

1 **Development of the Kunonga Framework for Extending Approaches in Health**  
2 **Inequality and Inequity Evidence Syntheses**

3 Tafadzwa Patience Kunonga,<sup>1,2</sup> Pauline Addis,<sup>2</sup> Eugenie Evelynne Johnson,<sup>2</sup> Peter Bower,<sup>3</sup>  
4 Barbara Hanratty,<sup>1</sup> Dawn Craig<sup>1,2</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup>National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Policy Research Unit in Older People  
6 and Frailty/Healthy Ageing, Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University,  
7 Newcastle-upon-Tyne, NE4 5PL, UK

8 <sup>2</sup>National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Innovation Observatory, Population  
9 Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE4 5TG, UK

10 <sup>3</sup>National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Policy Research Unit in Older People  
11 and Frailty/Healthy Ageing, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and  
12 Health, The University of Manchester, Manchester, M13 9PL, UK

13

14 **Corresponding author:** Tafadzwa Patience Kunonga - Population Health Sciences  
15 Institute, Newcastle Biomedical Research Building, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon  
16 Tyne NE4 5PL, UK. Tel.: +44 (0) 1912086260; fax: +44 (0) 19120861101;  
17 [patience.kunonga@newcastle.ac.uk](mailto:patience.kunonga@newcastle.ac.uk)

18 **Data availability statement:** All data relevant to the study are included in the article or  
19 uploaded as supplemental information.

20 **Word count:** Abstract: 197; Manuscript: 4653; References: 36

21

## 22 **ABSTRACT**

23 Health inequalities and inequities are shaped by intersecting factors and life-course  
24 experiences, yet current evidence synthesis methods often lack the depth to capture these  
25 dimensions. The Kunonga Framework was developed through a three-phase approach to  
26 address these gaps, enhancing methodologies to better focus on health inequality and  
27 inequity in research. In the first phase, a systematic review identified key gaps in current  
28 inequality/inequity considerations. The second phase involved expert Key Informant  
29 Interviews, refining the framework's design. Finally, findings from both phases informed the  
30 proposed framework, offering practical recommendations for integrating inequality and  
31 inequity considerations across evidence synthesis processes. At the protocol stage,  
32 reviewers are advised to explicitly define health inequality and inequity, select frameworks  
33 like PROGRESS-Plus, and develop a logic model to map pathways between social  
34 determinants, life-course factors, and health outcomes. During data extraction, organising  
35 data by demographic, socioeconomic, and healthcare factors is recommended to detect  
36 patterns of inequality and inequity. In analysis, an intersectionality matrix and life-course  
37 analysis will help reveal overlapping social determinants and cumulative effects on health  
38 outcomes. The Kunonga Framework offers a structured approach to embedding  
39 intersectional, life-course perspectives in evidence synthesis, supporting policymakers and  
40 researchers in designing more effective, inequality/inequity-focused interventions.

41 **Key words:** Health inequality; health inequity; intersectionality; evidence synthesis; life-  
42 course perspective

## 43 1. INTRODUCTION

44 Evidence synthesis involves systematically gathering, evaluating, and integrating existing  
45 research findings to provide a comprehensive and robust summary of available evidence on  
46 a particular topic (Higgins et al., 2023). It encompasses a range of methodologies including  
47 meta-analyses, systematic reviews and qualitative syntheses, depending on the nature of  
48 the research question (Higgins et al., 2023). Evidence synthesis plays a crucial role in  
49 driving evidence-based decision-making processes, particularly as policy-makers  
50 increasingly direct their attention towards addressing issues of inequality and inequity (Orton  
51 et al., 2011).

52 Currently, there is no universally accepted definition of health inequality and health inequity,  
53 and the terms are frequently used interchangeably (Kunonga, Hanratty, et al., 2023). For the  
54 purposes of this article, health inequality refers to differences in health status or  
55 determinants among individuals or populations, while health inequity specifically denotes  
56 unnecessary, avoidable, and unjust differences in health (Arcaya et al., 2015). Health  
57 inequalities remain a pressing issue globally, with outcome differences persisting across  
58 various demographic groups (Marmot et al., 2008).

59 While evidence synthesis methodologies play a crucial role in informing healthcare policies  
60 and interventions, there are significant gaps in how they address the impacts of health  
61 inequalities and inequities (Langlois Énnev, 2018). A recent systematic review conducted  
62 identified two key guides that currently inform equity-focused evidence synthesis (Kunonga,  
63 Hanratty, et al., 2023): (i) the PROGRESS-Plus framework (Place of residence,  
64 Race/ethnicity, Occupation, Gender, Religion, Education, Socioeconomic status, Social  
65 capital, plus additional factors such as personal characteristics tied to discrimination (e.g.  
66 age, disability), relational influences (e.g. smoking parents, school exclusion), and time-  
67 dependent vulnerabilities (e.g. post-hospitalisation, respite care) (Cochrane Methods Equity,  
68 2024; O'Neill et al., 2014); and (ii) the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and  
69 Meta-Analyses-Equity (PRISMA-Equity) checklist (Welch et al., 2012). The PROGRESS-  
70 Plus framework enables researchers to apply a structured lens to stratify data based on  
71 social determinants (Cochrane Methods Equity, 2024; O'Neill et al., 2014), while the  
72 PRISMA-Equity checklist provides guidelines for reporting equity-focused systematic  
73 reviews, promoting a consistent approach to identifying and analysing health  
74 inequalities/inequities within evidence synthesis (Welch et al., 2012).

75 These frameworks represent important advancements but remain limited in their ability to  
76 fully capture how various factors such as race, gender, sexuality, and class, combine to  
77 shape unique experiences of advantage or disadvantage. Additionally, they do not

78 adequately address how exposures and experiences over different stages of life contribute  
79 to health outcomes, highlighting the complex and evolving nature of health  
80 inequalities/inequities over time (Bambra, 2022; Chamberlain et al., 2022; Kunonga,  
81 Hanratty, et al., 2023; Marmot, 2005). This leaves a gap for a more comprehensive and  
82 inclusive approach that acknowledges and addresses the diverse needs and experiences of  
83 different groups within society (Kunonga, Hanratty, et al., 2023; Kunonga, Spiers, et al.,  
84 2023).

### 85 **1.1 Research Aim**

86 To introduce the Kunonga Framework as a novel approach for extending evidence synthesis  
87 methodologies, with a specific focus on addressing health inequality and inequity.

### 88 **1.2 Research Objectives:**

- 89 a. To gather expert insights through key informant interviews, identifying critical themes  
90 necessary for advancing beyond traditional evidence synthesis approaches in health  
91 inequality and inequity research.
- 92 b. To develop and refine the Kunonga Framework, incorporating insights from the key  
93 informant interviews to enhance its applicability for comprehensive and intersectional,  
94 and life-course analysis of health inequalities/inequities.

## 95 **2. METHODS**

96 The development of the proposed framework followed a modified three-stage approach,  
97 drawing on recommended phases for methodological framework development (McMeekin et  
98 al., 2020).

### 99 ***2.1 Phase 1: Identifying Evidence to Inform the Proposed Methodological Framework***

100 The first phase, as outlined in the introduction, involved conducting a comprehensive  
101 systematic review to assess existing approaches in inequalities/inequities-focused evidence  
102 synthesis. The methods and findings of this review have been previously reported elsewhere  
103 (Kunonga, Hanratty, et al., 2023), establishing a foundation for developing a more inclusive  
104 framework tailored to the complexities of health inequalities/inequities within evidence  
105 synthesis. Therefore, this paper will not elaborate further on these review findings but will  
106 instead concentrate on the subsequent phases that build upon these insights to develop the  
107 proposed framework.

### 108 ***2.2 Phase 2: Key Informant Interviews to Address Methodological Gaps***

109 Phase 2 involved conducting Key Informant Interviews with eight experts in health  
110 inequalities and/or inequities, evidence synthesis, or both, to explore the methodological  
111 gaps identified in Phase 1. This approach involves conducting specialised qualitative

112 interviews with individuals recognised for their insider knowledge or unique perspectives.  
113 Key Informant Interviews delve deeply into individual perspectives, offering a granular  
114 understanding of complex issues (Akhter, 2022; Pahwa et al., 2023). The method  
115 emphasises depth over breadth, specifically targeting sources rich in information (Pahwa et  
116 al., 2023). These interviews were structured to critically discuss the limitations observed in  
117 current methodologies and to gather expert insights on strategies to address these gaps.  
118 The study was reported according to the 32-item Consolidated Criteria for Reporting  
119 Qualitative Research (COREQ) checklist (Supplementary File 1) (Tong et al., 2007).

### 120 **2.2.1 Selection and recruitment of experts**

121 Experts were selected based on their demonstrated contributions to their respective fields,  
122 evidenced by substantial peer-reviewed publications and other scholarly outputs, such as  
123 policy briefs and conference presentations. This criterion ensured that participants brought a  
124 depth of expertise and a history of impactful research, thereby enhancing the rigour and  
125 credibility of insights gathered for this study (Akhter, 2022; Pahwa, 2023). The recruitment  
126 process aimed to ensure diversity of perspectives, including individuals from different sectors  
127 and countries. Thirteen experts were contacted via email, introducing the project, and  
128 inviting them to participate in the workshop. The email outlined the objectives, expected time  
129 commitment, and the potential benefits of involvement. Interested experts were asked to  
130 confirm their participation, and a suitable date for the interviews was selected based on their  
131 availability. Given the nature of the study, which focused on gathering voluntary  
132 methodological insights from knowledgeable professionals rather than vulnerable  
133 populations or sensitive personal data, formal ethical review was deemed unnecessary.

### 134 **2.2.2 Pilot workshops**

135 Two virtual pilot workshops were held with members of the Evidence Synthesis Group,  
136 Newcastle University to gather preliminary feedback and advice for the upcoming key  
137 informant interviews. These pilot sessions tested the interview content, activities, logistics  
138 and overall participant experience to ensure the effectiveness of the planned approach.  
139 Feedback from these sessions led to several refinements, including rephrasing questions for  
140 greater clarity and relevance to the two main topics:

- 141 • significant challenges or limitations faced when synthesising evidence on health  
142 inequality/inequity research using current methodologies; and
- 143 • potential alternative methodologies or approaches that could enhance the synthesis  
144 of evidence on health inequalities/inequities.

### 145 **2.2.3 Key Informant Interviews**

146 Three key informant interviews were held between March and July 2023. The discussions  
147 were led by TPK, an experienced evidence synthesis researcher, and facilitated by another  
148 expert in the field (PA). Each interview was held online for approximately 90 minutes and  
149 involved at least two experts, allowing for dynamic discussions. The sessions began with a  
150 5-minute introduction, followed by a 10-minute presentation of key findings from a case  
151 study to establish real-world context (Kunonga, Hanratty, et al., 2023). Participants then  
152 engaged in a 30-minute brainstorming exercise to foster collaborative problem-solving.  
153 Another 10-minute presentation of a second case study enhanced learning, followed by  
154 another 30-minute brainstorming session (Kunonga, Spiers, et al., 2023). The sessions  
155 closed with a summary and conclusion, reinforcing key insights. An outline of the session  
156 agenda is presented in Supplementary File 2.

#### 157 **2.2.4 Data collection**

158 Sessions were conducted via Zoom and audio-recorded to capture the conversations and  
159 discussions among the experts. Recordings were accessible only to the two designated  
160 researchers (TPK and PA), who transcribed and anonymised the data for analysis. For  
161 confidentiality, each participant received a unique numeric identifier to attribute their  
162 quotations, ensuring that personal data protection protocols were maintained throughout the  
163 process.

#### 164 **2.2.5 Data analysis**

165 Data analysis followed the approach outlined by Braun and Clark to identify key themes,  
166 patterns, and areas of consensus or disagreement (Braun et al., 2023). Initial coding was  
167 performed by two researchers (TPK and PA) using NVivo software, (Dhakal, 2022) where  
168 segments of data were labelled with codes representing emerging themes. These codes  
169 were then grouped into broader categories, forming initial themes. The themes and sub-  
170 themes were refined iteratively through feedback from the expert panel and further analysis.  
171 This process included revisiting the data to ensure accuracy and representation of insights.  
172 The refined themes were organised into a hierarchical coding frame to illustrate relationships  
173 between broader themes and sub-themes. Data saturation was reached during analysis  
174 when no new themes emerged from the data. Validation of the coding frame was achieved  
175 through discussions with the research team and additional expert input, ensuring reliability  
176 and accuracy. A copy of the coding frame is available in Supplementary File 3.

### 177 **2.3. Phase 3: Finalising framework components for practical application**

178 The final stage involved collating the findings from Phase 1, which identified methodological  
179 gaps in current equity-focused evidence synthesis approaches, and Phase 2, where expert  
180 insights were gathered through key informant interviews to address these gaps. This

181 synthesis of findings informed the structuring of the proposed framework to extend existing  
182 approaches in inequality and/or inequity-focused evidence syntheses. This stage organised  
183 the framework into specific components across specific evidence synthesis process, each  
184 designed to enhance methodologies by incorporating an inequality/inequity-focused,  
185 intersectional, and life-course approach.

### 186 **3. RESULTS OF THE KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS**

#### 187 **3.1 Characteristics of key informants**

188 Of the 13 originally contacted, eight experts participated in the key informant interviews. The  
189 backgrounds and expertise of these eight experts are detailed in Table 1.

190 *Insert Table 1*

191 The following section outlines the key findings with definitions (presented in Table 2) from  
192 the thematic analysis focusing on the two topics under discussion.

193 *Insert Table 2*

#### 194 **3.2 Theme 1: Distinguish between health inequality and health inequities**

195 Participants emphasised the importance of distinguishing between health inequality and  
196 health inequity when conducting evidence synthesis. Since the terms are often used  
197 interchangeably, participants stressed the importance of recognising the subtle yet  
198 significant distinctions, and the need for researchers to overcome any barriers preventing  
199 them from distinguishing these concepts.

200 *“When doing a study of real data, the theoretical difference is not always apparent*  
201 *when using secondary data as to whether it relates to inequality or inequity... but*  
202 *generally one should try to use them correctly.” [Expert 7]*

203 In addition, the meanings of inequality and inequity may vary across languages and cultures,  
204 leading to different interpretations and understandings. Translating these terms accurately  
205 while maintaining their subtle distinctions can be challenging, potentially resulting in  
206 miscommunication and ambiguity.

207 *“...especially when English is not their first language, the translation of inequality and*  
208 *inequity isn’t as clear as it is in English. Internationally, there is a tendency to use*  
209 *inequity, when they mean inequality.” [Expert 4]*

210 Even within the same language, different researchers may use the terms interchangeably or  
211 use other terms to define similar concepts.

212 *“...there is another term that is used quite a lot, particularly in North America, and*  
213 *that is disparity.” [Expert 8]*

214 **3.2 Theme 2: Intersectionality of multiple socio-demographic and commercial factors,**  
215 **and their impact on health outcomes**

216 Participants observed that an intersectional approach offered a deeper, more layered  
217 understanding of health inequalities and inequities. They described how various aspects of  
218 identity, such as race, gender, and socioeconomic status, interact and shape health  
219 outcomes uniquely for each individual. For example, some participants noted that the health  
220 experiences of a Black woman from a low-income background may be distinct from those of  
221 a white woman with similar socioeconomic circumstances. This perspective underscored  
222 how intersecting social identities and structural factors collectively influence health  
223 outcomes, highlighting the importance of tailored interventions that account for these  
224 complexities.

225 *"We must recognise the unique experiences and challenges faced by individuals who*  
226 *belong to multiple marginalised groups. Health inequalities cannot be understood in*  
227 *isolation; we need to consider the intersecting factors of race, gender, and*  
228 *socioeconomic status, for example."* [Expert 5]

229 During the interviews, one participant highlighted the influence of commercial determinants  
230 on health inequities by referencing studies on targeted marketing practices. For example, the  
231 participant noted research that illustrates how the marketing of unhealthy foods and  
232 beverages disproportionately targets low-income communities and ethnic minorities,  
233 exacerbating existing health inequalities and inequities (Harris et al., 2019). This example  
234 highlights how intersectionality can reveal interactions between individual factors and  
235 broader commercial influences.

236 *"What you need to do is take a holistic approach to social and commercial*  
237 *determinants. It's not just about what individuals do; it's also about how businesses*  
238 *influence health, like by making and advertising health products."* [Expert 1]

239 The discussions emphasised the importance of recognising both a health condition and the  
240 context-specific nature of intersectionality. For example, one expert discussed this in terms  
241 of mental health conditions.

242 *"...in conditions like mental health, interventions work very differently for very*  
243 *different groups ...and so, there are different factors that you need to take into*  
244 *account to actually clearly map the pathway to inequalities of these interventions."*  
245 [Expert 6]

246 In addition, the impact of intersecting identities on health outcomes may vary across  
247 geographic, cultural, and socio-political contexts.



248           “...ethnicity is really important in the US, but in some countries like France and  
249           Finland, they don’t specifically distinguish by ethnicity, because everyone is the same  
250           in theory... How that all fits in is that you know different countries have I guess,  
251           priorities, and how they view inequalities.” [Expert 3]

252   Researchers need to consider the unique characteristics of the populations under study and  
253   how different identities intersect with specific contextual factors to influence health  
254   inequalities or inequities.

### 255   **3.3 Theme 3: Incorporate the life-course perspective**

256   Participants recognised that a life-course approach could reveal the cumulative effects of  
257   various life experiences on health outcomes. They discussed how early-life factors, like  
258   socioeconomic status, educational access, and healthcare availability, can create long-term  
259   impacts that extend into adulthood.

260           "Adopting a life-course approach helps us understand the long-term effects of all  
261           determinants on health outcomes." [Expert 4]

262   Additionally, participants pointed out that social issues such as discrimination and structural  
263   inequalities interact with individual life trajectories, influencing health inequalities/inequities.  
264   This perspective highlighted the importance of understanding how both personal and  
265   broader societal factors contribute to health inequalities/inequities, helping to shape  
266   interventions that address not only demographic factors but also the wider commercial and  
267   environmental determinants of health.

268           “Issues like discrimination and systemic inequalities don’t just affect people  
269           individually; they interact with each person’s life path over time, leading to greater  
270           health risks. . . Look beyond individual characteristics and consider the larger social,  
271           economic, and environmental factors that shape people’s health.” [Expert 3]

272   Furthermore, specific life stages can be pivotal in determining health outcomes and  
273   inequalities. Researchers should pay particular attention to how these critical transitions can  
274   influence existing inequalities or inequities.

275           "Health inequalities or inequities can emerge or be exacerbated at critical life  
276           transitions, such as adolescence, adulthood, or older age... You look at maternal or  
277           child mortality and so on. You can go right back to the start and then follow it through  
278           to adult life." [Expert 7]

279   The combination of social identities and life-course trajectories can result in compounded  
280   disadvantage or privilege. Researchers should analyse how identities intersect with life-

281 course experiences, to understand the differential effects of health inequities across diverse  
282 populations.

283 *"Intersecting identities intersect with life-course experiences, creating unique health*  
284 *challenges... it is partly a matter of going back over their life-course to see why they*  
285 *have those adverse health conditions in the first place, and those conditions may be*  
286 *different to where they are now "* [Expert 8]

287 Incorporating a life-course perspective requires longitudinal data and an interdisciplinary  
288 approach. Participants emphasised the importance of data spanning multiple time points and  
289 disciplines, such as sociology, psychology, and public health.

290 *"Integrating a life-course perspective requires longitudinal data and an*  
291 *interdisciplinary approach."* [Expert 2]

292 By integrating these approaches, researchers can understand the dynamic nature of health  
293 inequalities and thus identify opportunities for appropriate interventions at each life stage.

#### 294 **4. THE KUNONGA FRAMEWORK FOR EXTENDING EXISTING APPROACHES IN** 295 **HEALTH INEQUALITY AND/OR INEQUITY-FOCUSED EVIDENCE SYNTHESSES**

296 This section outlines the proposed Kunonga Framework (Table 4), developed to extend  
297 existing approaches in inequality and inequity-focused evidence syntheses. The framework  
298 provides structured guidance at key stages of the review process, helping reviewers to  
299 conduct analyses that are inequality/inequity-focused, intersectional, and sensitive to life-  
300 course perspectives.

301 *Insert Table 3 here*

#### 302 **4.1 Protocol stage**

##### 303 **4.1.1 Define key terms and scope**

304 In addition to standard scope-setting practices, this stage requires reviewers to clarify  
305 whether the primary focus is on health inequality and/or health inequity, establishing explicit  
306 definitions and examples to guide the eligibility criteria. This approach complements existing  
307 frameworks by adding specificity, thereby enhancing alignment with the review's objectives  
308 and clarifying priorities for analysis (O'Neill et al., 2014).

##### 309 **4.1.2 Frameworks and theoretical approach selection**

310 Building on the PROGRESS Plus framework (O'Neill et al., 2014), the proposed framework  
311 includes an intersectional and life-course perspective, addressing social determinants  
312 comprehensively. Integrating these determinants with a life-course approach allows

313 reviewers to explore how health outcomes develop and accumulate across different life  
314 stages, providing a richer analysis of disparities (Ben-Shlomo & Kuh, 2002).

#### 315 **4.1.3 Developing a logic model**

316 As an enhancement to the PRISMA-Equity checklist (Welch et al., 2012), which  
317 recommends integrating equity considerations throughout systematic reviews, the proposed  
318 framework recommends the development of a detailed logic model outlining potential  
319 pathways through which intersectional and life-course factors contribute to health disparities.  
320 This model will help guide data collection, analysis, and interpretation by providing a  
321 structured framework systematically linking multiple intersecting social and structural factors  
322 with their cumulative effects on health inequities over time (Ben-Shlomo & Kuh, 2002; O'Neill  
323 et al., 2014).

#### 324 **4.2 Data extraction stage**

325 Building on existing descriptive methods, this stage emphasises mapping data to examine  
326 patterns and prevalence of inequalities or inequities across selected intersectional and life-  
327 course factors. It is advised that findings are categorised by demographic, socioeconomic  
328 and healthcare factors, revealing differences in access and outcomes. This stage further  
329 encourages specific subgroup and sensitivity analyses to delve into the impact of inequalities  
330 and inequities on health outcomes, allowing for a more granular understanding of systemic  
331 drivers (Gough et al., 2020). Primary literature may originate from various regions with  
332 distinct reporting standards. Hence, reviewers should be vigilant when extracting data on  
333 inequalities or inequities, particularly regarding terms like ethnicity or socioeconomic status,  
334 which may differ across studies (Holman et al., 2021).

#### 335 **4.3 Analysis stage**

##### 336 **4.3.1 Intersectionality**

337 The proposed framework enhances intersectional analyses by applying structured  
338 approaches, such as stratified and subgroup analysis, to systematically assess how  
339 overlapping social determinants shape barriers to care. Reviewers might find it valuable to  
340 construct an intersectionality matrix, where key demographic factors (such as race, gender,  
341 socioeconomic status and age) intersect to discern potential inequities and trends within the  
342 data (Coates et al., 2021). This matrix may help to systematically assess how different  
343 identity markers intersect and impact on outcomes.

344 To integrate intersectionality effectively into evidence synthesis, reviewers should consider  
345 actively involving a diverse range of experts and stakeholders throughout the review  
346 process. Engaging individuals from varied backgrounds (for example, across different

347 ethnicities, genders, levels of education and socioeconomic statuses) can provide unique  
348 insights into how intersecting identities influence health outcomes, thereby enhancing the  
349 depth and contextual relevance of the synthesis. This diversity not only deepens the  
350 contextual relevance of the synthesis but also aligns with already-established inclusive  
351 research standards, such as those outlined by the National Institute for Health and Care  
352 Research Innovations in Clinical Trial Design and Delivery for the Under-served (NIHR-  
353 INCLUDE) framework (National Institute for Health Research, 2020). Although primarily  
354 designed for clinical trials, NIHR-INCLUDE offers valuable guidance for enhancing diversity  
355 and representation in health research, which can be adapted to evidence synthesis to  
356 ensure diverse stakeholder perspectives and address potential biases in the synthesis  
357 process (National Institute for Health Research, 2020). For systematic reviews, the Authors  
358 and Consumers Together Impacting on eVidencE (ACTIVE) framework also offers structured  
359 guidance on stakeholder engagement, helping reviewers plan the stages and levels of  
360 influence that stakeholders can have within the review process (Pollock et al., 2019).  
361 Applying such frameworks can allow reviewers to embed stakeholder contributions  
362 systematically, from protocol development through to data analysis and interpretation,  
363 ensuring findings are validated through multiple perspectives. This collaborative approach  
364 fosters a unique understanding of intersectional issues and promotes inclusivity, ultimately  
365 enriching the quality and applicability of the evidence synthesis.

#### 366 **4.3.2 Life-course analysis**

367 Reviewers can consider integrating the life-course perspective into their analyses to capture  
368 the dynamic nature of health inequalities or inequities over an individual's lifespan. This  
369 perspective acknowledges that health outcomes are shaped by a multitude of factors and  
370 experiences across different life stages (Ben-Shlomo & Kuh, 2002). One approach might  
371 involve reviewers adopting a longitudinal framework within data synthesis, where reviewers  
372 systematically gather and integrate evidence on exposures, interventions, and outcomes  
373 across various life stages. Reviewers may find it valuable to draw upon life-course  
374 frameworks, such as the critical period model (which proposes that certain early-life  
375 exposures have a profound and lasting impact on health outcomes), or the accumulation  
376 model (which suggests that the cumulative effects of multiple exposures and experiences  
377 over time shape health outcomes) (Ben-Shlomo & Kuh, 2002). In doing so, they may  
378 elucidate the ways in which early-life factors collectively shape health trajectories in later life  
379 (Ben-Shlomo & Kuh, 2002). Factors such as socioeconomic status, access to resources and  
380 exposure to risk factors should be considered across the life span to comprehensively  
381 understand the complexities of health inequalities or inequities (Caruana et al., 2015).

## 382 **5. DISCUSSION**

## 383 **5.1 Main findings**

384 The Kunonga Framework advocates for a deeper understanding of health inequalities or  
385 inequities in evidence synthesis by focusing on three key themes: distinguishing between  
386 health inequality and inequity; incorporating intersectionality; and adopting a life-course  
387 perspective. With these themes, the proposed extended framework aims to enhance current  
388 efforts by comprehensively exploring the complex interplay of social, economic and  
389 environmental factors influencing health outcomes and healthcare accessibility across  
390 diverse population groups.

391 The evolving landscape of addressing health inequalities/inequities necessitates an  
392 approach that synergises existing tools and strategies used by policymakers and  
393 researchers (Kunonga, Spiers, et al., 2023). The themes identified by our work add value  
394 compared to current conventional approaches. First, we emphasise the critical difference  
395 between health inequality and inequity. While traditional frameworks may identify inequalities  
396 or inequities in health outcomes, they often fail to distinguish between inherent differences  
397 and unjust, avoidable differences (Kunonga, Hanratty, et al., 2023). Our approach highlights  
398 this crucial distinction, urging reviewers to scrutinise health differences through the lens of  
399 underlying social determinants and structures, thereby providing a more nuanced  
400 understanding of the origins of inequalities or inequities.

401 Secondly, our approach encourages the incorporation of intersectionality, recognising the  
402 intricate interplay of multiple social identities and determinants in shaping health outcomes  
403 (Crenshaw, 2017). By acknowledging the diverse socio-cultural environments in which  
404 health inequalities or inequities occur, we aim to prevent oversimplification and perpetuation  
405 of inequalities/inequities in policy and practice. However, it is crucial to acknowledge that the  
406 omission of various dimensions of an individual's identities may originate from oversights in  
407 primary studies. Reviewers are prompted to consider how contextual factors, including  
408 economic forces and commercial determinants, intersect with social identities to exacerbate  
409 inequalities and shape health outcomes, thus advocating for interventions that address  
410 systemic influences (Holman et al., 2021).

411 Finally, integrating a life-course perspective enhances our understanding of health  
412 inequalities or inequities by acknowledging their dynamic nature over an individual's lifespan  
413 (Ben-Shlomo & Kuh, 2002). By considering past experiences and exposures, we gain  
414 insights into the long-term trajectories of health inequalities or inequities and the structural  
415 determinants that shape health outcomes at different stages of life (Ben-Shlomo & Kuh,  
416 2002). This perspective informs targeted interventions and policies aimed at addressing  
417 health inequalities and inequities across the lifespan (Jones et al., 2019). To enhance the

418 contribution of evidence syntheses towards addressing inequity and inequality, researchers  
419 conducting primary studies may need to strengthen data collection on diverse social  
420 determinants, integrate an intersectional lens in their analyses, and ensure explicit reporting  
421 on how these intersecting factors impact health over time. Overall, our approach urges  
422 reviewers to adopt a lens that encompasses these three concepts, thereby advancing more  
423 comprehensive and effective strategies for addressing health inequalities and inequities in  
424 evidence synthesis.

## 425 **5.2 Strengths and limitations**

426 This study used a structured, three-phase approach to develop the Kunonga Framework,  
427 integrating inequality and inequity considerations into evidence synthesis. The framework's  
428 construction followed an iterative process: a systematic review to identify gaps, Key  
429 Informant Interviews with eight health inequality and inequity experts, and synthesis of  
430 findings into a practical framework. This phased design allowed for continual refinement,  
431 ensuring that each phase built upon previous insights to produce a comprehensive, context-  
432 sensitive framework.

433 One key strength of this approach is its methodological rigour. The systematic review phase  
434 established a solid foundation by identifying gaps in existing inequality/inequity-focused  
435 evidence synthesis methodologies, ensuring that the framework builds upon, rather than  
436 duplicates, prior work (Kunonga, Hanratty, et al., 2023). The use of Key Informant Interviews  
437 provided qualitative insights, contextualising these gaps and guiding framework elements by  
438 capturing unique perspectives on the needs and challenges of equity-focused synthesis  
439 (Akhter, 2022; Pahwa et al., 2023). This combined approach facilitated a holistic  
440 understanding of the multi-dimensional factors influencing health inequalities, which is  
441 crucial for developing effective interventions.

442 However, limitations in the framework construction process were also noted. First, the  
443 framework's reliance on a limited number of expert interviews means it may not fully  
444 represent the diverse perspectives and contexts relevant to global health inequities  
445 (Creswell & Clark, 2017; Denscombe, 2017). In addition, while the iterative synthesis  
446 enabled refinement, certain complexities in operationalising intersectionality and life-course  
447 theories, such as varying interpretations and applications across different health contexts  
448 may pose challenges for generalisability.

## 449 **5.3 Implications for research**

450 This work lays the groundwork for forthcoming papers where practical implementation of the  
451 framework will be comprehensively explored using evidence synthesis case studies. These  
452 case studies will serve as practical demonstrations of how to apply the proposed

453 comprehensive approach, ensuring its effective integration into healthcare policy and  
454 practice. Additionally, these case studies will provide opportunities to refine and evaluate the  
455 framework, assessing its adaptability across diverse contexts and identifying potential  
456 improvements to further enhance the utility of the Kunonga Framework in addressing health  
457 inequalities and inequities within evidence syntheses.

458 Adopting the Kunonga Framework may reveal important challenges in measuring health  
459 inequalities and inequities due to data limitations, particularly around implementing  
460 intersectionality theory. For example, data collection on sensitive topics such as race and  
461 sexuality may be hindered by underreporting and privacy concerns, which can limit the depth  
462 of intersectional analyses (Sannon & Forte, 2022). Similarly, the practical implementation of  
463 the life-course approach in evidence synthesis may be hindered by the scarcity of  
464 longitudinal data, particularly in resource-constrained settings (Reilly et al., 2019).

465 While further empirical refinement and validation of the framework is needed, its structured,  
466 intersectional, and life-course focus may highlight areas where current data infrastructure  
467 falls short, particularly in tracking health inequalities/inequities over time and across diverse  
468 social identities. For instance, by using the framework to organise and analyse existing data,  
469 researchers may identify where longitudinal or demographic-specific data is insufficient,  
470 guiding future research priorities.

#### 471 **5.4 Implications for policy**

472 The proposed Kunonga Framework will not only enhance our comprehension of health  
473 inequalities or inequities within evidence syntheses but will also offer a pathway for  
474 translating research findings into actionable policy recommendations and interventions. By  
475 identifying the root causes of health inequalities/inequities and understanding their dynamic  
476 nature across the life course and among diverse populations, policymakers and practitioners  
477 will be able to design targeted interventions that address underlying structural factors.

#### 478 **6. CONCLUSION**

479 This paper contends that the current state of evidence synthesis in health inequality/inequity  
480 research is inadequate in capturing the multifaceted and dynamic nature of the issue. To  
481 move beyond single estimates and isolated determinants, the Kunonga Framework presents  
482 a holistic approach offering valuable additions to the toolkit of evidence synthesis for public  
483 health practitioners and policymakers. By integrating these new elements to traditional  
484 approaches, we can better understand, address, and ultimately reduce health  
485 inequalities/inequities, promoting a more just and equitable society. Future research should  
486 validate and refine this theoretical framework, ensuring its robust adaptability and  
487 applicability across a wide range of contexts and populations.

488 **Funding/support:** This research is funded through the National Institute for Health and Care  
489 Research (NIHR) Policy Research Unit in Older People and Frailty (funding reference PR-  
490 PRU-1217-2150). As of 01.01.24, the unit has been renamed to the NIHR Policy Research  
491 Unit in Healthy Ageing (funding reference NIHR206119). The views expressed are those of  
492 the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social  
493 Care.

494 **Disclosure statement:** The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

495 **Author contributions:** TPK conceptualised the study, developed the methodology, curated  
496 the data, prepared the original draft, acquired resources, performed formal analysis, and  
497 managed project administration. TPK, PA, BH, PB, and DC contributed to visualisation,  
498 investigation, and validation. BH, PB, and DC supervised the project. TPK, PA, EEJ, BH, PB,  
499 and DC reviewed and edited the manuscript.

500 **Acknowledgements:** I would like to thank my PhD internal assessors, Professor Sheena  
501 Ramsay and Professor Thomas Scharf from Newcastle University, and members of the  
502 expert panel who generously provided knowledge and expertise.

503 **Data availability statement:** All data relevant to the study are included in the article or  
504 uploaded as supplemental information.

505 **Ethical approval:** This study was exempt from ethical approval as it involved experts in the  
506 field who provided informed consent to participate. Additionally, identifiers were removed  
507 from the data upon transcription.

508 **Patient involvement:** No patients or public were involved in the planning or drafting of this  
509 article.

## 510 7. REFERENCES

- 511 Akhter, S. (2022). Key Informants' Interviews. In M. R. Islam, N. A. Khan, & R. Baikady (Eds.),  
512 *Principles of Social Research Methodology* (pp. 389-403). Springer Nature Singapore.  
513 [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-5441-2\\_27](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-5441-2_27)
- 514 Arcaya, M. C., Arcaya, A. L., & Subramanian, S. (2015). Inequalities in health: definitions, concepts,  
515 and theories. *Global health action*, 8(1), 27106. <https://doi.org/10.3402/gha.v8.27106>
- 516 Bambra, C. (2022). Placing intersectional inequalities in health. *Health & Place*, 75, 102761.  
517 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2022.102761>
- 518 Ben-Shlomo, Y., & Kuh, D. (2002). A life course approach to chronic disease epidemiology:  
519 conceptual models, empirical challenges and interdisciplinary perspectives. 31(2), 285-293.  
520 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/31.2.285>
- 521 Braun, V., Clarke, V., & Hayfield, N. (2023). Thematic analysis: A reflexive approach. In *Qualitative*  
522 *Psychology: A Practical Guide to Research Methods* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.  
523 <https://uwe-repository.worktribe.com/output/10434585>
- 524 Caruana, E. J., Roman, M., Hernández-Sánchez, J., & Solli, P. (2015). Longitudinal studies. *Journal of*  
525 *thoracic disease*, 7(11), E537. <https://doi.org/10.3978%2Fj.issn.2072-1439.2015.10.63>



- 526 Chamberlain, A. M., Sauver, J. L. S., Rutten, L. J. F., Fan, C., Jacobson, D. J., Wilson, P. M., Boyd, C. M.,  
527 & Rocca, W. A. (2022). Associations of neighborhood socioeconomic disadvantage with  
528 chronic conditions by age, sex, race, and ethnicity in a population-based cohort. *Mayo Clinic*  
529 *Proceedings*, 97(1), 57-67. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocp.2021.09.006>
- 530 Coates, R. D., Ferber, A. L., & Brunnsma, D. L. (2021). *The Matrix of Race: Social Construction,*  
531 *Intersectionality, and Inequality*. SAGE Publications.  
532 <https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=DZE2EAAAQBAJ>
- 533 Cochrane Methods Equity. (2024). *PROGRESS-Plus*. Retrieved 9 November from  
534 <https://methods.cochrane.org/equity/projects/evidence-equity/progress-plus>
- 535 Crenshaw, K. W. (2017). *On intersectionality: Essential writings*. Faculty Books. 255.  
536 <https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/books/255/>
- 537 Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Sage  
538 publications.
- 539 Denscombe, M. (2017). *EBOOK: The good research guide: For small-scale social research projects*  
540 (Sixth ed.). McGraw-Hill Education (UK).  
541 [https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=SMovEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&ots=ILgaUcS7m8&sig=7oKrSbpzREO49loIOY420euKLMU&redir\\_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=SMovEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&ots=ILgaUcS7m8&sig=7oKrSbpzREO49loIOY420euKLMU&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false)
- 542
- 543 Dhakal, K. (2022). NVivo. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 110(2), 270-272.  
544 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2022.1271>
- 545 Gough, D., Davies, P., Jamtvedt, G., Langlois, E., Littell, J., Lotfi, T., Masset, E., Merlin, T., Pullin, A. S.,  
546 & Ritskes-Hoitinga, M. (2020). Evidence Synthesis International (ESI): Position Statement.  
547 *Systematic reviews*, 9(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-020-01415-5>
- 548 Harris, J., Frazier III, W., Fleming-Milici, F., Hubert, P., Rodriguez-Arauz, G., Grier, S., & Appiah, O.  
549 (2019). A qualitative assessment of US Black and Latino adolescents' attitudes about  
550 targeted marketing of unhealthy food and beverages. *Journal of Children and Media*, 13(3),  
551 295-316. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/17482798.2019.1604394>
- 552 Higgins, J. P. T., Thomas, J., Chandler, J., Cumpston, M., Li, T., Page, M. J., & Welch, V. A. (2023,  
553 August 2023). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.4*  
554 Cochrane, 2023. Retrieved 30 April from [www.training.cochrane.org/handbook](http://www.training.cochrane.org/handbook)
- 555 Holman, D., Salway, S., Bell, A., Beach, B., Adebajo, A., Ali, N., & Butt, J. (2021). Can intersectionality  
556 help with understanding and tackling health inequalities? Perspectives of professional  
557 stakeholders. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, 19(1), 97.  
558 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-021-00742-w>
- 559 Jones, N. L., Gilman, S. E., Cheng, T. L., Drury, S. S., Hill, C. V., & Geronimus, A. T. (2019). Life course  
560 approaches to the causes of health disparities. *American journal of public health*, 109(S1),  
561 S48-S55. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.2018.304738>
- 562 Kapilashrami, A., & Hankivsky, O. (2018). Intersectionality and why it matters to global health. *The*  
563 *Lancet*, 391(10140), 2589-2591. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31431-4)  
564 [6736\(18\)31431-4](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31431-4)
- 565 Kunonga, T. P., Hanratty, B., Bower, P., & Craig, D. (2023). A systematic review finds a lack of  
566 consensus in methodological approaches in health inequality/inequity focused reviews.  
567 *Journal of clinical epidemiology*, 156, 76-84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2023.02.013>
- 568 Kunonga, T. P., Spiers, G. F., Richmond, C., Beyer, F. R., Bower, P., Hanratty, B., & Craig, D. (2023).  
569 Health interventions and the unseen impact on equality. *The Lancet Healthy Longevity*, 4(1),  
570 e8-e9. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-7568\(22\)00268-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-7568(22)00268-9)
- 571 Langlois Éennev, W. V., Tugwell Peter. (2018). Addressing Health Equity in Syntheses of Health  
572 Policy and Systems Research. In *Evidence Synthesis for Health Policy and Systems: A Methods*  
573 *Guide*. World Health Organization. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK569594/>
- 574 Marmot, M. (2005). Social determinants of health inequalities. *The Lancet*, 365(9464), 1099-1104.  
575 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(05\)71146-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(05)71146-6)

- 576 Marmot, M., Friel, S., Bell, R., Houweling, T. A., & Taylor, S. (2008). Closing the gap in a generation:  
577 health equity through action on the social determinants of health. *The Lancet*, 372(9650),  
578 1661-1669. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(08\)61690-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(08)61690-6)
- 579 McMeekin, N., Wu, O., Germeni, E., & Briggs, A. (2020). How methodological frameworks are being  
580 developed: evidence from a scoping review. *BMC medical research methodology*, 20(1), 173.  
581 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-020-01061-4>
- 582 National Institute for Health Research. (2020). *Improving inclusion of under-served groups in clinical*  
583 *research: Guidance from the NIHR-INCLUDE project*. Retrieved 10 November from  
584 [https://www.nihr.ac.uk/improving-inclusion-under-served-groups-clinical-research-](https://www.nihr.ac.uk/improving-inclusion-under-served-groups-clinical-research-guidance-include-project)  
585 [guidance-include-project](https://www.nihr.ac.uk/improving-inclusion-under-served-groups-clinical-research-guidance-include-project)
- 586 O'Neill, J., Tabish, H., Welch, V., Petticrew, M., Pottie, K., Clarke, M., Evans, T., Pardo Pardo, J.,  
587 Waters, E., White, H., & Tugwell, P. (2014). Applying an equity lens to interventions: using  
588 PROGRESS ensures consideration of socially stratifying factors to illuminate inequities in  
589 health. *J Clin Epidemiol*, 67(1), 56-64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.08.005>
- 590 Orton, L., Lloyd-Williams, F., Taylor-Robinson, D., O'Flaherty, M., & Capewell, S. (2011). The use of  
591 research evidence in public health decision making processes: systematic review. *PLoS One*,  
592 6(7), e21704. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0021704>
- 593 Pahwa, M. (2023). *Ethical dimensions of lung cancer screening in Canada*  
594 [https://macsphere.mcmaster.ca/bitstream/11375/28905/2/Pahwa\\_Manisha\\_08-](https://macsphere.mcmaster.ca/bitstream/11375/28905/2/Pahwa_Manisha_08-2023_Health%20Policy%20PhD.pdf)  
595 [2023\\_Health%20Policy%20PhD.pdf](https://macsphere.mcmaster.ca/bitstream/11375/28905/2/Pahwa_Manisha_08-2023_Health%20Policy%20PhD.pdf)
- 596 Pahwa, M., Cavanagh, A., & Vanstone, M. (2023). Key Informants in Applied Qualitative Health  
597 Research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 33(14), 1251-1261.  
598 <https://doi.org/10.1177/10497323231198796>
- 599 Pollock, A., Campbell, P., Struthers, C., Synnot, A., Nunn, J., Hill, S., Goodare, H., Morris, J., Watts, C.,  
600 & Morley, R. (2019). Development of the ACTIVE framework to describe stakeholder  
601 involvement in systematic reviews. *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy*, 24(4), 245-  
602 255. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1355819619841647>
- 603 Reilly, J. J., Hughes, A. R., Gillespie, J., Malden, S., & Martin, A. (2019). Physical activity interventions  
604 in early life aimed at reducing later risk of obesity and related non-communicable diseases: A  
605 rapid review of systematic reviews. *Obesity Reviews*, 20, 61-73.  
606 <https://doi.org/10.1111/obr.12773>
- 607 Sannon, S., & Forte, A. (2022). Privacy research with marginalized groups: what we know, what's  
608 needed, and what's next. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*,  
609 6(CSCW2), 1-33. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3555556>
- 610 Tong, A., Sainsbury, P., & Craig, J. (2007). Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research  
611 (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for*  
612 *Quality in Health Care*, 19(6), 349-357. <https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzm042>
- 613 Welch, V., Petticrew, M., Tugwell, P., Moher, D., O'Neill, J., Waters, E., White, H., & group, P.-E. B.  
614 (2012). PRISMA-Equity 2012 extension: reporting guidelines for systematic reviews with a  
615 focus on health equity. *PLoS medicine*, 9(10), e1001333.  
616 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001333>
- 617

618 **Table 1: Characteristics of experts**

<b>Expert</b>	<b>Expertise</b>	<b>Title</b>
1	Evidence synthesis	Professor of Health & Wellbeing Evidence
2	Evidence synthesis	Professor in Evidence Synthesis
3	Health inequality	Professor of Health Inequalities
4	Evidence Synthesis	Senior Lecturer in Evidence Synthesis
5	Health inequality	Public Health Scientist
6	Health inequality	Health Economist
7	Health equity	Statistical Advisor
8	Health inequality and evidence synthesis	Emeritus Professor of Global Health

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635 **Table 2: Identified themes**

Theme	Explanation
Differentiating between health inequality and health inequity	Emphasises the importance of distinguishing between health inequality, which refers to differences in health status or determinants among individuals or populations, and health inequity, which refers to unnecessary, avoidable, and unjust differences in health (Arcaya et al., 2015).
Applying an intersectionality lens	<p>An intersectionality lens allows understanding of how multiple social categories, such as gender, race, socioeconomic status, and age, intersect and shape health outcomes. Individuals may experience multiple forms of disadvantage or privilege simultaneously, and these factors can accumulate or add up to produce different health outcomes (Crenshaw, 2017; Kapilashrami &amp; Hankivsky, 2018):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accumulative effects: The impact of each additional marginalised identity or social disadvantage increases the overall burden experienced by an individual.</li> <li>• Additive effects: Different forms of advantage or disadvantage interact in a more linear or straightforward manner, leading to combined effects that are the sum of the individual effects.</li> </ul>
Applying the life-course approach	Recognises that health trajectories are shaped by experiences and exposures across different stages of life. Captures the temporal dimension, acknowledging the significance of early-life determinants, critical periods, and cumulative effects on health inequalities throughout the life course (Ben-Shlomo & Kuh, 2002; Caruana et al., 2015).

636

637

638 **Table 3: The Kunonga Framework for Extending Existing Approaches in Inequality/Inequity-Focused Evidence Syntheses**

Stage	Component	Description
Protocol Stage	Define Key Terms and Scope	In addition to standard scope-setting, clarify the primary focus on health inequality and/or health inequity, providing clear definitions and examples. This step ensures alignment with the review’s objectives and establishes priorities for eligibility criteria and subsequent analysis.
	Frameworks and Theoretical Approach Selection	Select appropriate frameworks, such as PROGRESS Plus, incorporating both intersectional and life-course perspectives to address social determinants comprehensively. This integration enables an exploration of how health outcomes develop and vary across life stages and social contexts.
	Developing a Logic Model	Develop a detailed logic model that visualises potential pathways through which intersecting social and structural factors, along with life-course elements, contribute to health disparities. This model may guide data collection, analysis, and interpretation, mapping cumulative impacts on health over time.
Data Extraction Stage	Mapping Data	Organise and categorise data by demographic, socioeconomic, and healthcare factors to reveal disparities in access and outcomes.
Analysis Stage	Intersectionality	Construct an intersectionality matrix to examine how overlapping factors such as race, gender, socioeconomic status, and age shape access to care and health outcomes. Applying structured subgroup analyses can further highlight barriers faced by specific groups and trends across these intersections.
	Life-course Analysis	Adopt a life-course perspective by analysing health outcomes as they evolve across different life stages. Use frameworks such as the critical period model or accumulation model to assess how early-

Stage	Component	Description
		life exposures and cumulative experiences impact health trajectories over time, providing a holistic view of inequalities.

639 \*It is important to note that the list of statistical methods suggested is not exhaustive but rather can be tailored to the specific requirements of  
640 an evidence synthesis study

641

642

643

644

645

646

647

648

649

650

651

652

653 **Supplementary Materials**

654 Supplementary File 1: Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research (COREQ)  
655 checklist.

656 Supplementary File 2: Key Informant Interviews Agenda.

657 Supplementary File 3: Coding Frame for Health Inequality and Inequity Framework.