

1

2 **A multi-step analysis and co-produced principles to support Equitable Partnership with Liverpool**

3 **School of Tropical Medicine, 125 years on**

4 **Robinson Karuga¹ and Rosie Steege² (joint first); Shahreen Chowdhury^{2*}, Bertie Squire², Sally**

5 **Theobald², Lilian Otiso¹ (ST/LO joint last)**

6 ¹LVCT Health, P.O. Box 19835 -00202, Nairobi, Kenya

7 ²Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Pembroke Place Liverpool, L3 5QA UK

8 *Corresponding author email: shahreen.chowdhury@lstmed.ac.uk

9

10

11 **Abstract (max 300 words)**

12 Transboundary health partnerships are shaped by global inequities. Voices from “global South”
13 research partners are critical to understand and redress power asymmetries in research partnerships.
14 We undertook research with Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine (LSTM) partners to inform LSTM’s
15 equitable partnership strategy and co-develop principles for equitable partnerships.

16 We applied mixed methods and participatory approaches. An online survey (n=21) was conducted
17 with transboundary partners on fairness of opportunity, fair process, and fair sharing of benefits in
18 partnership with LSTM-Liverpool. We triangulated the survey with key informant interviews (n=12).
19 Qualitative narratives were coded and analysed using the thematic framework approach. These findings
20 were presented in a participatory workshop with transboundary partners to co-develop principles for
21 equitable partnership, which were then refined and validated.

22 Transboundary partners identified being involved in agenda setting from the outset, shaping the
23 design of research projects and theories of change as mechanisms to support fair opportunity
24 however, funding mechanisms that shape power structures was reported as limiting fair
25 opportunities. Fair process was supported by multi-directional, long-term collaborations with
26 opportunities for capacity strengthening. Participants raised concerns about funder requirements and
27 outdated language in contracting process that hindered equity. Fair benefit sharing was facilitated by
28 early discussions on authorship to promote equity and policy influence. Funding also influenced the
29 ability to travel and network, important for benefit sharing and fair opportunity. High paywalls limit
30 sharing of research findings and access to research findings for many “global-South” partners.

31 The co-developed principles are part of ongoing reflections and dialogue to improve and undo harmful
32 power structures that perpetuate coloniality within global health. While this process was conducted
33 with LSTM-Liverpool partners, the principles to strengthen equity are applicable to other institutions
34 engaged in transboundary research partnerships and relevant for funders.

35

36 Keywords: Decolonisation, equitable partnerships, global health research, trans-boundary partnership

37

38

39 **Introduction**

40 **How colonisation has shaped research partnerships in Global Health**

41 Transboundary partnerships in global health are inherently complex and shaped by global inequities.
42 These inequities are often reflected within research partnership due to the imbalance of economic
43 and academic resources, which disproportionately advantage those working in higher income
44 settings (1-4). Inequities in partnerships are rooted in socio-political and historical structures of
45 inequity and colonialism, but are maintained by the current ‘status quo’ in global health research
46 structures and funding streams. Global Health funding predominantly comes from high income
47 countries (HIC) and partners in the global north are often the lead grant recipients (3). As such,
48 Northern partners may hold power over research conducted in, and for, Low- and middle-income
49 countries (LMICs) - the global South. Literature shows how the allocation of funding can contribute
50 to unequal decision-making and division of labour (5-7). Northern researchers therefore often have
51 more opportunities to shape research and provide intellectual inputs, and at worst appropriate local
52 data. Khan *et al.* write that global health organisations may “*perpetuate the power imbalances they*
53 *claim to rectify through colonial and extractive attitudes, and policies and practices that concentrate*
54 *resources, expertise, data and branding within high-income country (HIC) institutions.*” (8)(p.1).

55 Global health is burdened with the weight of its colonial roots and recognising that language has the
56 power to harm and reinforce systemic injustice and perpetuate a false hierarchy, semantics hold
57 weight and require critical reflection and adaptability (9, 10). In this paper, we mainly use the term
58 transboundary research, but also global North and global South, when we wish to discuss the
59 location of researchers. We discuss our rationale and choice of language further in our findings. We
60 also acknowledge that “Tropical Medicine” is another homogenizing and problematic term (11).

61

62 **Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine (LSTM): Looking backwards and looking forward**

63 2023 marks 125 years of Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine (LSTM), the oldest school of Tropical
64 Medicine in the world created after an appeal from Joseph Chamberlain, Secretary of State for the
65 colonies to address “mortality and morbidity arising from endemic ‘tropical diseases’” (12). The
66 intention was both to advance teaching and research on tropical medicine in Britain, and arguably,
67 to facilitate political and economic exploitation by Western powers and expand European colonial

68 empires (12, 13) (14) (15) (16). As argued by Burgess (2022), we need research, and researchers, to
69 acknowledge how the past governs and shapes our efforts to change health (17). Thus, this
70 landmark calls for a critical and collective reflection of an organisation rooted in colonial and tropical
71 medicine. Staff in institutions such as LSTM- Liverpool, must critically reflect on, and acknowledge
72 how its history shapes inequalities today, to disrupt current knowledge asymmetries, through
73 sharing relative power, examining working practices and learning about what matters to partners in
74 working relationships. LSTM - Liverpool is currently engaged with transboundary partners through:
75 established research and education collaborations, involvement in organisation development,
76 having staff embedded in overseas organisations and overseas LSTM offices and is committed to
77 fostering equitable global partnerships in research, education and organisational development.

78 **The future for research partnerships in global health**


79 There is now no debating the need for change within the discipline of global health (17). There are
80 calls to level the research playing field for research and promote epistemic diversity by ‘aligning the
81 positionality and the gaze of global health funding models’, enhancing representation of researchers
82 from LMIC settings through diverse research teams and overhauling editorial structures that restrict
83 access to knowledge and privilege high-impact journals in the global North (3, 18, 19). Change
84 involves the dismantling of deeply entrenched power structures and is no small task as power
85 manifests itself in a myriad of intersecting ways. As Burgess and Weick write, social change can
86 happen by ‘small wins’ - tangible acts that add up to more than the sum of their parts (17, 20). One
87 ‘small win’ is the promotion of equitable partnerships; when transboundary partnerships prioritise
88 research needs from the global South, and embed research capacity development within partnership
89 aims, those with fewer resources benefit from such collaboration (21). Despite the recent explosion
90 in guidelines for partnerships that speak to efforts being made at an operational level to work
91 towards equity, Southern authors perspectives are often missing (2, 22) 21, 22). Voller *et al.* note
92 that Southern stakeholders “*continue to be under-represented in guideline development*” and found
93 only two guidelines out of 22 identified documents were developed predominantly or exclusively
94 drawing on Southern stakeholders as participants (23, 24). This perpetuates colonial structures of
95 knowledge generation and demands attention. As Audre Lorde famously wrote ‘*the master’s tools*
96 *will never dismantle the master’s house*’ (25) - a powerful metaphor which has been recently applied
97 to decolonising global health (26).

98 Aligned with efforts to decolonise and reflect on the global health climate we aimed to co-create
99 institutional guidance with transboundary partners to promote mutual learning, inform practice of
100 equitable partnerships and co-develop a set of principles for equitable partnerships to support
101 accountability and promote trust. While the exercise was conducted with LSTM-Liverpool's partners
102 to hear their perspectives and co-create principles to strengthen equity they are also applicable for
103 other institutions, research partnerships, and development partners/funders working towards
104 equitable partnerships.

105

106 **Methods**

107 We used mixed methods and participatory research approaches to co-create knowledge, principles
108 and encourage critical reflection and dialogue on our findings throughout the research process. Data
109 collection took place from October 2021 to November 2022 and engaged individual respondents
110 from 20 partner organisations, across 15 different country contexts in Africa, Asia and the Middle
111 East. We employed several methods in succession (Figure 1). These individual methods were
112 designed to feed into one another and helped to triangulate findings across multiple methods and
113 perspectives, over a period of six months. These steps are described in more detail below.



115 **Figure 1: Equitable Partnerships study process** – demonstrates how each consecutive stage of
116 process informed the following stage

117 **Step one:** We developed an online survey questionnaire for use with transboundary partner
118 organisations to seek anonymous responses. The aim was to elicit an understanding of what LSTM and
119 partners do well and where LSTM and partners have gaps in equitable engagement. The survey was
120 based on, and adapted, questions from the three domains listed in the Research Fairness Initiative's
121 (RFI) reporting guide (27). The guide seeks to improve the fairness, efficiency and impact of research
122 collaborations globally so it was an appropriate and standardised starting point. The domains are 1.
123 Fairness of opportunity (before research), 2. Fair process (during research) and 3. Fair Sharing of
124 Benefits, Costs & Outcomes (after research) (27). The questionnaire can be found in supplementary file
125 1 and includes Likert scale questions and free text.

126 *Recruitment:* Only organisations which have a pre-existing partnership with LSTM were approached.
127 A table of partner organisations was collaboratively developed across LSTM to ensure we captured a
128 range of partnerships – from multiple contexts, areas of focus, type of partnership (e.g teaching or
129 research) and length of engagement (long term engagement with LSTM vs short term /newer
130 partnerships).

131 An email introducing the study was initially sent from LSTM- Liverpool's Dean of Clinical Sciences and
132 International Public Health (BS) to senior leads at organisations that partner with LSTM (from a
133 range of geographical contexts) to gain their approval to participate in the study. If they wished to
134 participate they were invited to respond directly to RK or RS confirming approval to participate. RK
135 and RS then sent a survey link that they were asked to cascade within their organisation to capture
136 diversity. We had 21 responses, from eight organisations working across 11 country contexts. These
137 responses then informed the discussion guides for the Key informant interviews (KIIs).

138 **Step two:** Qualitative interviews were undertaken with purposively sampled key informants (n=12),
139 who were based in Africa and Asia, to gain diversity in organisations (long terms vs. short term
140 engagement with LSTM), gender, level of seniority and a range of geographical contexts. Interview
141 guides were co-developed by researchers from LVCT Health (Kenya) and LSTM (UK) and focused on
142 several areas relevant to partnerships such as research agenda setting, impact of the partnership on
143 global and local policies, funding structures, capacity development initiatives and language concepts.
144 Interviews triangulated findings from the survey and explored issues in more depth to understand

145 which ways of working currently serve to amplify partner’s perspectives and support equitable
146 engagement and whether partnerships with LSTM impact on the broader contexts we are working
147 in.

148 *Recruitment:* Survey respondents were asked to indicate if they/or another member of their team
149 would like to participate in a KII and we recruited some participants this way. Additionally, emails
150 were sent out to gauge interest to participate in interview from those who had not participated in
151 the survey but had indicated willingness to participate in the study. RS and RK conducted the
152 interviews virtually via Microsoft Teams or Zoom and informed consent was obtained. While authors
153 had access to identifiable information about participants due to the participatory nature of the
154 study, all data was anonymized after data collection.

155 **Step three:** We held a collaborative workshop in March 2022 with LSTM’s partners (n=11) to co-
156 develop a set of principles for LSTM partnership. Invitations to an online co-development workshop
157 were sent to all organisations who agreed to partake in the study, this meant we had some attendance
158 from people who were interviewed or participated in the survey but largely attendance was from
159 people who we had not previously spoken to providing diversity of respondents. The workshop
160 allowed us to disseminate interim study findings and begin the process of defining a set of principles
161 equitable engagement with transboundary partners. This was facilitated by external partners at
162 LVCT Health, Kenya (LO, RK) and staff who were not within senior LSTM management (RS, SC). Senior
163 LSTM colleagues (SBS, ST) joined at end of the session to affirm their commitment to the process
164 and give thanks for partners’ participation in the process.

165 *Recruitment:* A date, time and meeting invite was advertised via email to all organisations who had
166 indicated willingness to participate in the study.

167 **Step four – validation exercises:** An internal validation session at LSTM staff hybrid conference (n=173)
168 (included staff based in Liverpool and Kenya, Malawi, Nepal, Uganda and Zimbabwe) was held to
169 disseminate findings and draft principles. We collated inputs and comments via easyretro
170 (<https://easyretro.io/>) to inform principles and associated actions. We received 114 inputs which were
171 themed by two different analysts (SC and RS) and reviewed alongside the empirical data to inform our
172 analysis, but not included as empirical data.. We also undertook an external validation exercise via a
173 ‘world café’ approach at Health Systems Research (HSR) Conference, Bogota November 2022
174 (approximately 40 participants). This provided an opportunity to present the co-developed principles to

175 a wider audience to discuss and refine them. There was general consensus that the principles were
176 appropriate but questions were raised about accountability for principles, including processes and
177 resources for monitoring and learning, which we set out in the discussion. Finally, the amended co-
178 developed principles were shared with all study participants for final comments.

179

180 *Data Analysis*

181 Simple descriptive statistics were used to identify key trends in the survey data, and free text
182 questions from the survey were coded in NVivo version 12 (QSR International, Australia). Interviews
183 were transcribed verbatim and collated with free text responses from the survey. Data collected was
184 validated, organised and summarised according to themes. We used an inductive framework
185 approach, through sorting data with coding and followed by exploring and explaining links between
186 codes and themes (28) facilitated by NVivo 12. The participatory workshop with transboundary
187 partners (n=11) served as participant checking on the analysis as well as an opportunity for co-
188 creation of the principles. The LSTM Staff conference responses and easy retro inputs were reviewed
189 alongside the analytical process as an internal validation component that shaped our final principles.
190 The final principles were also externally validated by diverse health systems researchers and actors
191 at HSR, 2022. Three researchers with varying positionalities came together to validate coding
192 structures and summarise themes (RS, SC, RK).

193 *Ethical considerations*

194 This study received approval from the Research Ethics Committee at LSTM (21-060) in September
195 2021. Participant information sheets were provided, and written consent was obtained for all
196 workshop participants and for those who provided written responses.

197 *Positionality, power and engagement*

198 The survey allowed for anonymous responses to be gathered so participants could be critical. The
199 positionality of interviewers was also important to mitigate against this – interviews were either
200 conducted by LVCT Health staff (RK) – a Kenyan based organisation external to LSTM, or a previous
201 LSTM staff member (RS) who had not been part of senior management at LSTM and was
202 independent from LSTM at the time of interviews; both interviewers felt that they were able to build
203 rapport and have open and critical conversations. Further, a general positive perception respondents

204 held of working with LSTM may have facilitated critical discussion of the power imbalances within
205 global health research. We felt participants were comfortable to discuss the uncomfortable, which
206 was essential to have meaningful dialogue on this.

207

208

209 **Results**

210 We gathered responses from participants working across 20 different organisations and 15 different
 211 country contexts across the stages of the research process (table 1).

Method	Survey (n=21)	KIIs (n=12)	Participatory Workshop (n=11)
Organisations	N=8	N=12	N=10
Gender	Man (n=13) Woman (n=7) Other identity (n=1)	Man (n=9) Woman (n=3) Other identity (n=0)	Man (n=8) Woman (n=3) Other identity (n=0)
Nationality	North Africa (n=1) East Africa (n=6) West Africa (n=2) Southern Africa (n=1) South Asia (n=1) Middle East (n=0) Europe (n=1) Dual (n=1)	North Africa (n=0) East Africa (n=5) West Africa (n=2) Southern Africa (n=2) South Asia (n=3) Middle East (n=0) Europe (n=0) Dual (n=0)	North Africa (n=1) East Africa (n=4) West Africa (n=3) Southern Africa (n=1) South Asia (n=0) Middle East (n=1) Europe (n=0) Dual (n=0)
Organisations' involvement with LSTM	2-5 years (n=4) 5-10 years (n=11) 10-20 years (n=2) >20 years (n=1) Don't know (n=2)	2-5 years (n=1) 5-10 years (n=5) 10-20 years (n=5) >20 years	2-5 years (n=1) 5-10 years (n=4) 10-20 years (n=4) >20 years (n=2)
Total	N=22-41*		

212 **Table 1:** respondent characteristics across the three stages of the research process

213 * Given the survey was anonymous we do not know how much overlap there was between survey participants, key informants and
 214 workshop participants therefore we are providing a range of total participants.

215 Results are presented first by findings on language, then by thematic areas mapping to the domains
 216 from the RFI – fair opportunity (before research), fair process (during research) and fair benefit
 217 sharing (after research). We end with co-created principles and a discussion of how these were
 218 shaped. Under each theme, findings are integrated and triangulated across the survey, interviews
 219 and participatory workshop, including recommendations from partners where applicable.

220 **Language Terminology**

221 Overall, while there was a preference for the term ‘global south’ there was no clear consensus. One
222 participant emphasised that the language was not important as the different UN agencies and
223 multilaterals all have different mechanisms by which they categorise and label countries, so it is
224 difficult to achieve consensus on categorisation even within terms. Categorising countries by their
225 geographical location, or economic status in either way was viewed to be inaccurate, but inaccurate
226 geography was viewed more favourably. The term majority world was also offered as an alternative
227 in the workshop.

228 *‘Again, I think the LMICs for me is not is not palatable... it’s just a label...it’s not realistic. [We] might*
229 *be a poor nation, but now we have got millionaires...’* (KII – senior, man, Southern Africa)

230 **Fair opportunity - Funding streams**

231 While the majority of survey respondents (17 out of 21) agreed that the partnership with LSTM
232 attempts to ensure that research funder demands do not cause unfairness in partnership, three
233 respondents disagreed. This may be reflective of the funding structures that give LSTM more power
234 within the partnership that emerged in KIIs. Partners reported that most projects in the partnerships
235 were funded from sources within the UK. This was described as shaping the power dynamics in the
236 partnership, mainly attributed to LSTM’s interaction with funders, and should be an area of
237 reflection:

238 *‘[LSTM] are the ones who deal with the donors, because that’s just how our funding is arranged. So,*
239 *there will always be more power for the people at LSTM, in terms of taking charge of the project...*
240 *And all the projects that we’ve done, they have always been prime’* (KII – Senior, Man, Southern
241 Africa)

242 Budget allocations were described as being discussed collaboratively and transparently. Partners
243 reported LSTM supported with financial management capacity, technical and liaison support when
244 engaging with funders. All partners were affected by the UK’s 2021 Overseas Development
245 Assistance (ODA) funding cuts following COVID-19. Partners reported having open and transparent
246 discussion on how to work with limited funds after the 2021 funding cuts and reported positive
247 outcomes of LSTM Principal Investigators (PIs) negotiating down the size of the cuts. Unsurprisingly,
248 funding structures that rely on Northern funded research were described as stifling global equity;
249 domestic research budgets were described as being critical to equity:

250 *'...So, in terms of decision making, the global south has been included in decision making in many*
251 *ways. But we might be disadvantaged, or we might not reach the absolute end of equity, if we are*
252 *not financially independent. So, I think that if we really want to maintain independence, then*
253 *countries in the Global South should begin to think of how they can generate research funding from*
254 *within... So, I think in terms of resource capacity, that is one area that might likely stifle global*
255 *equity.'* (KII- Senior, Man, East Africa)

256 It was suggested that LSTM can play a role in facilitating dialogue between UK funders and LMIC
257 partners to foster transparency and build the capacities of both funders to understand contextual
258 realities in the global south, and of partners in understanding funding mechanisms. Further, through
259 our participatory workshop, it was highlighted that the space to bring together different partners
260 who do not normally come together was valuable and something LSTM-Liverpool could continue to
261 facilitate to support fair opportunity.

262 ***Fair opportunity - Agenda setting***

263 Agenda setting between LSTM-Liverpool and partners was often described as being defined mutually
264 and often a participatory process, particularly when physically together. Proposal writing workshops
265 and early engagement with partners was seen to help implementation and sustainability. Partners
266 mentioned being involved early in the partnership(s) and able to input into the aims, objectives,
267 methods for the partnership proposal and co-develop the Theory of Change within contextual
268 realities.

269 *LSTM is really good at ensuring that its partners are engaged as early possible on any opportunity*
270 *that arises. This has led to not only smooth implementation of the project (s), but implementing very*
271 *successful projects and partnerships where each partner is satisfied and even wishing for more.*
272 (Survey respondent, man, Southern Africa)

273 Agenda setting was also mentioned as being defined by the funding call and the global funding
274 architecture, which is predicated on global power dynamics. Ensuring this power dynamic is then not
275 replicated within the partnership itself was highlighted by one participant.

276 *'Somehow our partnership is also influenced by the global agenda setting process... our partners in*
277 *higher income countries who dominate in the selling process. However, I'm not blaming, but that has*
278 *some kind of synergies or linkages between the partnership of two institutions like [organisation] and*

279 *LSTM team. However, understanding of the global agenda setting process, not repeating the*
280 *weaknesses of that process, while agenda setting between two partners is very, very important...*
281 *open communication really that's the first thing ...and not dominating the discussion is very*
282 *important.'* (KII-Senior, Man, Southern Asia)

283 *Uh, and I think that's driven to a large extent by the fact that high income countries are putting in*
284 *more money and therefore they are answerable to their parliaments and not [our] parliament. I don't*
285 *think we will get into a situation where that is completely balanced out. I'm not even sure that it*
286 *needs to be completely balanced out.'* (KII- Senior, Man, East Africa)

287 Agenda setting in response to local needs was reported to be a balance of country priorities and
288 funder influences. It was noted that the UK funding landscape is shifting to allow a broader focus
289 which gives more space to align with country priorities. Long term engagement and familiarity with
290 contexts means that partners are able to respond to local needs in priority setting. One participant
291 who had a longer term engagement with LSTM also noted that the response to local priorities had
292 been given more weight in recent years, whereas historically LSTM's priorities had been dominant.
293 Despite funding streams generally flowing from North to South, there were examples where
294 Southern organisations were the consortium lead and funding recipient.

295 *'We do the agenda jointly. I mean, [consortium name] is leading the research uptake, the expectation*
296 *from the team is that Africa leads that program, leads the consortium, but, leading doesn't mean*
297 *that you determining everything, you basically co-create within the consortium. But we lead those*
298 *components, and so the agenda is set by the consortium itself.'* (KII-Senior, man, East Africa)

299 Space for innovation within protocol and grant writing was described as a current gap as many
300 partnerships are focused on executing research via traditional methods. This raises the question of
301 what spaces can be created for co-production and co-creation through prioritising local knowledge.

302

303 **Fair process - Collaboration with LSTM - Liverpool**

304 Collaboration between partners and LSTM-Liverpool took different forms, namely research, capacity
305 strengthening, teaching, research uptake, advocacy and publication. Length of engagement and
306 physical proximity were noted to influence the collaboration. One respondent noted the benefit of
307 LSTM-Liverpool having a physical in-country presence when collaborating, as opposed to only

308 attending for meetings. Physical separation was reported to negatively impact collaboration as
309 institutions are perceived to not “*walk the talk*” (KII- Senior, man, Southern Africa). The importance
310 of being physically together, through university faculty exchanges, was also stated as a way to
311 strengthen the partnership, but it was emphasised that this should be a two-way process.

312 The personality of PIs from LSTM-Liverpool were also influential on the nature of the collaboration.
313 Some PIs were mentioned for their excellence and commitment to equity in partnerships, which
314 influenced a valued, personal relationship with LSTM projects. How much this is reflective of a
315 culture of fairness within LSTM-Liverpool is unknown. Multi-directionality was also stated to be an
316 important factor in the nature of the collaboration.

317 *What I like about [consortium] what's been good, we had [name of PIs] and [PI name]'s approach is*
318 *very different... So you know, in some cases,there is engagement, you do great research, but*
319 *there isn't that feeling of you're part of a community. But with [consortium] I feel like we're part of a*
320 *community ... (KII - senior, woman, South Asia)*

321 *Actually, we have a rotating chair, I think way different partners take charge in chairing the*
322 *management meeting. This shows that there are efforts to make sure that partners especially in the*
323 *south involvement in the project. (KII-ECR, man East Africa)*

324 General decision making within partnerships was described by the majority of participants as fair
325 and respectful. Nevertheless, two survey respondents felt power dynamics that influence decision
326 making, are not always explicitly discussed and roles are not always clearly defined. Developing
327 organograms and advocating for rotating chairs in meetings emerged from KIIs as valuable to
328 understand who will lead what and share power at the outset.

329 It was also noted that LSTM-Liverpool has played a role in establishing transboundary organisations.
330 While LSTM-Liverpool’s supportive role was acknowledged, the analogy of LSTM-Liverpool as a
331 parent and the partner’s organisation as the child was used to describe the relationship, suggesting a
332 paternalistic collaboration with links to a colonial past. The analogy was also used to state the need
333 for independence, suggesting how although partnerships, capacities and relationships evolve
334 through time, power dynamics can be more entrenched.

335 *“I think [of LSTM] as our parent, we take ourselves as, as the brainchild of the LSTM... over the years,*
336 *we've seen LSTM supporting staff from [partner name] with education opportunities, master's*

337 *degrees, PhDs and I happen to be one of those are beneficiaries of this partnership... So they've seen*
338 *us through thick and thin. And that's why I use the term - like a baby, LSTM as a parent...What LSTM*
339 *is trying to achieve should actually also be seen in practice...you know, there reaches a point whereby*
340 *a child is grown and wants to walk alone. And I know that's very hard for the parent to let go. But*
341 *sometimes you do have to let go and just watch from afar. So maybe that's where LSTM and*
342 *[organization] are.” (KII- senior, man, Southern Africa).*

343 To support equity in fair process a suggestion was to leverage virtual mediums for knowledge
344 exchange and networking to expand and develop collaborations, as these can enhance equity as
345 costly travel and visa complications are avoided.

346 **Fair benefit sharing - Capacity strengthening**

347 Capacity strengthening was seen as a strength of LSTM-Liverpool’s engagement. It occurred
348 intentionally and evolved naturally by nature of the partnership. There was value placed on data
349 sharing and post research agenda, documentation, new methods and communication of research.
350 Project length was described as an important factor in influencing the success of capacity
351 strengthening initiatives, with longer projects e.g. 5 years, allowing space for individual capacities to
352 be enhanced.

353 *‘...projects that are two years you just getting into the momentum. And then it's like see you later,*
354 *goodbye, wrap up... But is that when you have a longer term project, I mean, colleagues come and*
355 *go, but the few that you can see them grow in terms of their skills. And I think that's very good.’ (KII -*
356 *senior, woman, South Asia)*

357 Capacity strengthening was mostly focused on an individual level particularly from LMICs, with MScs,
358 PhDs and post-docs being highlighted as particularly beneficial for mid-career researchers. Careful
359 attention however needs to be paid to the distribution of academic opportunities within consortium
360 partnerships to support equity:

361 *Training needs to be equally considered in participating countries for example all PhD opportunities*
362 *went to two countries while we had more several participating countries. A selection criteria need to*
363 *be purposeful as every country needs to strengthen research capacity (Survey respondent, East*
364 *Africa)*

365 It was also noted that projects with a transparent and horizontal hierarchy structure have benefits to
366 individual capacity strengthening – particularly for early and mid-career researchers. Individual
367 capacity strengthening has also evolved from community engagement - ‘unlearning academia’ -
368 these projects were reported to develop skills in blog writing, photo narrative writing and podcasts.

369 *Capacity strengthening has really been at its best since we started collaborating with LSTM. We*
370 *have our capacity building in different areas relating to research, to communication, to research*
371 *methods, ... it has been a wide range of opportunities for capacity building and it has really enhanced*
372 *our work, even in different projects that are not related...’ (KII- ECR, man, West Africa)*

373 Funding for institutional capacity building was identified as an unmet need but was reported as
374 critical for establishing credibility for organisations. One positive example was mentioned whereby
375 staff were sent to do secondments at LSTM-Liverpool and returned to build up institutional capacity
376 at home. Critically however, it was noted that this should be multi-directional.

377

378 While some participants mentioned improvements in budgeting and financial management as a
379 result of the partnership, many partners mentioned the need for capacity strengthening of financial
380 management systems, research and management capacity as well as publication for high impact
381 journals. Survey results suggested that there are gaps in the provision of resources for capacity
382 strengthening of project staff and it was also acknowledged that administrative and project
383 management staff are often overlooked. This is a critical area for consideration as one participant
384 emphasized the need to acknowledge transboundary partner institutional and contextual limitations
385 which may impede on their opportunities to lead partnerships and deliver to specific templates for
386 reporting.

387

388 *‘We are an organization established and evolving and struggling in developing world with lots of*
389 *limitations ... resource limitation, limitation in terms of capacity, limitation in terms of the*
390 *institutional component where you require investing quite a lot in terms of building institution, not*
391 *necessarily that is up to the standard of the LSTM institution But using a standard global*
392 *templates that are the template for all one size fit for all, while setting the standards from the LSTM*
393 *side... that presents limitation to organisations like us, we are not as big as LSTM, but big does not*
394 *mean that it should dominate the standards...I think it's important that there is a rigid trust built in*
395 *both end in terms of managing a project under this partisan framework. And understandably, it takes*

396 *time to build that trust... in order to develop trust both end by knowing the institutional practice....'*
397 (KII Senior, Man, South Asia)

398

399 Recommendations included completing a competency assessment to establish capacity
400 strengthening needs in research partnerships and to onboard all partners with established and clear
401 templates for planning, budgeting and reporting. One participant suggested that LSTM-Liverpool
402 could support partners with access to academic and online training courses currently available only
403 to LSTM-Liverpool staff and students e.g. in safeguarding, and access to libraries. It was also
404 emphasised a focus on strengthening capacity of partners to innovate and think outside of the
405 traditional research process would be beneficial.

406 *So I think it's the capacity to understand where innovations can be...there are small things such as*
407 *theory of change, etc. These are things which are not normal in our traditional medical research. So*
408 *it's something we're also taking on board, it's more of a global health issue, public health. So these*
409 *are things we're learning as we move along. So.., the UK may be way ahead of us, but we're learning*
410 *so even when we write proposals, we always gain knowledge. They understand how things work on*
411 *the ground, what the problems are, but we also gain that understanding of how to write certain*
412 *proposals. (KII – senior, woman, East Africa)*

413

414 **Fair benefit sharing - Impacts and outputs**

415 Research uptake at the local and national level is reported to be led by partners, whereas LSTM-
416 Liverpool was reported to facilitate at global level - including publications. The focus on LSTM's
417 impact at the global level reinforces broader power relations in knowledge generation within global
418 health and does need to be re-evaluated in order to support equitable partnerships. Nonetheless,
419 impacts of projects were described as having a major contribution to the policy dialogue and
420 partners' strong relations with the Ministries of Health were stated to be valuable in raising visibility

421 through international consortia. One partner also stated their existing strong relationships with
422 policy makers at national and local level should not be undervalued in creating policy change.

423 Another spoke to how the strengths of each institution come together for impact:

424 *'our strength lies with actually the understanding of the context...In terms of the problems and the*
425 *gaps and how to be able to address them...You have good ideas, but good ideas if it's not funded, it*
426 *will just remain good ideas* (KII - senior, man, West Africa)

427 Authorship with LSTM-Liverpool was described as fair and equitable and commendable. Good
428 practice involved early discussions on equitable authorship, a commitment to follow journal
429 protocols and guidelines and utilising opportunities for joint first and last authorship positions. It was
430 noted that the publication process is usually led by LSTM-Liverpool and northern partners, and that
431 this is also shaped by funding, limiting equitable access to publishing. *"To be honest, I can't afford*
432 *\$5000 to publish in maybe in BMJ or so"* (KII -Senior, man, West Africa). It was felt generally,
433 academics put more focus on outputs and publications while non-academic partners understand the
434 local context and influence policy in different ways other than publication, but this is not always
435 considered as being of equal value.

436 A critical area of concern however, with regards to impact and uptake is insensitive and outdated
437 legal language in contracts with LSTM-Liverpool – which often state that data is owned by LSTM-
438 Liverpool. This was described as promoting lack of ownership, and limits opportunities for Southern
439 led authorship and demands urgent attention across Northern institutions.

440 *'Legal language in contract that data is owned by LSTM, data should be owned by researchers with*
441 *right to publish. Promotes lack of ownership.'* Survey respondent, Woman, East Africa

442 This highlights the need for data sharing agreements to be put in place which give LMIC partners the
443 power and rights to their own data and grant LSTM access to support in dissemination and power
444 sharing. Further suggestions to increase equity in fair benefit sharing was for LSTM-Liverpool to
445 leverage their position to increase power of Southern partners by introducing and nominating
446 partners to be involved in international forums such as technical working groups or conferences, or
447 by promoting LMIC partners in publications. Additionally, considering opportunities for publishing
448 other outputs such as blogs and policy briefs alongside traditional journal articles.

449

450 **Co-developed principles for equitable partnership**

451 The values that survey and interview participants identified as critical to equitable partnerships are
452 depicted in Fig.2. The majority of respondents agreed that their partnerships with LSTM-Liverpool
453 matched these values. LSTM-Liverpool was regarded as doing well in equitable partnerships through
454 early collaboration and engagement, support for staff, honest and transparent processes and a focus
455 on co-leadership.

456



457

458 **Figure 2.** Synthesis of values of equitable partnerships from KIIs and survey findings, presented in
459 participatory workshop with partners, which informed the draft principles.

460 These values were then shaped into draft principles by (RS, RK, SC) to present in the participatory
461 workshop for discussion and input. Partners within the workshop further edited and refined the
462 draft principles. Key edits pertained to capacity strengthening being multi-directional (principle 6),
463 and the inclusion of values of the Global Code of Conduct (principle 7). These principles were then
464 shared again via email and further refined. Final principles are shown in Box 1.

465 Many partners suggested that equity could be evaluated against agreed parameters, through follow
466 up interviews over time as well recorded documents, regular feedback and record project evaluation
467 from both sides and that accountability mechanisms for voicing concerns exist, through open
468 communication (particularly when partnerships have been built over the years); regular

469 management meetings, safeguarding protocols and working groups were described as forums where
470 partners felt they could voice concerns formally or informally. It is important to note however, that
471 this was stated by respondents who work at senior levels.

472

473 ***Box 1: The co-developed principles for equitable partnership***

Co-Developed Principles for Equitable Partnership

1. Opportunity for all partners to input into research design, agenda setting and lead in development of outputs to ensure it reflects the priorities and needs agreed by all partners.
2. Transparency to guide all stages of the partnership from agenda setting, budgeting, data ownership, authorship, training and education.
3. Recognition that relevance is key to shaping agendas and conducting research that is appropriate and impactful in research settings.
4. Acknowledgement that professional development at all levels/cadres requires mutual, multi-directional capacity strengthening and exchange based on development needs assessed and identified by all partners at the outset.
5. Commitment to deliberate and strategic promotion of leadership of LMIC partners (where appropriate) in collaborations with LSTM (e.g., grants, capacity strengthening).
6. Commitment and adherence to a multi-centric model of partnership – not necessarily LSTM-Liverpool at centre, no centralized power, shared responsibilities.
7. Commitment to the four values of the Global Code of Conduct within all collaborations: Fairness, Respect, Care, Honesty and pay attention to institutional values.

475

476 **DISCUSSION**

477 This study is the first-time LSTM-Liverpool's partners have been actively engaged to co-develop
478 institutional principles to support meaningful and equitable engagement. It seeks to centre Southern
479 perspectives in progressing equitable partnerships and dismantling the 'master's house' of global
480 health.

481 ***Our findings***

482 We found that research partnerships with LSTM were overall, viewed positively, and equitably. With
483 regards to fair opportunity there were positive accounts of partners being involved in agenda setting
484 from the outset able to shape and input into the design of research projects and adapt theories of
485 change to their contexts. Fair process revealed that the collaborations were viewed as multi-
486 directional, positive and personal. Causes for concern around funder requirements creating
487 unfairness within the partnership and outdated language in contracting and partnerships not
488 supporting equity were also raised in the anonymous survey responses and require further
489 exploration. There was an emphasis on capacity strengthening in LSTM-Liverpool's partnerships that
490 was valued by partners, though it was highlighted this needs to be extended to research support
491 staff. Finally, fair benefit sharing revealed equitable processes around authorship supported by
492 upfront discussions and policy influence. The interlinkages between the three domains, and how
493 they are situated within broader political economy of research partnerships also clearly emerged in
494 our findings. For example, funding structures underpin power structures that dictate fair
495 opportunities, both in research grants and shaping the research agenda. Funding also influenced
496 ability to travel, network and share findings. This was important for both fair benefit sharing but also
497 fair opportunity as it was reported many collaborations with LSTM-Liverpool started through
498 networking at conferences internationally. Funding also influenced fair benefit sharing as high
499 paywalls limit both sharing of research findings and access to research findings for many Southern
500 institutions.

501 Additionally, findings from some KIIs had clear links to a colonial past, for example the language of
502 LSTM being the parent, speaks to paternalistic collaborations which Okeke has dubbed 'the little
503 brother effect' and requires LSTM-Liverpool staff, as well as staff in other northern institutions, to be
504 critically reflexive on their well-meaning role as 'older brother' (29). Colonial assumptions about

505 knowledge superiority were also discussed where partners described how capacity strengthening
506 opportunities usually flowed from north to south. Southern staff would go to do secondments at
507 LSTM-Liverpool and other northern institutions, but it was less expected that northern staff would
508 come to learn at Southern institutions. This highlights the importance of the multi-directional
509 capacity strengthening and exchange initiatives for equitable partnerships, which was stressed and is
510 reflected in co-constructed principles (for example, principles 4-6) (30). There was also debate
511 around accepted terminology for geographical and political areas. What is clear however, is that
512 efforts to homogenise large swathes of geographies into clear and widely accepted terminologies
513 fails to capture the nuances and the varying facets that characterise privilege and disadvantage in
514 those settings. Instead, we should embrace ‘pluriversality’ and stop trying to reach consensus, which
515 it has been argued is required for decolonization (31). It is worth bearing in mind however, that
516 language is not the sole issue, rather we need to think critically about the multiple power
517 relationships that language represents and tailoring language may be appropriate (32) (10). The
518 process of engaging in reflection, dialogue and debate is one of the ‘small wins’ we can make on the
519 journey towards changing existing power dynamics (9, 20).

520 ***Principles***

521 We co-developed seven actionable principles to guide equitable research collaborations and
522 validated these with different audiences (See Box 1). The process taken to arrive at the final
523 principles presented here took various methods and iterative consulting (figure 1). These principles
524 reflect some of the key issues/areas that are centre stage in other definitions or approaches (for
525 example there are some similarities in the UKCDR definition with a focus on mutual participation,
526 mutual trust and respect, mutual benefit and equal value placed on each partners contribution at all
527 stages of the research process). The process itself was also of value, where LSTM-Liverpool and
528 partners took time to deliberately reflect and define the partnership, a process that should be
529 maintained regularly. Partners also noted the value in being brought together to share ideas outside
530 of the confines of existing research partnerships, a process that it was suggested LSTM-Liverpool
531 continue to facilitate.

532 It is important to note that these principles must not be viewed as operating in a vacuum. We, as
533 researchers need to engage with the research eco-system that shapes the partnership, creating
534 space for mutual learning and adapt to changes in the external context (23). For example,
535 partnerships are influenced by the changing global funding architecture; the recent climate of UK

536 Overseas Development Aid (ODA) funding cuts amidst a global pandemic, brought unexpected
537 budget cuts and additional challenges to transboundary research as highlighted by respondents and
538 in recent literature on research partnerships (33). Individual and institutional action is critical but
539 also needs to be part of a wider process of change within the broader political and funding
540 ecosystems that shape and underpin research partnerships through funding infrastructure (donors)
541 and knowledge dissemination avenues (journals). Indeed, Voller *et al* (2022) notes how guidelines
542 may not always fully acknowledge the structural barriers and competing interests that get in the way
543 of these changes being realised (2).

544

545 ***What the implications of our findings – for LSTM-Liverpool and partners; and for broader research***
546 ***infrastructure***

547 *Role of funders and the future of funding*

548 The funding structures in research, that typically flow from north to south was lamented by our
549 respondents as inhibiting equitable partnerships more generally. This speaks to the need for political
550 change and for the funders to engage with, and embrace, the complexity of equitable research
551 partnerships and for funders to embrace contextually specific research to advance health systems
552 research. This requires a shift from Eurocentric modalities of research funding to support Southern
553 led research and encourage co-production approaches with populations in these settings, which is
554 occurring (34). Some funders are now funding LMIC institutions directly, as well as setting up
555 development funds to foster and enable partnership working in the grant development process (e.g.
556 NIHR, UKCDR) which is to be applauded. However, funders need to pay critical attention to ensuring
557 that funding provision is equitable and that by funding Southern institutions directly, they do not
558 leave them worse off by imposing excessive rules, regulations and costs that the organisations may
559 not be able to bear. As highlighted by respondents, institutional capacity is not always as strong as
560 large academic institutions and as such there needs to be flexibility in reporting requirements. Funds
561 for embedded operational capacity strengthening and ongoing work into distilling learnings on

562 equitable partnership are also critical – these must be co-created with Southern institutions, so it
563 has value for them and not just based on the funders needs.

564 As described by one of our respondents, investment into locally led research is also critical. Domestic
565 sources of funding for research is critical to mitigate against power imbalances in global health
566 research and should be what we strive for. The political climate of many northern countries may
567 even force this – recent UK ODA funding cuts were a source of concern for many partners we spoke
568 with and risked undermining relationships with UK institutions. Further, the UK and Italy were
569 notably absent from commitments to the Global Fund in September, 2022 who missed their
570 replenishment targets (35). Despite their absence, many Southern countries did pledge, some such
571 as Malawi, for the first time, which speaks to a shift towards who is funding global health with
572 implications for equity.

573 *Knowledge generation and dissemination: Role of journals, conferences and beyond*

574 Knowledge systems in research and academia need critical review. There is a growing body of work
575 on research equity, authorship, and the role of academic journals in the context of international
576 health research partnerships - see for example the "Consensus statement on measures to promote
577 equitable authorship in research publication from international research partnerships" (36) . A
578 number of journals (for example Health Policy and Planning) are now including reflexivity
579 statements, which require author teams to critically reflect on roles and responsibilities and
580 demonstrate inclusivity by regional location. Equity in authorship and in access to papers has also
581 been a key theme in recent conferences (37). Hosting conferences and forums virtually, or in hybrid
582 form, may also confer a benefit in terms of equity of participation when compared to in person
583 meetings that may be expensive and include visa complications (passport privileges emerging as an
584 important area for consideration). Practical suggestions to support equity from our findings were

585 having authorship discussions up front, and making use of joint first and last author positions, as we
586 have done in this paper. Transparency and trusting relationships between partners is therefore
587 critical to facilitate these potentially uncomfortable discussions.

588 Inequities in knowledge dissemination and sharing remain, our research participants highlighted
589 barriers in accessing resources to publish, and challenges in accessing resources which are not open
590 access. There also inequities in who publishes: a recent review of papers reporting research trials
591 from the global South showed from 1990-2013 papers with a first author from a LMIC increased 2.8
592 times while papers with a first author from high-income countries increased 11.8 (38, 39). To date,
593 knowledge generation has favoured those in the north over the south (38). This is maintained by the
594 so called 'international' reputable academic journals such as The Lancet or BMJ that are often
595 headquartered in the global north, as raised in our external validation exercise (36). We should strive
596 towards knowledge that is created and published within the global South as a valuable pathway for
597 Southern led and globally disseminated knowledge. It was also highlighted how equal value should
598 be given to understanding the context and policy space as well as academic publications, speaking to
599 the need for structural change in how we value knowledge in global health.

600

601 *What are the implications for LSTM and next steps?*

602 On the nature of collaboration, the measure of an equitable partnership was sometimes measured
603 by the merits and approach of individual PIs rather than as the institution as a whole. A key point
604 that emerged from the respective discussions is how will the principles be rolled out and assessed?
605 Whose responsibility is it to review adherence to the guidelines and document learning to guide
606 future work? LSTM's next steps involve fostering a culture among all staff (legal, financial,
607 administration, researchers, lecturers etc) that supports and values approaches to supporting

608 equitable partnerships. This will require relative power sharing, both in terms of securing funding
609 but also in promotion of Southern colleagues for benefit sharing where appropriate. It may also
610 entail ongoing review at annual staff meetings; consideration of the principles within the research
611 proposal submission system, processes of ethics, safeguarding and research integrity and
612 governance; an overhaul of outdated contracts (40), changes and trust in the way intellectual
613 property and data is handled with partners, establishing multi-directional structured mentorship
614 streams, re-evaluating academic currency and promotion criteria to value the soft skills of
615 partnerships as well as the measurable outputs from it (5) and critically, requires the will and the
616 drive to do it. Further, LSTM and academic institutions may wish to think about who has access to
617 short courses and resources – whether this is limited to current students, or extended to alumni and
618 transboundary partners. It will also be crucial for staff in LSTM-Liverpool to critically reflect on their
619 own positionality and how to embed transformative learning in curricula to sensitise upcoming
620 generations of staff, and build fair and transparent processes that acknowledge different people’s
621 multiple roles and responsibilities.

622 The principles that were co-created cannot be another set of principles that sit in an academic
623 archive. These have to be lived by LSTM staff and partners, and can hopefully be leveraged by
624 partners to use in external relationships too. In order to ensure they do not simply become a ‘tick
625 box exercise’ it is critical to have accountability mechanisms in place. During the participatory
626 workshop it was suggested by participants that further discussion amongst groups about how
627 partnership with LSTM would be useful, on an annual basis, possibly in a partnership council; with a
628 convenor and a rotating chair. This possibility and funding for it will be further explored and could
629 provide an opportunity to reflect and critically discuss the application of the principles and
630 document learning. These principles are also intended to act as a means for accountability. They
631 should be agreed upon at the beginning of partnerships and reviewed throughout. We also

632 encourage other institutions to engage in a similar reflective process with partners. Acknowledging
633 the burden on time of partners, we also welcome use of these principles for adaptation.

634

635 **Limitations of our approach**

636 Though we began the critical process of engaging with partners to co-develop principles for
637 equitable partnerships, there were some limitations to our approach. Firstly, we sampled from our
638 own partners which may have introduced some bias as partners generally felt positive about the
639 relationship. Though we sought to recruit diversity in partners, it is likely that those who had a
640 positive view of LSTM opted into the study more so than those who felt indifferently, or negatively.
641 Given recruitment processes were initiated through LSTM, participants may have felt they needed to
642 respond positively about the institution, we aimed to mitigate this through interview being
643 undertaken by LVCT Health (RK) and ex-LSTM (RS) employees. We also mostly recruited partners
644 who had a senior role within their organisations for the KIIs and the workshop. Although we
645 intended to engage partners from a range of career stages, the ethical approval process to conduct
646 the study required the approval of the organization head before we could approach other
647 researchers within the organization. Senior respondents were asked to cascade the recruitment call
648 within their organisations but this relied on their active engagement and may have limited our
649 respondent pool. There is a need to engage further with more junior researchers from
650 transboundary partners to mitigate against power imbalances that may have limited their
651 participation. We also had a fairly small sample of respondents, which again may have been limited
652 by the strict ethics process for recruitment. The multi-method approach (Figure 1) aimed to mitigate
653 this by capturing a range of diverse views and perspectives through time, providing a holistic picture
654 of the nature of partnerships. The challenges of recruitment also impacted the global diversity and

655 range of organisations that we spoke with, though our sample included 20 organisations reflective of
656 the areas in which LSTM-Liverpool works. Many organisations who we spoke with were engaged
657 with only a handful of PIs, so to what extent our findings reflect working partnerships across
658 different departments within LSTM is uncertain. Finally, our research was conducted at a particular
659 moment in time, COVID-19 had led to UK ODA funding cuts and high levels of uncertainty and
660 precarity in relationships, with early and mid-career researchers impacted most of all. This allowed
661 us to explore how LSTM responds to challenges but our results need to be interpreted with this
662 context in mind. Despite these limitations, we feel that the participatory analysis, co-construction
663 and validation processes aimed to bring diverse views and perspectives into the process and to
664 mitigate against some of the recruitment and power issues that may have influenced the research
665 process.

666

667 **Conclusion**

668 Fostering equitable partnerships means we must confront uncomfortable truths within partnerships;
669 acknowledging and discussing how funding sources, donor priorities, history and language shape
670 existing power asymmetries. LSTM-Liverpool is in the midst of an ongoing process of deep reflection
671 with partners. It is important to note that equitable partnerships is not something to be 'achieved'
672 rather, it is the process of ongoing reflection and dialogue, seeking to do better and to dismantle
673 harmful power structures that perpetuate coloniality within global health. These principles represent
674 small steps on this journey and critically include the perspectives of transboundary partners. We
675 hope these principles will be helpful to others and will be adopted by LSTM-Liverpool and
676 transboundary partners to hold each other to account as they strengthen existing relationships, and
677 form new ones.

678

679 **Acknowledgment:**

680 We would like to acknowledge all the partners that gave their time and thoughtful insight to shape
681 this research and co-develop the principles presented. We thank Professor Frances Cowan and Dr.
682 Webster Mavhu from LSTM and the Centre for Sexual and HIV and AIDS Research, Zimbabwe
683 (CeSHHAR), Dr. Ndekya M. Oriyo, National Institute for Medical Research (NIMR) and Profesor Asma
684 El Sony (Epi-Lab) for their critical comments and for the other valued, anonymous inputs we
685 received. Thank you for administrative support for the ADAPT team at LSTM: Beth Hollihead, Faye
686 Moody and Tracy Owen.

687

688 **Funding:** This research was funded by internal funding within LSTM.

689

690

691

692 **References**

- 693 1. Zaman M, Afridi G, Ohly H, McArdle HJ, Lowe NM. Equitable partnerships in global health
694 research. *Nature Food*. 2020;1(12):760-1.
- 695 2. Voller S, Schellenberg J, Chi P, Thorogood N. What makes working together work? A scoping
696 review of the guidance on North–South research partnerships. *Health Policy and Planning*.
697 2022;37(4):523-34.
- 698 3. Charani E, Abimbola S, Pai M, Adeyi O, Mendelson M, Laxminarayan R, et al. Funders: The
699 missing link in equitable global health research? *PLOS Global Public Health*. 2022;2(6):e0000583.
- 700 4. Larson CP, Plamondon KM, Dubent L, Bicaba F, Bicaba A, Minh TH, et al. The Equity Tool for
701 Valuing Global Health Partnerships. *Glob Health Sci Pract*. 2022;10(2).
- 702 5. Boum II Y, Burns BF, Siedner M, Mburu Y, Bukusi E, Haberer JE. Advancing equitable global
703 health research partnerships in Africa. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2018;3(4):e000868.
- 704 6. Dodson J. Building Partnerships of Equals: The role of funders in equitable and effective
705 international development collaborations. UK Collaborative on Development Science; 2017.
- 706 7. Carbonnier, Kontinen. North-South research partnership: academia meets development? .
707 European Association of Development Reseach and Training Institutes; 2014.
- 708 8. Khan M, Abimbola S, Aloudat T, Capobianco E, Hawkes S, Rahman-Shepherd A. Decolonising
709 global health in 2021: a roadmap to move from rhetoric to reform. *BMJ Global Health*.
710 2021;6(3):e005604.
- 711 9. Hommes F, Monzó HB, Ferrand RA, Harris M, Hirsch LA, Besson EK, et al. The words we
712 choose matter: recognising the importance of language in decolonising global health. *Lancet Glob*
713 *Health*. 2021;9(7):e897-e8.
- 714 10. Khan T, Abimbola S, Kyobutungi C, Pai M. How we classify countries and people-and why it
715 matters. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2022;7(6).
- 716 11. Shahvisi A. Tropicality and abjection: What do we really mean by “Neglected Tropical
717 Diseases”? *Developing World Bioethics*. 2019;19(4):224-34.

- 718 12. Hirsch LA, Martin R. LSHTM and Colonialism: A report on the Colonial History of the London
719 School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (1899– c.1960). London; 2022.
- 720 13. Hirsch LA. Is it possible to decolonise global health institutions? *The Lancet*.
721 2021;397(10270):189-90.
- 722 14. Small S. Smalltalk with Stephen Small: reparations for Liverpool imperialism and West Africa
723 Writing on the Wall; 2022 [Available from: [https://writingonthewall.org.uk/wp-](https://writingonthewall.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/04_Stephen-Small_Liverpool-School-of-Tropical-Medicine_V2-1.pdf)
724 [content/uploads/2022/05/04_Stephen-Small_Liverpool-School-of-Tropical-Medicine_V2-1.pdf](https://writingonthewall.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/04_Stephen-Small_Liverpool-School-of-Tropical-Medicine_V2-1.pdf)].
- 725 15. Westgraph L. Liverpool Philanthropy, Slavery and Empire. In: LSTM, editor. Decolonisation of
726 Global Health and inequalities in academia2020.
- 727 16. Nworah KD. The Liverpool 'Sect' and British West African Policy 1895-1915. *African Affairs*.
728 1971;70(281):349-64.
- 729 17. Burgess RA. Working in the wake: transformative global health in an imperfect world. *BMJ*
730 *Global Health*. 2022;7(9):e010520.
- 731 18. Bartels SM, Haider S, Williams CR, Mazumder Y, Ibisomi L, Alonge O, et al. Diversifying
732 Implementation Science: A Global Perspective. *Global Health: Science and Practice*.
733 2022;10(4):e2100757.
- 734 19. Koum Besson ES. How to identify epistemic injustice in global health research funding
735 practices: a decolonial guide. *BMJ Global Health*. 2022;7(4):e008950.
- 736 20. Weick KE. Small wins: Redefining the scale of social problems. *American Psychological*
737 *Association*; 1984. p. 40-9.
- 738 21. Asare S, Mitchell R, Rose P. How equitable are South-North partnerships in education
739 research? Evidence from sub-Saharan Africa. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International*
740 *Education*. 2022;52(4):654-73.
- 741 22. Price R, Snijder M, Apgar M. DEFINING AND EVALUATING EQUITABLE PARTNERSHIPS: A
742 RAPID REVIEW. *Tomorrow's Cities2020*.
- 743 23. Afsana K, Habte D, Hatfield J, Murphy J, Neufeld V. Partnership assessment toolkit. Ottawa:
744 Canadian Coalition for Global Health Research. 2009.
- 745 24. Faure MC, Munung NS, Ntusi NAB, Pratt B, de Vries J. Mapping experiences and perspectives
746 of equity in international health collaborations: a scoping review. *International Journal for Equity in*
747 *Health*. 2021;20(1):28.
- 748 25. Lorde A. *The Master's Tools will never Dismantle the Master's House*. London: Penguin;
749 1984.
- 750 26. Louskieter L, Munshi S. *International Health Policies*. 2020. [cited 2022]. Available from:
751 [https://www.internationalhealthpolicies.org/featured-article/global-health-is-still-the-masters-](https://www.internationalhealthpolicies.org/featured-article/global-health-is-still-the-masters-house-how-brave-are-we-to-decolonise-and-dismantle-it/)
752 [house-how-brave-are-we-to-decolonise-and-dismantle-it/](https://www.internationalhealthpolicies.org/featured-article/global-health-is-still-the-masters-house-how-brave-are-we-to-decolonise-and-dismantle-it/).
- 753 27. RFI. RFI reporting guide. Research Fairness Initiative; 2018.
- 754 28. Ritchie J, Spencer L. Qualitative Data Analysis for Applied Policy Research. In: Bryman A,
755 Burgess R, editors. *Analysing Qualitative Data*. London: Routledge; 1994.
- 756 29. Okeke IN. African biomedical scientists and the promises of “big science”. *Canadian Journal*
757 *of African Studies / Revue canadienne des études africaines*. 2016;50(3):455-78.
- 758 30. Voller S, Chitalu C-CM, Nyondo-Mipando AL, Opobo T, Bangirana CA, Thorogood N, et al.
759 “We should be at the table together from the beginning”: perspectives on partnership from
760 stakeholders at four research institutions in sub-Saharan Africa. *International Journal for Equity in*
761 *Health*. 2022;21(1):111.
- 762 31. Atuire CA, Rutazibwa OU. *Partnership YGHJ*, editor: Yale Law and Public Health Schools.
763 2022. [cited 2023].

- 764 32. Abimbola S. The foreign gaze: authorship in academic global health. *BMJ Global Health*.
765 2019;4(5):e002068.
- 766 33. Snijder M, Steege R, Callander M, Wahome M, Rahman MF, Apgar M, et al. How are
767 Research for Development Programmes Implementing and Evaluating Equitable Partnerships to
768 Address Power Asymmetries? *The European Journal of Development Research*. 2023.
- 769 34. Durose C, Perry B, Richardson L, Dean R. Leadership and the hidden politics of co-produced
770 research: a Q-methodology study. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*.
771 2023;26(1):1-21.
- 772 35. Devex. Global Fund falls short of \$18B target as UK, Italy delay pledges 2022 [Available from:
773 [https://www.devex.com/news/global-fund-falls-short-of-18b-target-as-uk-italy-delay-pledges-](https://www.devex.com/news/global-fund-falls-short-of-18b-target-as-uk-italy-delay-pledges-104046)
774 [104046](https://www.devex.com/news/global-fund-falls-short-of-18b-target-as-uk-italy-delay-pledges-104046)].
- 775 36. Morton B, Vercueil A, Masekela R, Heinz E, Reimer L, Saleh S, et al. Consensus statement on
776 measures to promote equitable authorship in the publication of research from international
777 partnerships. *Anaesthesia*. 2022;77(3):264-76.
- 778 37. Rhannam M. Open access: creating a level playing field for the Global South 2021 [Available
779 from: [https://www.elsevier.com/connect/open-access-creating-a-level-playing-field-for-the-global-](https://www.elsevier.com/connect/open-access-creating-a-level-playing-field-for-the-global-south)
780 [south](https://www.elsevier.com/connect/open-access-creating-a-level-playing-field-for-the-global-south)].
- 781 38. Reidpath DD, Allotey P. The problem of 'trickle-down science' from the Global North to the
782 Global South. *BMJ Global Health*. 2019;4(4):e001719.
- 783 39. Kelaher M, Ng L, Knight K, Rahadi A. Equity in global health research in the new millennium:
784 trends in first-authorship for randomized controlled trials among low- and middle-income country
785 researchers 1990-2013. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2016;45(6):2174-83.
- 786 40. Marais D, Toohey J, Edwards D, Jsselmuiden C. Where there is no lawyer: Guidance for
787 fairer contract negotiation in collaborative research partnerships. Geneva & Pietermaritzburg:
788 Council in Health Research for Development; 2013.
- 789
- 790
- 791

792 Appendix 1: **LSTM Partnership Survey – 2021**

793

794 **Equitable partnerships: Amplifying perspectives from the countries where LSTM works**

795

796 **Introduction to the equitable partnership survey**

797 You have been invited to complete this survey because LSTM wants to understand how to better support
798 equitable partnerships in the countries where it works. If you choose to participate, your views will be
799 instrumental in shaping and informing LSTM's practice and strategic vision in this area to ensure all our
800 partnerships are of mutual benefit.

801

802 We have identified a number of topics for investigation (these are adapted from the Research Fairness
803 initiative domains of: fairness of opportunity; fair process; fair sharing of benefits, costs and outcomes) but
804 please add any other issues you would like to tell us about, using the free-text boxes. You also have an
805 opportunity to include your contact details at the end if you wish to be contacted for a follow up interview
806 – however, if you wish to remain anonymous in the survey, but have a particular interest in being involved
807 in an individual interview please email rosie.steege@lstmed.ac.uk or robinson.karuga@lvcthealth.org .

808

809 All data will be kept securely and limited members from [LSTM](#) & [LVCT Health](#) will have direct access to this.
810 All your views expressed in this survey will be anonymous: we will anonymise data during analysis. We may
811 analyse data by characteristics (e.g. gender, location of institution, age or type of activity of participant)
812 but will ensure that in reporting no information that would reveal the identity of a respondent is used. By
813 taking part you consent to us analysing this data.

814

815 We will report the findings of the survey to all LSTM partners through a report and also discuss the findings
816 and potential ways to improve our partnership to be mutually beneficial. The survey should take no more
817 than 30 minutes to complete.

818

819 **Section 1: Characteristics**

820

821 In this section, we will ask you about your personal characteristics. **All questions in this section are**
822 **optional.**

823

824 1. What is your age?

825 <30

826 30-<40

827 40-<50

828 50 - <60

829 ≥60

830 prefer not to say

831

832 2. How do you define your gender? *If you prefer not to say, then please leave this question blank.*

833

834

835 3. What is your nationality? *If you prefer not to say, then please leave this question blank.*

836

837

838

839 4. Where is your organisation located?

840

841 Country:

842

843 5. What is the highest level of academic qualification you have obtained?

844 Certificate/ Diploma

845 Bachelors

846 Masters

847 Doctorate

848 Other

849

850 6. What is the nature of your partnership with LSTM? *(Please type here)*

851

852

853 7. How many years have you personally been involved with LSTM?

854

855 < 2 years

856 2-<5 years

857 5-<10 years

858 10 -<20 years

859 ≥20 years

860

861 8. How many years has your organisation been involved in partnership(s) with LSTM?

862

863 < 2 years

864 2-<5 years

865 5-<10 years

866 10 -<20 years

867 ≥20 years

868 Don't know

869

870 **Introduction to Section 2**

871

872 In the remainder of the survey, you will be asked your thoughts on your partnership with LSTM. The
873 questions will focus on the following three domains:

- 874 • Fairness of opportunity
- 875 • Fair process
- 876 • Fair sharing of benefits, costs and outcomes

877 **Domain 1: Fairness of opportunity**

878 Increasing fairness of the opportunity that stakeholders have to influence research and education
879 programmes at the stage or stages where it most impacts on their own ability to learn, contribute or
880 participate, provides a sound foundation for respect in the current and future research partnerships.
881 Fairness of opportunity sets the scene for the fair and efficient conduct of research / education and the fair
882 and efficient sharing of costs and benefits later on. Partnerships with increasing respect for the interests
883 and limitations of other partners last longer, work more efficiently, and create more resilience to overcome
884 inevitable partnership stress productively.

885

886 **1. Who is the ‘main’/lead partner in your partnership?**

887

888

889

890

891 **2. The following statements focus on early engagement and research priorities.** Please select your
892 response to each statement.

893

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The research / education we are involved in with LSTM aligns to priorities or strategy of your organization					
We were involved early in the partnership(s) and able to input into the aims, objectives, methods etc. for the partnership proposal(s)					
We had equal opportunity to input into decision making at the early stages of the partnership development					
Time was given to identify each partner’s strengths and weaknesses in expertise to deliver the project effectively					
The roles within our partnership are clearly defined					

There are clearly established processes for dispute resolution					
At the start of our partnership our research / project management capacity was assessed and appropriate support discussed and identified					
At the start of our partnership our contracting negotiation management capacity was assessed and appropriate support discussed and identified.					

894

895

896 3. Do you have any additional comments on **early engagement & project priorities** with LSTM?

897

898

899

900

901

902 4. The following statements focus on **financing arrangements**. Please select your response to each statement

903

904

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
LSTM's own sources of financial support are well understood					
Determinants of LSTM's capability (both limitations and capacity) to provide financial support are well understood					
There is equity in financial allocation across the partnership					
There is equity in non-financial contributions across the partnership					

905

906

907 5. Do you have any additional comments on **financing arrangements** with LSTM? *Please type your response in the box below*

908

909

910

911

912

913

914

915 **Domain 2: Fair process**

916 Domain 2 aims to improve fairness in how research / education is conducted and research /education
 917 partnerships and programmes are implemented. Expectations of different partners are usually different.
 918 By creating clarity in how organisations deal with these challenges in principle and in practice, research
 919 stakeholders can reduce misunderstandings and can increase the capacity of all partners to live up to the
 920 expectations that others may have of them.

921

922

923 6. The following statements focus on **hiring, capacity building and sourcing**. Please select your
 924 response to each statement

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Hiring local staff is encouraged in the partnership(s) with LSTM					
There are clear criteria for involving LSTM staff in the partnership you have with LSTM					
The partnership with LSTM includes a commitment to capacity building within my organisation					
The partnership with LSTM provides resources for capacity building of project staff					
The partnership with LSTM provides resources for training and higher education of project management staff					
The partnership with LSTM supports partners to become better able to access competitive grants					
Partnership with LSTM is helpful in assisting me to build my organisation's capacity to influence policy and practice locally .					
Partnership with LSTM is helpful in assisting my organisation's capacity to influence policy and practice globally .					

925

926 1. Do you have any additional comments **hiring, capacity building or sourcing** with LSTM? Please
 927 add them here or explain any answers above

928

929

930 **Ethical and Impactful Research**

931

932 1. The following statements focus on **ethical and impactful research / education**. Please select your
 933 response to each statement.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
There is respect and understanding in discussion and decisions around ethical review in our partnership with LSTM					
Our partnership with LSTM includes processes to support local research ethics review capacity if required (e.g. by sourcing independent expertise to conduct ethical review)?					

934

935 2. Do you have any additional comments about **ethical and impactful research / education**? If so,
936 please add them here or explain any answers above

937

938

939

940 **Data sharing and Intellectual Property (IP)**

941

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Data sharing agreements are in place					
There was opportunity to input into these					
There is an agreement on intellectual property rights use that I am comfortable with					
The partnership with LSTM includes explicit pre- / post-research discussions and negotiations with partners concerning the sharing of IP					
Any disagreements on IP were dealt with fairly					
The partnership with LSTM includes support for IP contracting					
The partnership with LSTM includes access to technology for my organisation					

942

943 1. Do you have any additional comments about **data sharing or IP**? If so, please add them here, or
944 explain any answers above

945

946

947

948

949 **Budgeting and Financial Management**

950

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The partnership with LSTM includes support with preparation and management of budgets if required					
The partnership with LSTM included, at the start, assessment of the competency of my organisation with regards to financial management for research					

951

952

953 2. Do you have any additional comments about **budgeting and financial management** in your
 954 partnership with LSTM? If so, please add them here or please explain any answers above

955

956

957

958 **Domain three: Fair sharing of benefits, costs and outcomes**

959

960 Domain 3 deals with improving fairness in sharing the costs, benefits and outcomes of research /
 961 education. It focuses both on short-term costs, benefits and outcomes of individual studies / education
 962 programmes, but also on the medium- and long-term impact that partnership can have on the ability of
 963 partners to grow their own capacity, increase their ability to compete in attracting funding, on social
 964 impact, and on future economic benefits of research in terms of economic activity, technology sector
 965 growth, and both technical and social innovations benefits accruing to all in the partnership.

966

967 3. The following statements focus on **innovation**. Please select your response to each statement.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The partnership with LSTM gives scope for us to be innovative from the inception of projects					
The partnership with LSTM includes, in the research contract negotiations and in research partnership agreements, clear statements on how future spin-off economic activities resulting from the research will be shared					

The partnership with LSTM facilitates institutional or national discussions on this matter – supporting partners to make sure that research does not end with publications					
--	--	--	--	--	--

968

969

970 **4.** Do you have any additional comments about **innovation** in your partnership with LSTM? If so,
 971 please add them here or please explain any answers above

972

973

974

975

976 **5.** The following statements focus on **culture and inclusivity**. Please select your response to each
 977 statement.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The partnership with LSTM encourages diversity of participation in research and in the partnership by gender, age, ethnicity and socio-economic status?					
The partnership with LSTM works to assess, report and minimise environmental impact of research partnerships					
The partnership with LSTM encourages/supports my organisation to create a culture of fairness in its research partnerships					
The partnership with LSTM attempts to ensure that research funder or sponsor demands do not create unfairness in partnerships					
The relationships between people in our partnership are respectful					
The decisions made in our partnership are equitable					
I plan to collaborate with LSTM in the future					

978

979 **6.** Do you have any additional comments about **culture and inclusivity** in your partnership with
 980 LSTM? If so, please add them here or please explain any answers above

981

982

983

984 **Research uptake**

985

986 **7.** The following statements focus on **research uptake**, meaning the use of research by others
 987 including researchers and policy makers. Please select your response to each statement.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The Partnership with LSTM is helpful in enabling my organisation to have more interactions with policy makers and other stakeholders locally					
The partnership with LSTM is helpful in enabling my organisation to have more interactions with policy makers and other stakeholders globally					
Publishing authorship is usually agreed collaboratively and in an equitable way in the partnership with LSTM					

988

989 **8.** Please explain your answers above

990

991

992 **Responsiveness during the COVID-19 pandemic**

993 **9.** We would also like your thoughts on how the LSTM has responded to the COVID-19 pandemic.
 994 Please select your response to this statement.

995

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The partnership with LSTM has provided support during the COVID-19 pandemic					

996

997 **10.** Please explain your answer above

998

999

1000

1001 **11.** Do you have any additional comments about the **responsiveness of the partnership with LSTM**
 1002 **to COVID-19?** If so, please add them here.

1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026

Final thoughts

12. Do you have any suggestions for improving partnership with LSTM? If so, please write them here.

13. Is there anything you think partnership with LSTM does well and you would like to see continue?

14. Finally, is there anything you would like to add that hasn't been covered in the survey?

Many thanks for taking the time to complete this survey.

Would you like to include your email for contact?

1027 Appendix 2: Abridged anonymised survey responses (does not include free text responses)

1028


Early engagement and research priorities

11 The following statements focus on early engagement and research priorities. Please select your response to each statement.

11.1 The research / education we are involved in with LSTM aligns to priorities or strategy of your organization


1.1.a The research / education we are involved in with LSTM aligns to priorities or strategy of your organization - Please select one response

10 / 38



11.2 We were involved early in the partnership(s) and able to input into the aims, objectives, methods etc. for the partnership proposal(s)

1.2.a We were involved early in the partnership(s) and able to input into the aims, objectives, methods etc. for the partnership proposal(s) - Please select one response




1029

1030

1031


1.3.a We had equal opportunity to input into decision making at the early stages of the partnership development - Please select one response



11 / 38


11.4 Time was given to identify each partner's strengths and weaknesses in expertise to deliver the project effectively

1.4.a Time was given to identify each partner's strengths and weaknesses in expertise to deliver the project effectively - Please select one response



11.5 The roles within our partnership are clearly defined

1.5.a The roles within our partnership are clearly defined - Please select one response




1032

1033


1034

11.6.a There are clearly established processes for dispute resolution - Please select one response




11.7 At the start of our partnership our research / project management capacity was assessed and appropriate support discussed and identified

11.7.a At the start of our partnership our research / project management capacity was assessed and appropriate support discussed and identified - Please select one response



11.8 At the start of our partnership our contracting negotiation management capacity was assessed and appropriate support discussed and identified

11.8.a At the start of our partnership our contracting negotiation management capacity was assessed and appropriate support discussed and identified - Please select one response




Financing arrangements

14 / 38

14 The following statements focus on financing arrangements. Please select your response to each statement


14.1 LSTM's own sources of financial support are well understood

14.1.a LSTM's own sources of financial support are well understood - Please select one response



14.2 Determinants of LSTM's capability (both limitations and capacity) to provide financial support are well understood

14.2.a Determinants of LSTM's capability (both limitations and capacity) to provide financial support are well understood - Please select one response



14.3 There is equity in financial allocation across the partnership

14.3.a There is equity in financial allocation across the partnership - Please select one response

1036

1037


14.3.a There is equity in financial allocation across the partnership - Please select one response

15 / 38



14.4 There is equity in non-financial contributions across the partnership

14.4.a There is equity in non-financial contributions across the partnership - Please select one response



1039

1040

1041


1042

Hiring, capacity building and sourcing

17


17.1 Hiring local staff is encouraged in the partnership(s) with LSTM

17.1.a Hiring local staff is encouraged in the partnership(s) with LSTM - Please select one response



17.2 There are clear criteria for involving LSTM staff in the partnership you have with LSTM


17.2.a There are clear criteria for involving LSTM staff in the partnership you have with LSTM - Please select one response



17 / 38

17.3 The partnership with LSTM includes a commitment to capacity building within my organisation


17.3.a The partnership with LSTM includes a commitment to capacity building within my organisation - Please select one response



1043

1044


17.4.a The partnership with LSTM provides resources for capacity building of project staff - Please select one response



17.5 The partnership with LSTM provides resources for training and higher education of project management staff


17.5.a The partnership with LSTM provides resources for training and higher education of project management staff - Please select one response

18 / 38



17.6 The partnership with LSTM supports partners to become better able to access competitive grants


17.6.a The partnership with LSTM supports partners to become better able to access competitive grants - Please select one response



1045

1046


17.7.a Partnership with LSTM is helpful in assisting me to build my organisation's capacity to influence policy and practice locally. - Please select one response



17.8 Partnership with LSTM is helpful in assisting my organisation's capacity to influence policy and practice globally. - Please select one response
19 / 38

practice globally.

17.8.a Partnership with LSTM is helpful in assisting my organisation's capacity to influence policy and practice globally. - Please select one response



1047

1048


Ethical and Impactful Research

20 / 38

20 The following statements focus on ethical and impactful research / education. Please select your response to each statement.


20.1 There is respect and understanding in discussion and decisions around ethical review in our partnership with LSTM

20.1.a There is respect and understanding in discussion and decisions around ethical review in our partnership with LSTM - Please select one response



20.2 Our partnership with LSTM includes processes to support local research ethics review capacity if required (e.g. by sourcing independent expertise to conduct ethical review)?

20.2.a Our partnership with LSTM includes processes to support local research ethics review capacity if required (e.g. by sourcing independent expertise to conduct ethical review)? - Please select one response




1049

Data sharing and Intellectual Property (IP)

23 The following statements focus on Data sharing and Intellectual Property (IP). Please select your response to each statement.

23.1 Data sharing agreements are in place


23.1.a Data sharing agreements are in place - Please select one response



23.2 There was opportunity to input into data sharing agreements

23.2.a There was opportunity to input into data sharing agreements - Please select one response


22 / 38



1050


23.3 There is an agreement on intellectual property rights use that I am comfortable with

23.3.a There is an agreement on intellectual property rights use that I am comfortable with - Please select one response



23.4 There was opportunity to input into Intellectual Property agreements


23.4.a There was opportunity to input into Intellectual Property agreements - Please select one response



23.5 The partnership with LSTM includes explicit pre- / post-research discussions and negotiations with partners concerning the sharing of IP

23 / 38

23.5.a The partnership with LSTM includes explicit pre- / post-research discussions and negotiations with partners concerning the sharing of IP - Please select one response




1051

1052


23.6 Any disagreements on IP were dealt with fairly

23.6.a Any disagreements on IP were dealt with fairly - Please select one response



23.7 The partnership with LSTM includes support for IP contracting


23.7.a The partnership with LSTM includes support for IP contracting - Please select one response



24 / 38

23.8 The partnership with LSTM includes access to technology for my organisation

23.8.a The partnership with LSTM includes access to technology for my organisation - Please select one response



1053


1054

Budgeting and Financial Management

26 The following statements focus on Budgeting and Financial Management. Please select your response to each statement.


26.1 The partnership with LSTM includes support with preparation and management of budgets if required

26.1.a The partnership with LSTM includes support with preparation and management of budgets if required - Please select one response



26.2 The partnership with LSTM included, at the start, assessment of the competency of my organisation with regards to financial management for research


26.2.a The partnership with LSTM included, at the start, assessment of the competency of my organisation with regards to financial management for research - Please select one response



1055

1056

29.3.a The partnership with LSTM facilitates institutional or national discussions on innovation - supporting partners to make sure that research does not just end with publications - Please select one response



1057

1058

1059


Domain 3: Fair sharing of benefits, costs and outcomes

Innovation

29 The following statements focus on innovation. Please select your response to each statement.

29.1 The partnership with LSTM gives scope for us to be innovative from the inception of projects

29.1.a The partnership with LSTM gives scope for us to be innovative from the inception of projects - Please select one response




29.2 The partnership with LSTM includes, in the research contract negotiations and in research partnership agreements, clear statements on how future spin-off economic activities resulting

27 / 38

from the research will be shared

29.2.a The partnership with LSTM includes, in the research contract negotiations and in research partnership agreements, clear statements on how future spin-off economic activities resulting from the research will be shared - Please select one response



1060


1061

Culture and inclusivity

32 The following statements focus on culture and inclusivity. Please select your response to each statement.

32.1 The partnership with LSTM encourages diversity of participation in research and in the partnership by gender, age, ethnicity and socio-economic status?


32.1.a The partnership with LSTM encourages diversity of participation in research and in the partnership by gender, age, ethnicity and socio-economic status? - Please select one response



32.2 The partnership with LSTM works to assess, report and minimise environmental impact of research partnerships

29 / 38


32.2.a The partnership with LSTM works to assess, report and minimise environmental impact of research partnerships - Please select one response



1062


1063

32.3.a The partnership with LSTM encourages/supports my organisation to create a culture of fairness in its research partnerships - Please select one response




32.4 The partnership with LSTM attempts to ensure that research funder or sponsor demands do not create unfairness in partnerships

32.4.a The partnership with LSTM attempts to ensure that research funder or sponsor demands do not create unfairness in partnerships - Please select one response




32.5 The relationships between people in our partnership are respectful

32.5.a The relationships between people in our partnership are respectful - Please select one response




32.6 The decisions made in our partnership are equitable

32.6.a The decisions made in our partnership are equitable - Please select one response



32.7 I plan to collaborate with LSTM in the future

32.7.a I plan to collaborate with LSTM in the future - Please select one response



31 / 38

1065


Research uptake

35 The following statements focus on research uptake, meaning the use of research by others including researchers and policy makers. Please select your response to each statement.

35.1 The Partnership with LSTM is helpful in enabling my organisation to have more interactions with policy makers and other stakeholders locally


35.1.a The Partnership with LSTM is helpful in enabling my organisation to have more interactions with policy makers and other stakeholders locally - Please select one response

32 / 38




35.2 The partnership with LSTM is helpful in enabling my organisation to have more interactions with policy makers and other stakeholders globally

35.2.a The partnership with LSTM is helpful in enabling my organisation to have more interactions with policy makers and other stakeholders globally - Please select one response



1066

35.3.a Publishing authorship is usually agreed collaboratively and in an equitable way in the partnership with LSTM - Please select one response



1067


1068

Responsiveness during the COVID-19 pandemic

38 We would also like your thoughts on how LSTM has responded to the COVID-19 pandemic. Please select your response to this statement.

38.1 The partnership with LSTM has provided support during the COVID-19 pandemic

38.1.a The partnership with LSTM has provided support during the COVID-19 pandemic - Please select one response



1069

1070

1071

1072 Appendix 3: **Topic Guide for Key Informant Interviews**

1073 **Equitable partnerships: Amplifying perspectives from partner organisations in countries where LSTM**
1074 **works**

1075
1076 **Introductory questions**
1077

- 1078 1. Please tell me more about yourself and your organisation
1079 2. How have you and LSTM collaborated?
1080 a. *Probe: How long for each partnership*
1081 b. *Probe: What is the nature of the collaboration – research, education, other?*
1082 c. *Probe has it changed through time?*
1083 3. What words would you use to describe the partnership?
1084 4. When referring to your country context, what language are you most comfortable with? E.g.
1085 would you have any preference between the use of the phrases “Global South” and LMIC
1086 settings? Why?
1087

1088 **Agenda setting**

- 1089 5. Please describe to me how the agenda/research questions / education priorities for your
1090 partnership was/ were developed
1091 a. *What was the process?*
1092 b. *Probe the process of developing the agenda / research questions / education priorities*
1093 *for each partnership (if multiple)*
1094 c. *What was your role in proposal development?*
1095 i. *Probe - How were your views incorporated?*
1096 ii. *Probe - How did that influence the partnership?*
1097 iii. *Probe - space for innovation from both LSTM and partners based in*
1098 *L/MICs/global south?*
1099 iv. *Probe - Engagement of local knowledge systems?*
1100 6. How did these agenda / research questions / education priorities respond to needs in your
1101 context?
1102 a. *In what ways can partnership with LSTM support locally- driven priorities?*
1103 7. Do you feel that the partnership plays to your strengths as an organization - How?
1104 a. *Probe: Are the teams skillset recognized and valued?*
1105 b. *Dynamics of HIC vs LMIC expertise*
1106 8. How are power differentials in the partnership discussed / made explicit / negotiated?
1107

1108 **Impacts and outputs**

- 1109 9. What are the key outputs that were developed as a result of your partnership with LSTM?
1110 a. *Probe for each partnership, if multiple*
1111 10. What are your views about the distribution of authorship between LSTM and your organization
1112 in the different outputs from your partnership with LSTM
1113 a. *Probe for views about each partnership*
1114 11. What is the approach to disseminating lessons learnt / best practices developed in your
1115 partnership with LSTM?

1116 a. *Probe for local and global dissemination – explicit role of partners based in middle and*
1117 *low income countries*

1118 b. *Who takes lead role?*

1119 12. What would you say have been the impact of the collaboration between LSTM and your
1120 organization?

1121 a. Probe: On broader development in your context

1122 b. Probe: On policy changes in your context

1123 c. Probe: For communities

1124 13. What are your views about capacity strengthening in the partnership with LSTM?

1125 a. *Probe for specific examples of capacity strengthening*

1126 b. *Institutional capacity strengthening*

1127 c. *Individual capacity strengthening*

1128

1129 **Future of partnership**

1130 14. What are some things that you can recommend for LSTM to strengthen to make the current and
1131 future partnerships more mutually beneficial?

1132 15. In your own words, how would you define equitable partnerships between Global Northern/HIC
1133 and Global Southern/LMIC institutions?

1134 a. How do you think this could be evaluated?

1135 16. How does your description of equitable partnerships relate to your current partnership(s) with
1136 LSTM?

1137 a. Probe: diversity of participation in research by gender, age, ethnicity and socio-
1138 economic status?

1139 17. From your experience partnering with LSTM, what would you say are the principles of equitable
1140 partnership?

1141 a. How would you suggest holding LSTM accountable to equitable partnerships?

1142 b. How would you suggest holding your organisation accountable to equitable
1143 partnerships?

1144 c. If you had a concern about the partnership – how would you voice/ address that?

1145

1146 **Funding**

1147 18. How would you say the funding structure influences your partnership?

1148 a. *What are the major sources of funding for projects in your partnership with LSTM*

1149 b. *Does funding for projects in your partnership always flow from North to South?*

1150 c. *If not, what are examples of some sources of funding in LMICs?*

1151 d. *Who decides on budget allocations?*

1152 19. In the environment of funding cuts to the UK aid budget. Has this changed the dynamic of the
1153 partnership?

1154 a. *How do you think LSTM and the partnership has handled the situation?*

1155 b. *What could LSTM and the partnership do to best support you/ be an effective ally in this*
1156 *moment?*

1157 Closing -

1158 20. Is there anything you want to flag that LSTM does particularly well/ not so well at in fostering
1159 mutually beneficial partnerships?

1160

1161 Thank you for your time. Do you have anything else you would like to share?

1162

1163

1164 Appendix 4:

1165 **Consensus statement as per Morton et al. guidance on equitable authorship:**

1166 **1. How does the study address local research and policy priorities?**

1167 Our study was specifically designed to support equity within transboundary partnerships. Supporting
1168 equitable partnerships is a key component of decolonising global health which is an issue of major
1169 priority in global health partnerships.

1170 **2. How were local researchers involved in study design?**

1171 This was a global study designed by researchers in LSTM Liverpool (BS, ST, RS, SC) and LVCT health
1172 Kenya (RK and LO). LVCT Health and LSTM are longstanding partners and both are aligned in their
1173 goals to support equity in partnership. The study was designed to engage the perspectives of
1174 transboundary partners to co-develop principles for equitable partnerships in this area.

1175 **3. How has funding been used to support the local research team?**

1176
1177 The funding was used for pay for staff time in both LVCT Health and LSTM.

1178
1179 **4. How are research staff who conducted data collection acknowledged?**

1180
1181 RS and RK conducted the data collection for the survey and KIIs, SC was also involved in data
1182 collection for the workshop. All research staff involved are authors on this paper.

1183
1184 **5. Do all members of the research partnership have access to study data?**

1185 All members of the partnership have access to data.

1186 **6. How was data used to develop analytical skills within the partnership?**

1187 Most of the members of the research team are mid-career or senior researchers. SC is a research
1188 assistant and doctoral candidate and played a key role in workshop facilitation and analysis. She was
1189 supported by RS and RK. SC also presented on behalf of the research team at the Health Systems
1190 Global Conference in Bogota 2022.

1191 **7. How have research partners collaborated in interpreting study data?**

1192 LVCT health colleagues (RK, LO) played a key role in analysing and interpreting the study data. In
1193 addition we:

- 1194 • All participants were invited to a virtual workshop where the findings were presented for
1195 feedback followed by a process of co-creating principles. The principles were then also
1196 shared by email with all partners for any further additions or reflections.
- 1197 • The study process, feedback and principles were also fed back to LSTM staff at a workshop
1198 and anonymous feedback was elicited through easy retro
- 1199 • The study process, feedback and principles were also shared as part of a session on
1200 “Equitable Partnerships” held at the Health Systems Global conference in Bogota in Nov,
1201 2022 and discussed in a world café format.
- 1202 • Partners were also given opportunity to comment on the manuscript before submission

1203
1204 **8. How were research partners supported to develop writing skills?**

1205 We supported each other in the development of the outputs – including ethical protocols,
1206 PowerPoints and papers.

1207 **9. How will research products be shared to address local needs?**

1208 We have opted for open access publication so that our research process and findings and principles
1209 are open for all to learn from and adapt as appropriate. These principles can be used by partners to
1210 hold LSTM to account in future collaborations.

1211 **10. How is the leadership, contribution and ownership of this work by LMIC researchers
1212 recognised within the authorship?**

1213 The contribution of LVCT in shaping and conducting this research and output has been recognised
1214 with joint first (RK) and last authorship (LO) positions.

1215 **11. How have early career researchers across the partnership been included within the
1216 authorship team?**

1217 We have included SC as a doctoral researcher within the authorship team, her critical role has been
1218 acknowledged as a corresponding author.

1219 **12. How has gender balance been addressed within the authorship?**

1220 Four authors are women (RS, SC, ST, LO) and two men (RK, BS). We have women as both first author
1221 (RS) and last (LO/ST) author positions.

1222 **13. How has the project contributed to training of LMIC researchers?**

1223 The LMIC researchers involved in the research are mid-senior in their career so this was not
1224 applicable.

1225 **14. How has the project contributed to improvements in local infrastructure?**

1226 This project has not directly contributed to improvements in local infrastructure.

1227 **15. What safeguarding procedures were used to protect local study participants and
1228 researchers?**

1229 We used the [LSTM safeguarding policy](#) to guide this study; no safeguarding issues emerged during
1230 the study.

1231