions could be developed to address harmful attitudes, norms and stigma and improve communication related to menstruation?	D1
	2	7	0.915	What characteristics of menstrual health interventions/programmes enable them to be sustained over time?	D2

	3	9	0.913	What new interventions could be developed to manage menstrual pain?	D3
	4	10	0.913	What are the impacts of unconditional and conditional cash transfer interventions on the menstrual health of girls, women, and others who menstruate, and consequently on their education, work, and social participation?	D4
	5	11	0.913	What are the impacts of providing free/subsidized menstrual products/materials on menstrual health?	D5
<b>Integrating and scaling up (n=11)</b>	1	8	0.915	How can interventions to address menstrual health (e.g. education, social norm change, distribution of menstrual products/materials, improvements in WASH infrastructure/services, provision of health services for menstrual pain and disorders) be scaled up with quality and equity?	I1
	2	14	0.902	How can information on menstruation be integrated into existing formal and non-formal educational curricula, health services (e.g. contraceptive services, HPV vaccination, FGM support, psychosocial support), social norms, and gender equality interventions/programmes?	I2
	3	15	0.902	How can considerations for the menstrual health needs of girls, women, and others who menstruate with particular needs and circumstances (e.g. those with disabilities and their caregivers, those living in urban/rural settings, those who have experienced FGM, those in indigenous communities, those in humanitarian settings) be integrated into existing policies and interventions/programmes?	I3
	4	17	0.897	How can governments integrate menstrual health across sectors (e.g. education, health, WASH, gender) and achieve multi-sectoral coordination?	I4
	5	32	0.876	How can integration of menstrual health across sectors be optimally monitored and evaluated?	I5
<b>Measurement and research (n=5)</b>	1	1	0.956	What indicators are optimal for assessing menstrual health over time (e.g. related to norms, education, health, rights, etc.)?	M1
	2	19	0.890	What tools/instruments/approaches/measures are optimal for assessing the impact of interventions to address menstrual health at various programmatic levels (e.g. local, national, global)?	M2
	3	37	0.868	What is the definition of a meaningful improvement in menstrual health, and how can it be measured?	M3
	4	78	0.785	How can lessons learned from the delivery of menstrual health interventions be optimally documented and shared?	M4

	5	89	0.724	What support is needed to encourage relevant, timely, and rigorous research on menstrual health, and which actors need to be engaged in the research process?	M5
--	---	----	-------	---	----

**Table 7. Top five research questions ranked by individual scoring criteria**

Individual scoring criteria	Rank within criteria	Overall rank	Question	Overall RPS	Unique ID
<b>Novelty</b>	1	16	How long should menstrual cups be worn, how should they be cleaned between use, and how often should they be replaced?	0.901	D8
	2	17	How can governments integrate menstrual health across sectors (e.g. education, health, WASH, gender) and achieve multi-sectoral coordination?	0.897	I4
	3	1	What indicators are optimal for assessing menstrual health over time (e.g. related to norms, education, health, rights, etc.)?	0.956	M1
	4	6	What new interventions could be developed to manage menstrual pain?	0.913	D3
	5	10	What are the impacts of providing free/subsidized menstrual products/materials on menstrual health?	0.913	D5
<b>Potential for implementation</b>	1	1	What indicators are optimal for assessing menstrual health over time (e.g. related to norms, education, health, rights, etc.)?	0.956	M1
	2	4	Are girls, women, and others who menstruate able to access and afford their preferred menstrual product/materials; what is the quality of these products/materials; where do they obtain them; and how do they use and dispose of them?	0.924	U2
	3	3	What new interventions could be developed to address harmful attitudes, norms and stigma and improve communication related to menstruation?	0.930	D1
	4	2	What are the experiences of girls, women, and others who menstruate in relation to menstrual pain and disorders (e.g. what proportion experience them, what are their perceptions about them, how do they manage them, and what support do they seek and receive for them)?	0.932	U1
	5	6	What are the experiences and challenges of girls, women, and others who menstruate with particular needs and circumstances (e.g. those living with HIV, those with disabilities, those who are incarcerated, those experiencing homelessness, those who have experienced FGM, trans and gender non-binary persons) in relation to their menstrual health?	0.919	U4
<b>Importance/ impact</b>	1	1	What indicators are optimal for assessing menstrual health over time (e.g. related to norms, education, health, rights, etc.)?	0.956	M1

	2	2	What are the experiences of girls, women, and others who menstruate in relation to menstrual pain and disorders (e.g. what proportion experience them, what are their perceptions about them, how do they manage them, and what support do they seek and receive for them)?	0.932	U1
	3	5	What is the impact of unmet menstrual health needs (e.g. products/materials, WASH infrastructure/services) on the participation and engagement of girls, women, and others who menstruate in school and work and their self-esteem and agency?	0.921	U3
	4	23	What is the impact of unmet menstrual health needs (e.g. information, products/materials, WASH infrastructure/services) the health and wellbeing of on girls, women, and others who menstruate across the life course?	0.888	U6
	5	3	What new interventions could be developed to address harmful attitudes, norms and stigma and improve communication related to menstruation?	0.930	D1

**Table 8. Average Research Priority Scores, by domain and stakeholder group**

Domain	Total number of research questions	Average RPS		
		All participants	Academics	Non-academics
Understanding the problem	25	0.850	0.843	0.853
Designing and implementing interventions	53	0.833	0.841	0.830
Integrating and scaling up	11	0.862	0.850	0.867
Measurement and research	5	0.845	0.815	0.857

## Discussion

This study used a modified version of the CHNRI approach to identify research priorities on menstrual health across the life-course in LMICs, moving beyond previous research priority identification that focused on adolescent girls.<sup>3</sup> In doing so, it generated input from 82 participants across all continents with expertise in policy, programming, financial support, and/or research relating to menstrual health.

Overall, the study identified a greater number of research questions in the domains of ‘understanding the problem’ and ‘designing and implementing interventions’, and higher prioritization of those research questions, than questions on ‘integration and scale-up’ and ‘measurement and research’. This confirms that there are still many knowledge gaps in understanding the menstrual experiences of women, girls, and people who menstruate, and in identifying and assessing what are the most effective and optimal interventions to meet their needs. These two domains also align with the previous research priority assessment focused on adolescent girls, which specifically noted ‘the need for a strong evidence base’, and included illustrative questions related to understanding the problem and learning around interventions.<sup>3</sup> Until these gaps are addressed, it appears that stakeholders perceive questions regarding integration and scale-up to be premature. The lower prioritization of questions on ‘integration and scale-up’ may also reflect the composition of stakeholder groups that participated in this study, as only a small proportion of participants represented international agencies, government, and funding agencies.

Despite there being fewer ‘measurement and research’ questions identified and prioritized overall, the top ranked question identified, the top-ranked research question identified in this study was ‘What indicators are optimal for assessing menstrual health over time?’ The previous research priority assessment focused on adolescent girls highlighted a broad need for standardized measures, and specifically noted a need for identifying indicators for national-level monitoring for assessing changes over time. Having a standardized set of indicators is critical even to answer the other research questions in this list. A standardized set of indicators allows for comparison of menstrual health issues across and within different populations worldwide, and helps researchers, implementers, and funders to target their efforts where they are needed most. Notably, since this prioritization work was initiated, progress on indicators has been made, reflecting both the need identified in the initial research priority work with adolescent girls and the extent to which having indicators is truly wanted in the sector.<sup>34</sup> Specifically, a shortlist of priority indicators for monitoring girls’ menstrual health at the national level<sup>43</sup> and a list of potential indicators for monitoring menstruation among those who work outside the home have been published.<sup>44</sup> Additionally, in 2021, the Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply, Sanitation, and Hygiene—custodians of monitoring data for SDG targets 6.1 and 6.2—included a set of harmonized menstrual health indicators as part of the first dedicated section on menstrual health in the regular reporting on household drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene.<sup>45</sup>

This study identified that the top research priorities were not limited to one area of expertise (e.g. education, health, WASH etc.) but were distributed across issues. For example, the top ten-ranked research priorities include questions related to menstrual pain, socio-cultural drivers of menstrual health, menstrual products, and participation in school and work. This indicates that research gaps exist in multiple domains of menstrual health, which will require addressing through collaborative efforts across all areas of expertise. Further, they identify a strong need to promote equity by understanding the specific menstrual needs and experiences of underserved populations (e.g. those living with HIV, those with disabilities, those who are incarcerated, those experiencing homelessness, those who have experienced FGM, trans and gender non-binary persons), and identifying effective interventions to meet



those needs. Finally, the difference in RPS between the top 10-ranked research questions and those following was not substantial, pointing to the high prioritization of many questions beyond those included only in this abbreviated list.

This study also identified important differences in the top ten-ranked research priorities among academics and non-academics. In part, the different priorities may reflect what the two stakeholder groups see firsthand as challenges and needs in their day-to-day work. Alternatively, or perhaps in addition, it may reflect an important need for improved knowledge sharing between stakeholder groups. For example, while sorting through the proposed research questions in Phase 2, the Global Menstrual Collective's Research and Evidence Group – which is itself largely composed of academics – felt that a number of the proposed questions already had a substantial amount of evidence in the published literature. As such, effort is needed to ensure that research evidence is not confined to academic literature, but rather that findings and recommendations are written, translated, and disseminated purposefully and meaningfully to others working in the field of menstrual health, e.g., through educational programmes, through liaison with governments to support legislation.

On the other hand, it is very possible that those directly involved in the implementation of menstrual health interventions have generated substantial learnings on interventions and how to deliver them effectively in various contexts, and thus see those domains as being of lower priority but have not had the opportunity or support to formally evaluate and/or document these learnings in the published literature. Effort is needed to ensure that these learnings are documented and integrated into the evidence base on menstrual health and disseminated across the different stakeholder groups. Finally, these differences may also reflect variations in what stakeholder groups view as worthy of the investment of what remains a limited pool of resources. For example, academics may feel that there is insufficient evidence to invest resources on an intervention, while non-academics may approach such decision-making from a different lens, such as one of human rights.

### **Strengths and Limitations**

This study has several limitations. First, whilst the open invitation along with snowballing technique opened our survey to a wide audience, participants were permitted to self-select and stringent criteria were not used to evaluate their eligibility for inclusion. As a result, it is possible that the study was affected by non-response bias, and some respondents may not have had sufficient expertise to be considered an 'expert' in menstrual health. Second, many participants began the surveys in Phases 2 and 3 but did not complete them. The format of the online survey did not allow participants to view the whole document; instead, they had to complete each page before the next page was revealed. This meant participants were unable to decide in advance whether the survey was appropriate or of interest to them until after they had completed their demographic details. A formal analysis of the barriers to completion was not possible, but we hypothesize that the length of the surveys – particularly that used in Phase 3, which had a total of 91 questions each requiring consideration of 3 criteria – may not have been user-friendly for such a wide audience. This may also have contributed to the high level of consistency in scores across the 3 criteria. Further, this was a global exercise but was only conducted in English; thus, non-English speaking menstrual health experts may not have been able to participate and, among those who did, some may not speak English as their primary language. This may be reflected in the absence of substantial participation from Latin America and the Caribbean and the Middle East. It is also important to note that the survey required participants to have stable internet connectivity, as it was not available to download; this may also have undermined full participation. As a result, the findings

from this study may not perfectly reflect the opinions of all menstrual health experts. Finally, in the interest of ensuring anonymity of the data, it was not possible to confirm that the participants who responded to the survey in Phase 2 were the same as those who responded to the survey in Phase 3. As a result, the perspectives and expertise of the participants may have varied throughout the process.

However, this study also has many strengths. While research priorities were previously generated on menstrual health among school-going girls,<sup>3</sup> this is the first study to generate research priorities on menstrual health across the life-course in LMICs. This is particularly timely given the growing momentum among researchers, implementers, and activists in recognizing the importance of menstrual health to female empowerment and gender equity. Additionally, the study utilized a modified CRHNI approach, which is a well-respected and widely utilized systematic approach to research priority setting with transparent criteria. The study also incorporated input from many participants representing a wide range of countries, sectors, stakeholder groups, and years of experience in menstrual health. Finally, this study included several sub-analyses to (1) understand the characteristics of those who did and did not complete the surveys and the implications of this for others seeking to use the CHNRI approach to generate research priorities, and (2) to understand how the research priorities differ by stakeholder group, along with the implications for knowledge dissemination and translation between academics and non-academics.

## **Conclusions**

As menstrual health continues to gain attention and emphasis as an important component of public health, it is hoped that these research priorities can be utilized by policymakers, programmers, NGOs, entrepreneurs, researchers, and funders to guide future research in this area. Recognizing that research priority setting is a dynamic process, it is also hoped that these research priorities will be revisited in an iterative manner as the field continues to evolve.

## Acknowledgements

We are grateful to all members of the Global Menstrual Collective's Research & Evidence group for their contributions to this study. Cheryl Giddings is thanked for her administrative support. We also thank the many colleagues managing collaborations and various consortia and hubs that provided a conduit to forward the surveys involved in this study to their colleagues and constituents, to ensure a wide representation of participants around the world and in different sectors. We thank all participants who so carefully generated and scored these research questions.

## Funding

We are grateful to Virginia Kamawa and Therese Mahon from the Global Menstrual Collective who facilitated funding to LSTM to support this work. Funders did not influence design or implementation of the project but provided feedback on the publication.

## References

1. Sommer M, Caruso BA, Sahin M, et al. A Time for Global Action: Addressing Girls' Menstrual Hygiene Management Needs in Schools. *PLoS Med* 2016; **13**(2): e1001962.
2. Sommer M, Hirsch JS, Nathanson C, Parker RG. Comfortably, Safely, and Without Shame: Defining Menstrual Hygiene Management as a Public Health Issue. *Am J Public Health* 2015; **105**(7): 1302-11.
3. Phillips-Howard PA, Caruso B, Torondel B, Zulaika G, Sahin M, Sommer M. Menstrual hygiene management among adolescent schoolgirls in low- and middle-income countries: research priorities. *Global health action* 2016; **9**: 33032.
4. Hennegan J, Shannon AK, Rubli J, Schwab KJ, Melendez-Torres GJ. Women's and girls' experiences of menstruation in low- and middle-income countries: A systematic review and qualitative metasynthesis. *PLoS Med* 2019; **16**(5): e1002803.
5. Phillips-Howard P, Nyothach E, ter Kuile F, et al. Menstrual cups and sanitary pads to reduce school attrition, and sexually transmitted and reproductive tract infections: a cluster randomised controlled feasibility study in rural western Kenya. *BMJ open* 2016; **6**:e013229.: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2016-013229>.
6. Montgomery P, Hennegan J, Dolan C, Wu M, Steinfield L, Scott L. Menstruation and the Cycle of Poverty: A Cluster Quasi-Randomised Control Trial of Sanitary Pad and Puberty Education Provision in Uganda. *PloS one* 2016; **11**(12): e0166122.
7. Kansiime C, Hytti L, Nalugya R, et al. Menstrual health intervention and school attendance in Uganda (MENISCUS-2): a pilot intervention study. *BMJ open* 2020; **10**(2): e031182.
8. Austrian K, Kangwana B, Muthengi E, Soler-Hampejsek E. Effects of sanitary pad distribution and reproductive health education on upper primary school attendance and reproductive health knowledge and attitudes in Kenya: a cluster randomized controlled trial. *Reprod Health* 2021; **18**(1): 179.
9. VanLeeuwen C, Torondel B. Exploring menstrual practices and potential acceptability of reusable menstrual underwear among a Middle Eastern population living in a refugee setting. *Int J Womens Health* 2018; **10**: 349-60.
10. Schmitt ML, Clatworthy D, Ratnayake R, et al. Understanding the menstrual hygiene management challenges facing displaced girls and women: findings from qualitative assessments in Myanmar and Lebanon. *Confl Health* 2017; **11**: 19.
11. Sommer M, Utami D, Gruer C. Menstrual hygiene management considerations during Ebola response: a qualitative exploration. *Journal of International Humanitarian Action* 2022; **7**(1): 1-11.

12. Fry W, Njagi J, Houck F, Avni M, Krishna A. Improving Women's Opportunities to Succeed in the Workplace: Addressing Workplace Policies in Support of Menstrual Health and Hygiene in Two Kenyan Factories. *Sustainability* 2022; **14**(8): 4521.
13. Caruso BA, Clasen TF, Hadley C, et al. Understanding and defining sanitation insecurity: women's gendered experiences of urination, defecation and menstruation in rural Odisha, India. *BMJ Glob Health* 2017; **2**(4): e000414.
14. Boyers M, Garikipati S, Biggane A, et al. Period poverty: The perceptions and experiences of impoverished women living in an inner-city area of Northwest England. *PloS one* 2022; **17**(7): e0269341.
15. Hennegan J, Kibira SPS, Exum NG, Schwab KJ, Makumbi FE, Bukonya J. 'I do what a woman should do': a grounded theory study of women's menstrual experiences at work in Mukono District, Uganda. *BMJ Glob Health* 2020; **5**(11).
16. Ballard AM, Hoover AT, Rodriguez AV, Caruso BA. Emphasizing Choice and Autonomy in Personal Hygiene, Menstrual Health, and Sexual Health Product Distribution to People Experiencing Homelessness in Atlanta, Georgia During COVID-19. *Health promotion practice* 2021; **22**(6): 764-6.
17. Sommer M, Phillips-Howard PA, Gruer C, et al. Menstrual Product Insecurity Resulting From COVID-19 Related Income Loss, United States, 2020. *Am J Public Health* 2022; **112**(4): 675-84.
18. Boden L, Wolski A, Rubin AS, Oliveira LP, QP T. Exploring the barriers and facilitators to menstrual hygiene management for women experiencing homelessness. *Journal of Occupational Science* 2021: 1-16.
19. Krusz E, Hall N, Barrington DJ, et al. Menstrual health and hygiene among Indigenous Australian girls and women: barriers and opportunities. *BMC Womens Health* 2019; **19**(1): 146.
20. Lowik AJ. "Just because I don't bleed, doesn't mean I don't go through it": Expanding knowledge on trans and non-binary menstruators. *Int J Transgend Health* 2021; **22**(1-2): 113-25.
21. Spinhoven P, Zulaika G, Nyothach E, et al. Quality of life and well-being problems in secondary schoolgirls in Kenya: Prevalence, associated characteristics, and course predictors. *PLoS Global Health* 2022; **Accepted**.
22. Hennegan J, Nansubuga A, Smith C, Redshaw M, Akullo A, Schwab KJ. Measuring menstrual hygiene experience: development and validation of the Menstrual Practice Needs Scale (MPNS-36) in Soroti, Uganda. *BMJ open* 2020; **10**(2): e034461.
23. Hunter EC, Murray SM, Sultana F, et al. Development and validation of the Self-Efficacy in Addressing Menstrual Needs Scale (SAMNS-26) in Bangladeshi schools: A measure of girls' menstrual care confidence. *PloS one* 2022; **17**(10): e0275736.
24. Schmitt ML, Wood OR, Clatworthy D, Rashid SF, Sommer M. Innovative strategies for providing menstruation-supportive water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) facilities: learning from refugee camps in Cox's bazar, Bangladesh. *Confl Health* 2021; **15**(1): 10.
25. Barrington DJ, Robinson HJ, Wilson E, Hennegan J. Experiences of menstruation in high income countries: A systematic review, qualitative evidence synthesis and comparison to low- and middle-income countries. *PloS one* 2021; **16**(7): e0255001.
26. van Eijk AM, Sivakami M, Thakkar MB, et al. Menstrual hygiene management among adolescent girls in India: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ open* 2016; **6**(3): e010290.
27. Wilbur J, Torondel B, Hameed S, Mahon T, Kuper H. Systematic review of menstrual hygiene management requirements, its barriers and strategies for disabled people. *PloS one* 2019; **14**(2): e0210974.
28. VanLeeuwen C, Torondel B. Improving menstrual hygiene management in emergency contexts: literature review of current perspectives. *Int J Womens Health* 2018; **10**: 169-86.
29. Hennegan J, Brooks DJ, Schwab KJ, Melendez-Torres GJ. Measurement in the study of menstrual health and hygiene: A systematic review and audit. *PloS one* 2020; **15**(6): e0232935.

30. van Eijk AM, Zulaika G, Lenchner M, et al. Menstrual cup use, leakage, acceptability, safety, and availability: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Public Health* 2019; **4**(8): e376-e93.
31. Sumpter C, Torondel B. A systematic review of the health and social effects of menstrual hygiene management. *PLoS one* 2013; **8**(4): e62004.
32. Chandra-Mouli V, Patel SV. Mapping the knowledge and understanding of menarche, menstrual hygiene and menstrual health among adolescent girls in low- and middle-income countries. *Reprod Health* 2017; **14**(1): 30.
33. Shannon AK, Melendez-Torres GJ, Hennegan J. How do women and girls experience menstrual health interventions in low- and middle-income countries? Insights from a systematic review and qualitative metasynthesis. *Cult Health Sex* 2020: 1-20.
34. GMMG. Priority List of Indicators for Girls' Menstrual Health and Hygiene: Technical Guidance for National Monitoring, Global MHH Monitoring Group New York: Columbia University, 2022.
35. Hennegan J, Winkler IT, Bobel C, et al. Menstrual health: a definition for policy, practice, and research. *Sex Reprod Health Matters* 2021; **29**(1): 1911618.
36. Haver J, Long J, B.A C, Dreibelbis RD. New directions for assessing MHM in Schools: a bottom-up approach to measuring program success. *Studies in Social Justice* 2018; **12**(2): 372-81.
37. Sommer M, Chandraratna S, Cavill S, Mahon T, Phillips-Howard P. Managing menstruation in the workplace: an overlooked issue in low- and middle-income countries. *International journal for equity in health* 2016; **15**: 86.
38. de Francisco A, d'Arcangues C, Ringheim K, et al. Perceived research priorities in sexual and reproductive health for low- and middle-income countries: results from a survey. . Geneva: : Global Forum for Health Research, 2009.
39. Rudan I, Gibson JL, Ameratunga S, et al. Setting priorities in global child health research investments: guidelines for implementation of CHNRI method. *Croat Med J* 2008; **49**(6): 720-33.
40. Nagata JM, Ferguson BJ, Ross DA. Research Priorities for Eight Areas of Adolescent Health in Low- and Middle-Income Countries. *J Adolesc Health* 2016; **59**(1): 50-60.
41. Hindin MJ, Christiansen CS, Ferguson BJ. Setting research priorities for adolescent sexual and reproductive health in low- and middle-income countries. *Bull World Health Organ* 2013; **91**(1): 10-8.
42. Ali M, Seuc A, Rahimi A, Festin M, Temmerman M. A global research agenda for family planning: results of an exercise for setting research priorities. *Bull World Health Organ* 2014; **92**(2): 93-8.
43. Group GMM. Priority List of Indicators for Girls' Menstrual Health and Hygiene: Technical Guidance for National Monitoring New York: Columbia University 2022.
44. USAID. Advancement of Metrics for Menstrual Hygiene Management in the Workplace: Final Report. . Washington DC: USAID Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene Partnerships and Learning for Sustainability (WASHPaLS) Project, 2021.
45. WHO. Progress on household drinking water, sanitation, and hygiene 2000-2020: Five years into the SDGs. . Geneva: WHO, UNICEF, 2021.

## Supplementary Materials

Table S1. Example of a consolidated research question representing similar questions

Table S2. Number of participants that proposed and did not propose research questions for each sub-domain in Phase 2

Table S3. Number of research questions proposed by participants that are highly experienced (7 years or more) and less experienced (6 years or less) in menstrual health in Phase 2

**Table S1. Example of a consolidated research question representing similar questions**

Consolidated Question	Individual questions listed in the survey
<i>What are the effects of female genital cutting on menstrual health?</i>	'What are the effects of female genital cutting on menstrual health'?
	'How does FGM/female cutting affect a girl while menstruating and its links to infections'?
	'The impact of FGM on menstrual health (it is massive but hidden!)

**Table S2. Number of participants that proposed and did not propose research questions for each sub-domain in Phase 2**

Domains and sub-domains	Total participants	
	Proposed questions	Did not propose questions
<b><i>Understanding the problem</i></b>		
Experiences relating to menstrual health including social context/community attitudes	78	69
Factors affecting menstrual health	68	79
Impact and consequences of poor menstrual health	73	74
<b><i>Designing and implementing interventions</i></b>		
Discovery of new interventions	61	86
Developing and testing the effectiveness of interventions and programmes in a controlled trial	43	103
Evaluations of the effectiveness, acceptability, adoption, appropriateness, feasibility, fidelity, cost, coverage, and sustainability of interventions/programmes	45	102
- testing the effectiveness of interventions and programmes in real life circumstances		
- evaluations of the cost of interventions and programmes	34	113
- evaluations of the delivery (including acceptability, adoption, appropriateness, feasibility, fidelity, coverage, and reach) of interventions and programmes	40	107
- evaluations on the sustainability of interventions/programmes	32	115
<b><i>Integrating and scale-up</i></b>		
Integration of menstrual health interventions and programmes into health, gender, education, WASH, social services	50	97
Scale-up of menstrual health interventions/programmes	44	103
<b><i>Other</i></b>	28	119

**Table S3. Number of research questions proposed by participants that are highly experienced with 7 years or more, and less experienced (6 years or less) in menstrual health in Phase 2**

	Understanding the problem	Designing and implementing interventions	Integrating and scale-up	All
6 years or less	5.33 (9.48)	4.62 (4.42)	1.49 (1.82)	11.74 (7.75)
7 years or more	8.03 (7.10)	7.10 (7.50)	2.23 (2.14)	17.58 (11.93)
all	6.37 (3.72)	5.57 (5.87)	1.77 (1.94)	13.98 (9.92)
p value	0.001	0.065	0.1	0.009








Figure 2




Figure 1