

REPRISE Checklist

REporting guideline for PRiority SETting of health research (Tong et al. 2019)

Manuscript: Towards a credible trial of the health effects of Universal Basic Income in Norway

No.	Item	Descriptor/Examples	Reported (Yes/No/Partial)	Location in manuscript (line numbers and notes)
A	Context and scope			
1	Define geographical scope	Global, regional, national, city, local area, institutional/organizational level, health service	Yes	Lines 153–158: Norway. Also title and throughout.
2	Define health area, field, focus	Disease or condition specific, interventions, healthcare delivery, health system	Yes	Lines 46–54 (abstract), 89–124 (Background): MSK and mental health conditions; UBI as intervention; health effects focus.
3	Define the intended beneficiaries	General population or specific population based on demographic, clinical, or other characteristics	Yes	Lines 126–128: Adults legally resident and entitled to work in a country.
4	Define the target audience of the priorities	Policy makers, funders, researchers, industry or others who have the potential to implement the priorities identified	Yes	Lines 160–166: Health and political science researchers preparing a credible grant application in the Norwegian context.
5	Identify the research area	Public health, health services research, clinical research, basic science	Yes	Lines 89–166: Public health; health services research; UBI policy research.
6	Identify the type of research questions	Etiology, diagnosis, prevention, treatment, health services, psychosocial, economic evaluation, implementation; may not be pre-defined	Yes	Tables 2a and 2b (lines 289–303): Research questions ordered by study type including systematic reviews, qualitative, Delphi, DCE, ecological, interventional, cohort, cross-sectional, case-control.
7	Define the time frame	Interim, short-term, long-term priorities, plans to revise and update	No	Not explicitly stated. The priorities are presented as underpinning work needed before a grant application.
B	Governance and team			
8	Describe the selection and structure of the leadership and management team	Those responsible for initiating, developing, and guiding the process; e.g. Steering Committee, Advisory Group, Technical Experts	Yes	Lines 170–172: Working group formed following a meeting between pain researchers (RF, MG, MU) and UBI researchers (AHB, AWP).
9	Describe the characteristics of the team	Stakeholder group or role, institutional affiliations, country or region, demographics, discipline, experience, expertise	Yes	Table 1 (line 254): Age, sex, country of residence, principal background, years of experience in discipline and UBI/health research.
10	Describe any training or experience relevant to conducting priority setting	Consultants or advisors, members with experience or skills relevant to priority-setting	Yes	Lines 212–213: Facilitators (MU, RF) had prior experience of conducting other consensus exercises.
C	Framework for priority setting			
11	State the framework used (if any)	James Lind Alliance, COHRED, CHNRI, Dialogue Model, no framework	Yes	Lines 194–200: Spencer's Technology of Participation (ToP) workshop approach. Also aligns with concept mapping consensus workshop methods. Refs 25, 26.
D	Stakeholders or participants			

12	Define the inclusion criteria for stakeholders	Patients, caregivers, community, health professionals, researchers, policy makers, NGOs, government, industry; vulnerable/marginalised populations	Yes	Lines 172–178: Those who had done trials of UBI-like interventions, written a book on UBI, or made other key contributions. Supplemented by snowball sampling.
13	State the strategy or method for identifying and engaging stakeholders	Partnership with organisations, social media, recruitment through hospitals	Yes	Lines 170–179: Invited by working group based on expertise; supplemented by snowball sampling from recommendations of other invitees.
14	Indicate the number of participants and/or organisations involved	Number of individuals and organisations, by stakeholder group	Yes	Lines 239–247: 13 initially identified; 14 participated. Table 1 shows breakdown by group.
15	Describe the characteristics of stakeholders	Stakeholder group, demographic characteristics, areas of interest and expertise, discipline, affiliations	Yes	Table 1 (line 254): Age, sex, country, background, years of experience.
16	State if reimbursement for participation was provided	Cash, vouchers, certificates, acknowledgement; what purpose	Yes	Lines 178–179: No reimbursements given other than for travel and accommodation expenses.
E	Identification and collection of research priorities			
17	Describe methods for collecting initial priorities	Methods e.g. Delphi, surveys, NGT, interviews, focus groups, workshops; mode e.g. face-to-face, online	Yes	Lines 181–227: Two-day process. Day 1: public conference with presentations and debate. Day 2: closed ToP workshop with breakout groups, facilitated brainstorming, charted on whiteboard. Face-to-face.
18	Describe methods for collating and categorising priorities	Taxonomy or other framework used to organise, summarise, aggregate	Yes	Lines 220–222: Ordered into similar nominal (unranked) groupings. Lines 280–288: Ordered by methodological category of research.
19	Describe methods and reasons for modifying priorities	Based on scope, clarity, definition, duplication, other criteria	Partial	Lines 284–286: Noted that questions could be addressed through multiple approaches and may appear in more than one list. No explicit removal/addition criteria described.
20	Describe methods for refining or translating priorities into research topics or questions	Reviewed by Steering Committee or project team	Yes	Lines 222–227: Categories named through group collaboration (Naming step). Lists collaboratively organised into implementable plan in plenary (Evaluating step). Lines 305–317: Plenary evaluation and prioritisation.
21	Describe methods for checking whether research questions have been answered	Systematic reviews, evidence mapping, consultation with experts	No	Not reported. The Background discusses limited existing evidence but no formal check was described as part of the workshop process.
22	Describe number of research questions or topics	Number of priorities at each stage of the process	Partial	Tables 2a and 2b show the final research questions. The number at intermediate stages is not reported.
F	Prioritisation of research topics/questions			
23	Describe methods and criteria for prioritising research topics or questions	Methods e.g. Delphi, voting, ranking; criteria e.g. need, feasibility, novelty, equity	Yes	Lines 305–317: Participants reconvened in plenary. Results summarised and evaluated. Priorities identified through collaborative deliberation. Lines 197–200: Convergence reached through deliberation (no sorting or rating).
24	State the method or threshold for excluding research topics/questions	Thresholds for ranking scores, proportions, votes; other criteria	No	Not reported. Prioritisation was through deliberation rather than quantitative thresholds.
G	Output			
25	State the approach to formulating the research priorities	Area, topic, questions, PICO	Yes	Tables 2a and 2b: Research questions formulated by study type. Lines 305–317 and 421–430: Prioritised pieces of work described as research areas.
H	Evaluation and feedback			

26	Describe how the process of prioritisation was evaluated	Survey, workshop	No	Not reported.
27	Describe how priorities were fed back to stakeholders and/or to the public	Public meetings, newsletters, website, email	Partial	Lines 229–230: All workshop participants were invited to be co-authors. The manuscript itself serves as feedback. No separate feedback process described.
I	Implementation			
28	Outline the strategy or action plans for implementing priorities	Communication with target audience, via policies and funding	Yes	Lines 421–430: Specific recommendations for future research by UBI researchers, particularly in the Norwegian context.
29	Describe plans, strategies, or suggestions to evaluate impact	Integration in decision-making, funding allocation, review of relevant documents	No	Not reported.
J	Funding and conflict of interest			
30	State sources of funding	Name sources of funding; if relevant include budget and/or cost	Yes	Lines 483–487: Seed corn funding from Kristiania and OsloMet. Event funding from Research Council of Norway (grant 360379). Funders had no role in design, collection, analysis, interpretation, or writing.
31	Declare any conflicts or competing interests	Individual level and/or contextual level conflicts	Yes	Lines 468–482: RF and MU conflicts declared in detail. Statement that no other authors have declared conflicts.