medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.13.24317273; this version posted November 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

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

Tafadzwa Patience Kunonga,[1,2] Pauline Addis,[2] Eugenie Evelynne Johnson,[2] Peter Bower,[3] Barbara Hanratty,[1] Dawn Craig[1,2]

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

[2]National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Innovation Observatory, Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE4 5TG, UK

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

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

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

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

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.13.24317273; this version posted November 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT

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

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.13.24317273; this version posted November 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

1. INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.13.24317273; this version posted November 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

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

1.1 Research Aim

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

1.2 Research Objectives:

a. To gather expert insights through key informant interviews, identifying critical themes necessary for advancing beyond traditional evidence synthesis approaches in health inequality and inequity research.

b. To develop and refine the Kunonga Framework, incorporating insights from the key informant interviews to enhance its applicability for comprehensive and intersectional, and life-course analysis of health inequalities/inequities.

2. METHODS

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

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

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

2.2 Phase 2: Key Informant Interviews to Address Methodological Gaps

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.13.24317273; this version posted November 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

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

2.2.1 Selection and recruitment of experts

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

2.2.2 Pilot workshops

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

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

2.2.3 Key Informant Interviews

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.13.24317273; this version posted November 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

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

2.2.4 Data collection

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

2.2.5 Data analysis

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

2.3. Phase 3: Finalising framework components for practical application

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.13.24317273; this version posted November 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

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

3. RESULTS OF THE KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS

3.1 Characteristics of key informants

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

Insert Table 1

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

Insert Table 2

3.2 Theme 1: Distinguish between health inequality and health inequities

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

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

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

> "*…especially when English is not their first language, the translation of inequality and inequity isn't as clear as it is in English. Internationally, there is a tendency to use inequity, when they mean inequality*." [Expert 4]

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

> "*…there is another term that is used quite a lot, particularly in North America, and that is disparity*." [Expert 8]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.13.24317273; this version posted November 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.13.24317273; this version posted November 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

> "*…ethnicity is really important in the US, but in some countries like France and Finland, they don't specifically distinguish by ethnicity, because everyone is the same in theory… How that all fits in is that you know different countries have I guess, priorities, and how they view inequalities*." [Expert 3]

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

3.3 Theme 3: Incorporate the life-course perspective

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.13.24317273; this version posted November 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

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

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

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

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

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

4. THE KUNONGA FRAMEWORK FOR EXTENDING EXISTING APPROACHES IN HEALTH INEQUALITY AND/OR INEQUITY-FOCUSED EVIDENCE SYNTHESES

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

Insert Table 3 here

4.1 Protocol stage

4.1.1 Define key terms and scope

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

4.1.2 Frameworks and theoretical approach selection

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.13.24317273; this version posted November 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

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

4.1.3 Developing a logic model

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

4.2 Data extraction stage

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

4.3 Analysis stage

4.3.1 Intersectionality

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

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.13.24317273; this version posted November 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

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

4.3.2 Life-course analysis

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

5. DISCUSSION

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.13.24317273; this version posted November 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

5.1 Main findings

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

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

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

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.13.24317273; this version posted November 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

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

5.2 Strengths and limitations

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

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

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

5.3 Implications for research

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.13.24317273; this version posted November 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

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

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

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

5.4 Implications for policy

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

6. CONCLUSION

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.13.24317273; this version posted November 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7. REFERENCES

Akhter, S. (2022). Key Informants' Interviews. In M. R. Islam, N. A. Khan, & R. Baikady (Eds.), *Principles of Social Research Methodology* (pp. 389-403). Springer Nature Singapore. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-5441-2_27

Arcaya, M. C., Arcaya, A. L., & Subramanian, S. (2015). Inequalities in health: definitions, concepts, and theories. *Global health action*, *8*(1), 27106. https://doi.org/10.3402/gha.v8.27106

Bambra, C. (2022). Placing intersectional inequalities in health. *Health & Place*, *75*, 102761. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2022.102761

Ben-Shlomo, Y., & Kuh, D. (2002). A life course approach to chronic disease epidemiology: conceptual models, empirical challenges and interdisciplinary perspectives. *31*(2), 285-293. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/31.2.285

Braun, V., Clarke, V., & Hayfield, N. (2023). Thematic analysis: A reflexive approach. In *Qualitative Psychology: A Practical Guide to Research Methods* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications. https://uwe-repository.worktribe.com/output/10434585

Caruana, E. J., Roman, M., Hernández-Sánchez, J., & Solli, P. (2015). Longitudinal studies. *Journal of thoracic disease*, *7*(11), E537. https://doi.org/10.3978%2Fj.issn.2072-1439.2015.10.63

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.13.24317273; this version posted November 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Chamberlain, A. M., Sauver, J. L. S., Rutten, L. J. F., Fan, C., Jacobson, D. J., Wilson, P. M., Boyd, C. M., & Rocca, W. A. (2022). Associations of neighborhood socioeconomic disadvantage with chronic conditions by age, sex, race, and ethnicity in a population-based cohort. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, *97*(1), 57-67. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocp.2021.09.006

Coates, R. D., Ferber, A. L., & Brunsma, D. L. (2021). *The Matrix of Race: Social Construction, Intersectionality, and Inequality*. SAGE Publications. https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=DZE2EAAAQBAJ

Cochrane Methods Equity. (2024). *PROGRESS-Plus*. Retrieved 9 November from https://methods.cochrane.org/equity/projects/evidence-equity/progress-plus

Crenshaw, K. W. (2017). *On intersectionality: Essential writings*. Faculty Books. 255. https://scholarship.law.columbia.edu/books/255/

Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Sage publications.

Denscombe, M. (2017). *EBOOK: The good research guide: For small-scale social research projects* (Sixth ed.). McGraw-Hill Education (UK). https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=SMovEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&ots=lLgaUcS7m8&sig=7oKrSbpzREO49IoIOY420euKLmU&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false

Dhakal, K. (2022). NVivo. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, *110*(2), 270-272. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2022.1271

Gough, D., Davies, P., Jamtvedt, G., Langlois, E., Littell, J., Lotfi, T., Masset, E., Merlin, T., Pullin, A. S., & Ritskes-Hoitinga, M. (2020). Evidence Synthesis International (ESI): Position Statement. *Systematic reviews*, *9*(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-020-01415-5

Harris, J., Frazier III, W., Fleming-Milici, F., Hubert, P., Rodriguez-Arauz, G., Grier, S., & Appiah, O. (2019). A qualitative assessment of US Black and Latino adolescents' attitudes about targeted marketing of unhealthy food and beverages. *Journal of Children and Media*, *13*(3), 295-316. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/17482798.2019.1604394

Higgins, J. P. T., Thomas, J., Chandler, J., Cumpston, M., Li, T., Page, M. J., & Welch, V. A. (2023, August 2023). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.4* Cochrane, 2023. Retrieved 30 April from www.training.cochrane.org/handbook

Holman, D., Salway, S., Bell, A., Beach, B., Adebajo, A., Ali, N., & Butt, J. (2021). Can intersectionality help with understanding and tackling health inequalities? Perspectives of professional stakeholders. *Health Research Policy and Systems*, *19*(1), 97. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-021-00742-w

Jones, N. L., Gilman, S. E., Cheng, T. L., Drury, S. S., Hill, C. V., & Geronimus, A. T. (2019). Life course approaches to the causes of health disparities. *American journal of public health*, *109*(S1), S48-S55. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.2018.304738

Kapilashrami, A., & Hankivsky, O. (2018). Intersectionality and why it matters to global health. *The Lancet*, *391*(10140), 2589-2591. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(18)31431-4

Kunonga, T. P., Hanratty, B., Bower, P., & Craig, D. (2023). A systematic review finds a lack of consensus in methodological approaches in health inequality/inequity focused reviews. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*, *156*, 76-84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2023.02.013

Kunonga, T. P., Spiers, G. F., Richmond, C., Beyer, F. R., Bower, P., Hanratty, B., & Craig, D. (2023). Health interventions and the unseen impact on equality. *The Lancet Healthy Longevity*, *4*(1), e8-e9. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-7568(22)00268-9

Langlois Éennev, W. V., Tugwell Peter,. (2018). Addressing Health Equity in Syntheses of Health Policy and Systems Research. In *Evidence Synthesis for Health Policy and Systems: A Methods Guide.* World Health Organization. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK569594/

Marmot, M. (2005). Social determinants of health inequalities. *The Lancet*, *365*(9464), 1099-1104. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(05)71146-6

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.13.24317273; this version posted November 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Marmot, M., Friel, S., Bell, R., Houweling, T. A., & Taylor, S. (2008). Closing the gap in a generation: health equity through action on the social determinants of health. *The Lancet*, *372*(9650), 1661-1669. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(08)61690-6

McMeekin, N., Wu, O., Germeni, E., & Briggs, A. (2020). How methodological frameworks are being developed: evidence from a scoping review. *BMC medical research methodology*, *20*(1), 173. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-020-01061-4

National Institute for Health Research. (2020). *Improving inclusion of under-served groups in clinical research: Guidance from the NIHR-INCLUDE project*. Retrieved 10 November from https://www.nihr.ac.uk/improving-inclusion-under-served-groups-clinical-research-guidance-include-project

O'Neill, J., Tabish, H., Welch, V., Petticrew, M., Pottie, K., Clarke, M., Evans, T., Pardo Pardo, J., Waters, E., White, H., & Tugwell, P. (2014). Applying an equity lens to interventions: using PROGRESS ensures consideration of socially stratifying factors to illuminate inequities in health. *J Clin Epidemiol*, *67*(1), 56-64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2013.08.005

Orton, L., Lloyd-Williams, F., Taylor-Robinson, D., O'Flaherty, M., & Capewell, S. (2011). The use of research evidence in public health decision making processes: systematic review. *PLoS One*, *6*(7), e21704. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0021704

Pahwa, M. (2023). *Ethical dimensions of lung cancer screening in Canada* https://macsphere.mcmaster.ca/bitstream/11375/28905/2/Pahwa_Manisha_08-2023_Health%20Policy%20PhD.pdf

Pahwa, M., Cavanagh, A., & Vanstone, M. (2023). Key Informants in Applied Qualitative Health Research. *Qualitative Health Research*, *33*(14), 1251-1261. https://doi.org/10.1177/10497323231198796

Pollock, A., Campbell, P., Struthers, C., Synnot, A., Nunn, J., Hill, S., Goodare, H., Morris, J., Watts, C., & Morley, R. (2019). Development of the ACTIVE framework to describe stakeholder involvement in systematic reviews. *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy*, *24*(4), 245-255. https://doi.org/10.1177/1355819619841647

Reilly, J. J., Hughes, A. R., Gillespie, J., Malden, S., & Martin, A. (2019). Physical activity interventions in early life aimed at reducing later risk of obesity and related non-communicable diseases: A rapid review of systematic reviews. *Obesity Reviews*, *20*, 61-73. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/obr.12773

Sannon, S., & Forte, A. (2022). Privacy research with marginalized groups: what we know, what's needed, and what's next. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, *6*(CSCW2), 1-33. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1145/3555556

Tong, A., Sainsbury, P., & Craig, J. (2007). Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, *19*(6), 349-357. https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzm042

Welch, V., Petticrew, M., Tugwell, P., Moher, D., O'Neill, J., Waters, E., White, H., & group, P.-E. B. (2012). PRISMA-Equity 2012 extension: reporting guidelines for systematic reviews with a focus on health equity. *PLoS medicine*, *9*(10), e1001333. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001333

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.13.24317273; this version posted November 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1: Characteristics of experts

Expert	Expertise	Title
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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.13.24317273; this version posted November 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

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	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 & Hankivsky, 2018): • Accumulative effects: The impact of each additional marginalised identity or social disadvantage increases the overall burden experienced by an individual. • 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.
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).

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.

*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 an evidence synthesis study

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.11.13.24317273; this version posted November 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Supplementary Materials

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

Supplementary File 2: Key Informant Interviews Agenda.

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