

**Supplementary material**

**Understanding the factors that make public participation effective in health policy and planning: a realist synthesis**

*Celso P. Pagatpatan<sup>A,B</sup> and Paul R. Ward<sup>B,C</sup>*

<sup>A</sup>Ateneo Center for Health Evidence, Action and Leadership (A-HEALS),  
Ateneo de Manila University, Ortigas Avenue, Pasig City 1604, Philippines.

<sup>B</sup>Discipline of Public Health, School of Health Sciences, Flinders University,  
Bedford Park, SA 5042, Australia.

<sup>C</sup>Corresponding author. Email: [paul.ward@flinders.edu.au](mailto:paul.ward@flinders.edu.au)

**Table S1. Data extraction (health policy and planning)**

Context	Mechanism	Outcome
<p><i>Health problems affect the common good and priority of the public</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate topic for deliberation that affects the common good and is genuinely of interest to the sponsor, values the input of the participants (Carman <i>et al.</i> 2015).</li> </ul> <p>Factors that promote user involvement: the subject priority by users (Crawford <i>et al.</i> 2003).</p> <p><i>Specific health problem and tangible possible options</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More tangible specific health problem rather than less tangible health problem such as determinants of health (Abelson <i>et al.</i> 2003).</li> <li>• Factors that promote users involvement: project has clear issue with tangible outcomes (Crawford <i>et al.</i> 2003).</li> </ul>	<p><i>Willingness to listen</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The literature reveals a common view that the public interprets ‘willingness to listen’ as an initial signal that policymakers intend to do something with the input they receive. Our analysis shows that a ‘willingness to listen’ is tied to two key factors -personal attitudes towards public involvement and organisation culture. (Li <i>et al.</i> 2015).</li> <li>• Lead moderator used several strategies to minimise power differentials by actively seeking public members’ opinions during discussion ... ensuring the public members engage in debate by actively seeking their dissenting views (Boivin <i>et al.</i> 2014).</li> <li>• Results of the meetings and opinions of the participants were tabulated and assembled into a report; the resulting document was used by the Health Services Commission in its deliberation (Kitzhaber 1993).</li> <li>• Willingness to challenge openly two of the underlying assumptions of the American health system (Kitzhaber 1993).</li> </ul>	<p><i>Increased understanding</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved lay learning/knowledge on the consultation topics and the process of healthcare priority-setting (Goold <i>et al.</i> 2005; Guttman <i>et al.</i> 2008).</li> <li>• Increased knowledge among deliberative participants to 50% greater than reading material only (RMO); participants across all deliberative methods also believed (self-reported) that deliberation affected their opinions on the deliberative topics (Carman <i>et al.</i> 2015).</li> <li>• Participants’ views may be more amenable to change; deliberation does make a difference to participants’ views (Abelson <i>et al.</i> 2003).</li> <li>• Participants realised the difficulties involved in making healthcare policy decisions (Guttman <i>et al.</i> 2008).</li> <li>• Instead, we found that those in fair or poor health were more likely to report that they ‘learned a lot’ (Goold <i>et al.</i> 2005).</li> <li>• Less educated participants reported more anger, less enjoyment, and less understanding of the exercise, but also more learning and rated informativeness and information adequacy more favourably. (Goold <i>et al.</i> (2005).</li> <li>• Less educated participants reported more anger, less enjoyment, and less understanding of the exercise, but also more learning and rated informativeness and information adequacy more favourably. (Goold <i>et al.</i> 2005).</li> </ul>

Context	Mechanism	Outcome
<p><i>Presence of policy mandate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that participation in decision-making could arguably be improved if a patient and public engagement policy were to be formulated alongside changes that are more widespread across processes to assess social values using approaches such as the Citizens' Jury (Whitty and Littlejohns 2015).</li> <li>• To fulfil the legislative requirement for a community meeting process, the commission turned to Oregon Health Decisions, a grassroots bioethics organisation founded in 1983 by Ralph Crawshaw, a Portland psychiatrist, and Michael Garland, an ethicist at the Oregon Health Sciences University (Kitzhaber 1993).</li> </ul> <p><i>Broad-base support</i></p> <p>By encouraging attendance at Health Service Commission meetings and hearings, and by soliciting testimony, we sought to ensure that the commission received input and information from the broadest possible citizen base (Kitzhaber 1993).</p> <p><i>Presence of mediating bodies</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mediating, interpreting bodies are essential to the enhancement of priority-setting processes that aspire to rationality and legitimacy (Tenbensen 2002).</li> </ul>	<p><i>Dedication to educate the public</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dedicated to educating Oregonians on the health policy choices confronting them and on the consequences of these choices. Oregon Health Decisions had been conducting community discussions on a variety of ethical issues for nearly 10 years (Kitzhaber 1993).</li> <li>• From the point of view of forum participants and members of the sponsoring institution, the information provided before and during the forum was considered fair, balanced and useful for learning about the policy issues and perspectives of others (Molster <i>et al.</i> 2013).</li> </ul> <p><i>Dedication to allocate financial and human resources</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilisation of a variety of strategies to represent and address the health needs of the population.</li> <li>• Effective public participation will require significant financial resources, as well as adequate staffing and administrative support (Alborz <i>et al.</i> 2002).</li> <li>• Allocating adequate resources for implementing strategies to achieve these outcomes has the potential to produce large dividends in relation to better public policy and facilitating the distribution of decision-making power towards those who are most affected by the policy decision (Restall 2015).</li> </ul> <p><i>Feedback loop and partnership brokering</i> (Tenbensen 2002; Li <i>et al.</i> 2015)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is needed is a greater acknowledgement of the role and functions of mediating agencies, and more attention paid to what enhances their capacity to make wise interpretations of the meaning of participation.</li> <li>• The Commission actively employs its judgement; it is not that necessary for the information collected to be objectively interpretable through a transparent rationality.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Consensus</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mutual influence and agreement about health care improvement priorities (Boivin <i>et al.</i> 2014).</li> <li>• Achievement of consensus for specific health problems like teenage pregnancy rather than those issues that are less tangible and general like determinants of health (Abelson <i>et al.</i> 2003).</li> <li>• Plan was enacted through a consensus building exercise with broad-based support (Oregon Medical Association, Association of Oregon Hospital, consumer groups, organised labour and business community).</li> </ul> <p><i>Public influence on policy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was found that results from public involvement commissioned by governmental agencies require 'active interpretation' to be considered in health policy decision-making (Li <i>et al.</i> 2015).</li> <li>• Members of the Oregon Health Services Commission have always emphasised that the prioritisation of conditions in the Oregon list took into account the public input garnered from the Oregon Health Decisions forums (Tenbensen 2002).</li> </ul>

---

Context	Mechanism	Outcome
	<p data-bbox="772 261 1305 288"><i>Feedback loop and partnership brokering (Cont.)</i></p> <ul data-bbox="772 293 1469 935" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="772 293 1469 536">• Given the complexity of information and the vast potential for conflict between different principles of evaluation, the requirement for logical consistency is far too demanding and the results are likely to disappoint. A good example of this would be the ‘hand-adjusted’ shift in the ranking of tuberculosis. The Oregon Health Services Commission’s allocation of conditions to 17 categories originally placed tuberculosis in the fifth-ranked category – chronic fatal.</li><li data-bbox="772 541 1469 627">• In any case, even when issues for deliberation were defined tightly, they rarely produced results that might resemble specific priority setting decisions.</li><li data-bbox="772 632 1469 751">• The process of transformation of public input into substantive decisions is highly opaque. But it seems this situation is regarded as preferable by both the health authorities that commissioned the juries, and the juries themselves.</li><li data-bbox="772 756 1469 876">• Exercises in public involvement provide some of the raw material for policymakers. However, information that is raw and that has to be swallowed whole (i.e. undigested by mediating bodies) will probably be regurgitated by the policy process.</li><li data-bbox="772 880 1469 935">• Information on the forum design and translation of outputs to policy will be publicly available (Molster <i>et al.</i> 2013).</li></ul>	

---

**Table S2. Data extraction (broad literature)**

A. Possible mechanism of political commitment				
Intervention	Context	Mechanism	Extracts (mechanism)	Reference
Enhancing citizen participation	Decentralised responsibility (governance and administrative structures). Effectiveness of traditional mechanism to elicit citizen participation are increasingly questioned.	Commitment	Enhancing citizen participation in health decision-making involves developing appropriate structures and processes within which to engage citizens. Citizens must be adequately resourced for the undertaking – having timely and appropriate information.	Church <i>et al.</i> 2002
Regional health boards	Community participation as part of health reform, in the form of lay health authorities. Difference of opinion regarding appropriate roles and responsibilities for members of regional health authorities. Differences of opinion on the appropriate composition of regional health authorities. Differences of opinion on what skills and attributes are most suited for governing on regional health authorities.	Commitment	An understanding of how and why health authorities succeed or fail needs an assessment of the dynamics of the community structures and processes. Strengthening of both formal and community networks is an important strategy to facilitate action of regional health boards.	Frankish <i>et al.</i> 2002
Public involvement in forest service policymaking	Multiple forms of public participation in forest service.	Commitment	Most frequently cited factors key to the success of participatory policymaking include: effective facilitation, active participation of agency staff and support from agency-wide policy and administrators. Though these factors mainly refer to factors categorised as process design traits, it influences the category of participants' traits by identifying participants with appropriate traits or helping participants learn these traits. In addition, planners of participatory exercises have the responsibility to ensure that important contextual traits are being addressed for the participatory policymaking.	Leach 2006
Participatory rural energy planning	Decentralisation of energy planning. Limited success of the government household energy program that is attributed to the lack of community participation in planning.	Commitment	An effective approach in energy programs could be realised when policymakers and planners have adequate awareness and sensitivity to decentralised and participatory process – incorporating local knowledge and expertise in the design of energy plans; giving significant importance to social equity based on gender and social class, as well as building local capacities and transferring of planning tasks to local bodies.	Neudoerffer <i>et al.</i> 2001
Joint health and safety	Widely acknowledged as important to a healthy and safe work environment.	Commitment	Studies suggest that for JHSC to be effective, there is a need to expand the role and scope of committees' authority such	Yassi <i>et al.</i> 2013

A. Possible mechanism of political commitment				
Intervention	Context	Mechanism	Extracts (mechanism)	Reference
committees (JHSC)	Studies demonstrated its effectiveness is more likely to be in a unionised working environment.		as broader mandates that provide more power to the committees. Adequate logistic for committee and ensuring capacity building as a right of the workers. Giving the committee power to write orders, however, was a concern as a result of the difficulty that workers experience when exercising this role without fear of reprisal.	
Public participation in water quality planning	More widely shared knowledge about environmental science and about citizens' preferences as a result of innovations in process.	Commitment	This study demonstrates a linkage among process, knowledge and motivation. Specifically, if process is revised to empower stakeholders, the information is shared more freely and knowledge levels of participants significantly increase. This new process resulted in better dissemination and use of information as well as greater motivation for public involvement.	Burroughs 1999
Participatory sustainable energy planning	Constitutional and statutory duty to permit meaningful public participation. Complexities of the political context, social inequities and imperative of economic growth.	Commitment	The case demonstrates that where civil society organisations develop strategic and technical capacity, they can begin to overcome the obstacles to effective engagement. Effectiveness and influence in decision-making requires civil society to: (a) ensure that technical inputs into the process of deliberation must meet a high standard of quality; and (b) demonstrate that it enjoys the support of broad-based constituents.	Calland and Nakhlooda 2012
Preparing the civil society for participation	Directive that imposes stakeholders be actively involved in the preparation of water management plans and that the public at large be consulted	Commitment	Lessons reinforce the idea that providing information is a prerequisite to consultation and a <i>fortiori</i> for other more ambitious forms of participation. It also highlights the need to construct a common knowledge base between stakeholders, expert and scientists.	Loubier <i>et al.</i> 2005
Innovative outreach model – 'Knowledge Exchange Train'	Recognition of the people's role in resource conservational and sustainable development in the face of large infrastructure projects. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a need to raise awareness about new infrastructure and its social and environmental consequences.</li> <li>• The need to build local capacity for shared governance by facilitating stakeholder participation in local planning process.</li> </ul>	Commitment	The 'Knowledge Exchange Train' model was a useful means to increase public awareness and provided a means of broadening participation in planning. By combining the dissemination of data products with dialogue, stakeholders and decision-makers were provided with a common empirical basis for participatory planning on a scale larger than in an individual community	Mendoza <i>et al.</i> 2007

A. Possible mechanism of political commitment				
Intervention	Context	Mechanism	Extracts (mechanism)	Reference
Characterisation of citizens in participatory governance	Different characterisation of citizens such as active (expert, everyday makers and social entrepreneurs) and disengaged citizens (monitorial and young)	Commitment	Understanding about ‘who’ participates and ‘how’ they participate can enhance the participatory process. To broaden the inclusion of affected citizens, public authorities need to ensure that they tailor participation processes by applying distinct approaches to different types of citizens that includes balancing between enabling and restraining experts; maintaining the interest of the everyday makers; connecting the social entrepreneurs from the voluntary sectors to public governance.	Agger 2012
Public involvement in health genomics	An increasing emphasis placed on public involvement in the area of health and genomics	Commitment	Close attention to the core elements (goals, level of involvement, who the public are, methods used, evaluation) can have important implications concerning the articulation of policies promoting public involvement.	Avard <i>et al.</i> 2010
Participatory planning on sustainable water management	Assumption that stakeholder groups or perspective are meaningful ways of talking about the variation in opinion that participants bring to the table.	Commitment	It may be very common that participants have polarised positions, distinct attitudes and opinions, and divergent viewpoints on participatory planning. Findings of this quantitative study challenge this supposition. This suggests the usefulness of eliciting and characterising the nature and extent of variation between stakeholder viewpoints and expectations, and that we should not assume that stakeholders necessarily have divergent views on key issues.	Baggett <i>et al.</i> 2008
Role analysis	Fundamental differences of opinions concerning the effectiveness of methods that incorporate public views in decision-making.	Commitment	Role analysis allowed participants to think systematically about each organisation by understanding value differences and willingness to negotiate. This helped participants to identify potential alliances and roadblocks that resulted in the development of a common view on how to involve stakeholders in the development of management plans.	Burkardt and Ponds 2006
Framework for involving the public in planning	Planning in marine protected areas. No clear guidance in the conservation literature on how to involve the public in marine planning.	Commitment	Participation process should be structured to promote active participation involvement, ensure complete information exchange, encourage fair decision-making, use administration efficiently, and promote positive participant interaction.	Dalton 2005
	Current ontological understanding of how a citizen suffers from ‘lightness’	Commitment	Citizens’ appraisal of their resources, their self-perceived capacity to be within a deliberative body, and their ability to	Lehoux <i>et al.</i> 2012

A. Possible mechanism of political commitment				
Intervention	Context	Mechanism	Extracts (mechanism)	Reference
Understanding citizens in public involvement	Acknowledgement of the complex and rich material citizens are likely to embody.		achieve their goals and satisfy their interest (both personal and altruistic) combined to forge different ways of embodying a citizens' role.	
Participatory multi-criteria decision analysis	Conflicting views of several stakeholders. Web-based multi-criteria decision support software (Web-HIPRE) that provides tools for problem structuring, preference elicitation and the sharing of results over the Internet.	Commitment	Web-based decision analysis software, Web-HIPRE, proved to be an applicable approach in trying to reach consensus between the stakeholders. The analysis was able to clarify the views of the stakeholders, and a consensus on the new regulation policy was reached. New techniques cannot yet replace traditional face-to-face meetings and interaction, but they provide complementary ways for stakeholders to participate.	Mustajoki <i>et al.</i> 2004
Transdisciplinary landscape planning	Shift from traditional top-down perspective to bottom-up and integrated approach involving participation of local stakeholders – trans-disciplinarity as a new paradigm in landscape research.	Commitment	This case study shows that when trying to involve local people in landscape issues, many more factors are at play than only the landscape. To involve diverse participants [representativeness], the need to know whom the people are (sociodemographic variables, all people who have an interest in the issue, hard-to-reach people) and know how they should be approached is required.	Sevenant and Antrop 2010
Understanding participants' perspective of participation	Diversity among participants' perceptions on appropriate public participation.	Commitment	Knowing how and what people think about public participation is essential to crafting a meaningful and successful participation process. There are four clearly distinct perspectives on what an appropriate public participation should be: <i>science-centred stakeholder consultation, egalitarian deliberation, efficient cooperation and informed collaboration</i> . There is limited agreement and strong differences about what makes a good process.	Webler and Tuler 2006
Deliberative public participation	Characteristics of the issue: availability of resources to allocate to community-based services Culture of the organisation: commitment of the leadership at all levels of the organisation. Decision being made: short decision timeframe. Increasing attention to power relations.	Commitment    Commitment	These comparative quasi-experimental study findings demonstrate that the deliberative method clearly performed better under some circumstances than others, and that the different context within which this type of method was implemented made a difference.	Abelson <i>et al.</i> 2007

A. Possible mechanism of political commitment				
Intervention	Context	Mechanism	Extracts (mechanism)	Reference
Institutionalising participation	Extent of adopting participatory discourses and practices within formal development institutions lead to transforming structures.		The success or failure of specific initiatives to make river basin government more participatory, in the sense of including a wide range of actors in decision-making [representativeness], is to analyse the condition to which participatory development is conceived, implemented and contested.	Sneddon and Fox 2007
Group meetings (focus groups or consultation meetings)	Public involvement in the design stage of primary health research	Commitment	Barriers and tension concerning public involvement in research design were identified; tensions between stakeholder groups; the level of understanding of members of the public about health research methods; time and cost; representativeness and language and jargon. Four main strategies to facilitate public involvement in research design were identified: (1) cultural sensitivity, (2) clear explanation of health research methods, (3) independent facilitation and (4) funding for involvement in research design.	Boote <i>et al.</i> 2010
Health facility committee	Low- and middle-income countries. Formally constituted structure with community representation.	Commitment	Health facility committees could be effective mechanism for community participation in health. The key to effectiveness is to understand the process factors, by which the interventions were successful, the context in which these processes took place and the interaction between intervention and context.	McCoy <i>et al.</i> 2012
Local healthcare planning	County councils and more mature primary care groups (PCGs) had devolved responsibility for the deployment of scarce healthcare resources. Physicians, nurses and other health professionals have strong unions with high level of participation	Commitment	Developing consultative and participative processes in health service planning requires redistribution of power. This process needs to secure a long-term, formal arrangement with define objectives and jurisdictions rather than ad-hoc, informal discussions. Development of trust and mutual confidence is also required.	North and Werko 2002

B. Possible mechanism of partnership synergy				
Intervention	Context	Mechanism	Extracts (mechanism)	Reference
Collaborative planning	Long-standing debate about the role of professional land managers and citizen owners of public lands. Many overlapping pieces of legislation address aspects of public participation.	Synergy	Gaining trust for each other is the most beneficial aspect of going through collaborative planning or the collective process for resolving conflicts and advancing shared visions involving a set of diverse stakeholders	Carr <i>et al.</i> 1998
Citizen parliament	Recognition of conflicting cultural and political vantage points inherent in any pluralistic society. Ensuring equal voice for all citizens regardless of ethnic or cultural heritage.	Synergy	The emergence of a joint ownership of the process and policy recommendations might help explain how deliberative processes can ensure a sufficient degree of shared identity among participants to enable them to speak with a coherent voice.	Hartz-Karp <i>et al.</i> 2010
Stakeholder participation and conflict	Diverse stakeholders in democratic settings involves risks to public safety	Synergy	The importance of developing and maintaining quality relationships among stakeholders before, during and after consultation in part through active communication and conflict management. With a trusting relationship among stakeholders, consultation phases for licensing and other decision-making processes can be shortened due to a reduction in conflict and misunderstandings.	Poetz 2012
Regulatory negotiations	An increasing interest in fostering democratic discourse and in developing a process that increase discussion, facilitate the exploration of alternative views and give voice to the marginalised.	Synergy	There is some evidence that collaborative processes can produce solutions that efficiently and effectively address the relevant problems and enhance participants' satisfaction with the process. Elements of successful collaboration include: clear and binding rules governing the process, leadership by the agency and its commitment to fairness and collaboration, legal discretion to allow groups to formulate proposals, a facilitator who manages conflict and keeps the process going.	Bryner 2001

C. Possible mechanism of inclusiveness				
Intervention	Context	Mechanism	Extracts (mechanism)	Reference
Participation in student councils	Students' participation in health promotion. Involvement of students in collective decision-making processes at school or at a class level that requires a dialogue between students and other decision-makers.	Inclusiveness	Student councils seems to be a promising way of including students in decision-making at school and thus improving students' health. Synthesis of characteristics of student councils, which may make them more effective, includes concern for a full representation of the council and communication between council and the student body that shows an established reporting mechanism.	Griebler and Nowak 2012
Grounded citizens jury	Highly marginalised community as a possible alternative for engaging with people in a meaningful way that does not require changing of structures, abolishing of established organisations, passing of new legislation or appointment to centralised bureaucracies.	Inclusiveness	Using grounded methodology would provide legitimate deliberative opportunities and would in this way explicitly enable hitherto silenced, alienated and marginalised voices to be heard.	Kashefi and Mort 2004
Patient and public participation in health technology assessment	Parent and members of the public may have different roles and should be considered separately.	Inclusiveness	It is important to canvass multiple patients and patient organisations because they can offer insights into the value and relative value of health technologies, especially in terms of coverage and reimbursement decisions.	Menon and Stafinski 2011
Commissioning public participation	Consultation projects on adult mental health services and maternity services.	Inclusiveness	Population is not a homogeneous entity with a single view. Minority groups being different from majority groups is a necessary base to determine priorities.	Summers and McKeown 1996
Community consultations in local government council	Recognition of the need for the participation of a certain segment of the community, especially the 'hard to reach'.	Inclusiveness	It is unclear whether consultative processes are intended to be regarded as representative of communities in whole or in part. The need to involve multiple publics and reach those who are usually not inclined to participate is important to guarantee the representativeness.	Brackertz and Meredyth 2009
Consensus building (participatory action plan development)	Recognition of the existence of power relations and often considerable diversity of interests among local communities. Participation in community-based natural resource management	Inclusiveness	One significant finding of comparing a participatory action plan development (PAPD) with a non-PAPD, provides evidence that by initially developing separately the views of divergent stakeholders and later coming up with a final plan through a common plenary, all perspectives can be included and it minimises the scope for powerful people to dominate poor people's views. This increases participation of the poor and brings decisions, actions and benefits faster because of the consensus created.	Sultana and Abeyasekera 2008

C. Possible mechanism of inclusiveness				
Intervention	Context	Mechanism	Extracts (mechanism)	Reference
Concept mapping and policy Delphi	Starkly divergent perspective on issues and uneven degrees of power and influence.	Inclusiveness	Suggest an alternative anonymous group discussion that aims to mitigate the potential weakness of a face-to-face approach that is plagued by power dynamics. By combining approaches of concept mapping and policy Delphi, knowledge and values of disparate groups are integrated, which stimulated critical group thinking. It provides opportunity for clarification of arguments and values, as well as mitigation of the risk that divergent views would be silenced by the dominant voices.	Klenk and Hickey 2011
Citizen engagement in heritage planning	Perceived democratic deficit, which has inspired a variety of innovative means of engaging citizens. Need for a more interactive and iterative process of deliberation among citizens.	Inclusiveness	A higher level of citizen engagement can be achieved if the right strategies are adopted. The use of information communication technology and web-based discussion fora are both useful to distribute information and facilitate discussion among citizens and government officials. The use of web-based communications reduces the investment of time for involvement and reduces the normal reticence of citizens to speak in front of a large, unknown audience.	MacMillan 2010
Internet-based participation	Commonly used web-based technology, like Facebook and Second Life that provide a platform for public participation in planning.	Inclusiveness	Illustrated the need to connect in-person and have online participation to effect change. Web-based technologies work best as part of a broader participatory process.	Evans-Cowley and Hollander 2010
Participatory community mapping	Participatory geographic information system (PGIS) as a useful strategy to help community members identify community problems and express their needs and concerns.	Inclusiveness	The use of a simple method (transparent photomaps) enables effective participation and group collaboration in the participatory mapping process. Photomaps play an important role in providing a common ground where individual participants can share, draw and organise spatially referenced comments. A viable solution for neighbourhood infrastructure planning would combine the simple method (photomaps) with an advance solution (mobile GIS and web map) through facilitation.	Aditya 2010

C. Possible mechanism of inclusiveness				
Intervention	Context	Mechanism	Extracts (mechanism)	Reference
Participatory planning in local government areas	Social media and web 2.0 tools offer opportunities to devise novel participation strategies that can engage previously difficult to reach certain segments of society for participatory planning in local government areas.	Inclusiveness	Allowing public participation to take place alongside traditional physical settings and incorporating digital tools to engage people is likely to: capture a wider audience by including people who are unable to attend physically; attract younger participants; give community members, who are ordinarily reluctant in traditional settings, the opportunity of participating; reduce reliance on physical resources in the participatory processes.	Fredericks and Foth 2013
Digital public participation for social capital	Digital technologies serve as the infrastructure for our communications.	Inclusiveness	The unique characteristics of face-to-face communication in building consensus, communicating complex information or creating new ideas means that it cannot totally be replaced by online communication.	Mandarano <i>et al.</i> 2010
Web-based surveys	Utilisation of the Internet to gather community input with a large population sample for an urban design proposal on a contentious riverfront site.	Inclusiveness	The Internet survey proved to be a fundamental tool for public participation, allowing building upon the community's expectations and incorporating the public opinion into the program. Gathering of useful, realistic information (site analysis, interview key participants, pilot survey) helps understand the place, constraints and opportunities. Any real planning or urban design project must ensure that community participation happens at different levels and as widely as possible through different methods.	del Rio and Levi 2009
Participation in healthcare priority setting and resource allocation	Multiple methods to engage multiple publics and the use of methods at different levels.	Inclusiveness	The use of multiple methods at different levels by many decision-makers appears to provide a balance between breadth and depth that may lead to a more rounded understanding of the public's desire.	Mitton <i>et al.</i> 2009
Consultation on ethical decision-making	Democratic deficit in the method of settling on the ethical principles or notions that underlie policy decisions.	Inclusiveness	An observed reduced appeal of public consultation as a means of bringing views of the public in ethical decision-making because of the tension between involving all stakeholders as a way to maintain legitimacy and a broader source of potential ideas and the nature of ethical debate that only allows a small number of participants.	Mullen 2008

C. Possible mechanism of inclusiveness				
Intervention	Context	Mechanism	Extracts (mechanism)	Reference
Public involvement in research agenda setting (framework)	Involvement of people whose primary interest in health care is their own health or that of their family, as users of services or carers and people representing these groups through community organisations, networks or campaigning and self-help groups.	Inclusiveness	The development of methods of involvement should be a shared task with lay people that allows them to be more influential rather than just complying with involvement methods established by professionals. Participation could also be more effective when sufficient time and resources are given to the committee members to consult their peers more widely.	Oliver <i>et al.</i> 2008
Characterisation of citizens in participatory governance	Different characterisation of citizens such as active (expert, everyday makers and social entrepreneurs) and disengaged citizens (monitorial and young).	Inclusiveness	Understanding about ‘who’ participates and ‘how’ they participate can enhance the participatory process. To broaden the inclusion of affected citizens, public authorities need to tailor participation processes by applying distinct approaches to different types of citizens, which includes balancing between enabling and restraining experts; maintaining the interest of the everyday makers; connecting the social entrepreneurs from the voluntary sectors to public governance.	Agger 2012
Role analysis	Fundamental differences of opinions concerning the effectiveness of methods that incorporate public views in decision-making.	Inclusiveness	Role analysis allowed participants to think systematically about each organisation by understanding value differences and willingness to negotiate. This helped participants to identify potential alliances and roadblocks that resulted in the development of a common view on how to involve stakeholders in the development of a management plan.	Burkardt and Ponds, 2006
Public involvement at different levels of healthcare decision making	Varying degree of participation across different levels of decision-making: individual, program and system levels.	Inclusiveness	Findings show variations in the willingness of the public to be involved in healthcare decisions and consistency across the different forms. There is a strong desire in all the groups for the public to be involved both at the system and program level, but less at the individual level. Two issues are found in all groups and at all levels: the need for information and into take account public experience and emotions.	Litva <i>et al.</i> 2002
	Conflicting views of several stakeholders.	Inclusiveness		

C. Possible mechanism of inclusiveness				
Intervention	Context	Mechanism	Extracts (mechanism)	Reference
Participatory multi-criteria decision analysis	Web-based multi-criteria decision support software (Web-HIPRE) that provides tools for problem structuring, preference elicitation and the sharing of results over the Internet.		Web-based decision analysis software, Web-HIPRE, proved to be an applicable approach in trying to reach consensus between the stakeholders. The analysis was able to clarify the views of the stakeholders, and a consensus on the new regulation policy was reached. New techniques cannot yet replace traditional face-to-face meetings and interaction, but they provide complementary ways for stakeholders to participate.	Mustajoki <i>et al.</i> 2004
Understanding participants' perspective of participation	Diversity among participants' perceptions on appropriate public participation.	Inclusiveness	Knowing how and what people think about public participation is essential to crafting a meaningful and successful participation process. There are four clearly distinct perspectives on what an appropriate public participation should be: <i>science-centred stakeholder consultation</i> , <i>egalitarian deliberation</i> , <i>efficient cooperation</i> and <i>informed collaboration</i> . There is limited agreement and strong differences about what makes a good process.	Webler and Tuler 2006
Participatory environmental decision-making	Commitment among council members and staff to running an exemplary public participation process combined with expert advice. Diverse interests and stakeholders were encouraged to participate, and the council held meetings with any group who requested them. State-based citizens' advisory committees were created.	Inclusiveness	Different people expressed different ideas about what defines a good public participation process. Dramatic differences exist among these views that suggest an important challenge for those responsible for designing and carrying out public participation process. The implications of this difference in the design of participation process are: take time to listen to what the people want in the process; reflect carefully on what to expect from the process; develop greater familiarity with the participation techniques and available resources; and bit flexibility in running a participatory process.	Webler <i>et al.</i> 2001
Designing public engagement	International trend towards increased involvement of the public in the affairs and decisions of policy-setting bodies. Growing number of variety of processes, techniques or instruments – (mechanisms) – for enabling involvement.	Inclusiveness	Classify the engagement techniques (or mechanisms) based on their similarities and differences on several key numbers of variables (between-mechanism variables). These might affect effectiveness.	Rowe and Frewer 2005

D. Possible mechanism of deliberativeness				
Intervention	Context	Mechanism	Extracts (mechanism)	Reference
Participatory forest management	Demand for public participation following the global shift in sustainable forest management Inadequate opportunities to participate in forest management as leading public complaint	Deliberativeness	The number of opportunities for participation is clearly not all that matters but the quality of public decision making process – inclusive decision making process where participants are free from compulsion and allows for all stated proposals to be brought into question	DesRoches 2007
Structured deliberation and polarisation cascades	Popular worries on the potential risks and perils of new technologies such as nanotechnology. Polarisation cascades that occur when individuals holding the minority opinion in a group adopts the majority opinion for normatively undesirable reasons after deliberating.	Deliberativeness	This study strongly suggests that it is possible to structure public deliberation about policy to mitigate known polarisation cascades by the use of a professional facilitator and dissemination of balanced informational materials to a create heterogeneous argument pool. Opinion change consistent with polarisation effects is inherently the result of undesirable decision-making qualities.	Hamlett and Cobb 2006
Coastal zone environmental impact assessment	Recognition of the importance of public input into the formal planning process through legislation pertaining to environmental impact assessment.	Deliberativeness	The effectiveness of public participation depends on a number of key principles that includes: <i>early participation</i> in the process, which will help clarify the important issues; <i>interactive consultation</i> allowing views and opinions to be actively sought from interest groups and the wider community; <i>continuous</i> consultation methods used; <i>opportunity for feedback</i> to the participants on their input; <i>inclusive process</i> allowing all concerned individuals to get involved; transparent and honest.	Johnson and Dagg 2003
Communicative action in transportation planning	Unbounded uncertainty: stems from a lack of knowledge; arising from the inability to comprehend present and future preferences; doubt that taste and desires of a community will change over time.	Deliberativeness	An analysis of the use of ‘validity claims’ in planning practice shows that a rationally grounded consensus can emerge from practical or communicative discourse between contending groups.	Khisty and Leleur 1997
Participatory water management planning	Actively involving the public and interested stakeholders in water management planning is a policy requirement from higher-level governance bodies. Conflicting criteria in the design and implementation of public participation.	Deliberativeness	A range of standardised context, process and outcome criteria confirms that, despite major conflicting interests and doubts at the outset, the process has resulted in a range of satisfactory outcomes. The process design played an important role in reaching a successful process and outcome – productive conditions were created for effective horizontal communication in all groups.	Lamers <i>et al.</i> 2010

D. Possible mechanism of deliberativeness				
Intervention	Context	Mechanism	Extracts (mechanism)	Reference
Achieving democratic values in participatory budgeting	Intentionality of the committee's democratic mission and a demography of a more representative committee. Openness and inclusiveness are two values articulated in the budgetary process	Deliberativeness	Being open and inclusive comes in the form of the citizens–public administrators dialectic, but it resides in the intellectual, ethical and practical engagement with incorporating democratic values.	Rossmann and Shanahan 2012
Web-based geographical information system (GIS) in wind farm participatory planning	Demography of more representative committee Use of the Internet for supporting and enhancing citizen involvement in the planning process. Combination of web-based and face-to-face contact with professionals.	Deliberativeness	There is a real potential for the use of innovative digital visualisation and communication techniques to enhance current methods of visual information dissemination and public participation by dissemination of good quality, relevant planning information. Participation by a wider audience would be encouraged with the availability of the system.	Berry <i>et al.</i> 2011
Improving effectiveness	Presence of a legal framework that gives the responsibility to ensure that the public concerned are given the opportunity to express an opinion before a development project is initiated.	Deliberativeness	An important opportunity for improvement of the effectiveness of public participation includes providing simplified procedures with increased transparency, credibility and efficiency such as early involvement of the public, accessibility of documents and adequate length of time in formulating comments.	Del Furia and Wallace-Jones 2000
Deliberative public forum on bio banking	Information provided before and during the forum was considered fair, balanced and useful for learning. Structure of deliberation that provides a respectful way for citizens to reason with each other and work towards consensus.	Deliberativeness	This provides evidence that a deliberative public forum sponsored by a government institution was able to achieve most of the deliberative principles embedded in its design – fair, balance useful information, and it provided a respectful way for citizens to reason with each other, though it lacked sociodemographic diversity and influence on public health policy.	Molster <i>et al.</i> 2013
Assessing quality of deliberation	The practise of deliberative democracy regards citizens' views as important and a necessary source of public policy.	Deliberativeness	The four dimensions of quality of the deliberation process developed in this study proved useful in examining the process and assessing the quality of deliberative democracy. Showing a high quality of deliberation process, this study demonstrated that deliberative democracy can be reliably used to elicit opinions about ethical dilemmas in surrogate consent for research.	De Vries <i>et al.</i> 2010
	Public participation in environmental planning.	Deliberativeness		Higgs <i>et al.</i> 2008

D. Possible mechanism of deliberativeness				
Intervention	Context	Mechanism	Extracts (mechanism)	Reference
IT methods in enabling consensus	Use of an integrated approach that involves the use of GIS and multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA)		GIS have shown to increase levels of public participation in a decision-making process facilitating public input into the planning process. MCDA permits stakeholders to contribute to the decision-making process through iterative means that involve well-rehearsed stages.	
Deliberative democratic perspective in participation	Increasing scientific complexity and uncertainty, along with lack of social consensus about how natural resources should be managed. Demand for and academic interest in public participation appear to be relentless.	Deliberativeness	Demonstrated that a deliberative democratic perspective on public participation may serve to challenge some established traditions within the natural resource literature and lead to new ways of conducting and evaluating public participation – seek to understand ubiquitous and amorphous networks and coalitions of discussions and debate, focus on forms of internal exclusion, focus on the institutional level of trust rather than interpersonal.	Parkins and Mitchell 2005
Citizens' juries in planning	Commitment of jurors to the process and continued interest of the issue under discussion.	Deliberativeness	Citizens' juries have become a key means of involving the public in policymaking. Though there are considerable challenges to the process and imperfect means in ensuring democracy, representation and influence – the structure that the jury process provides acts as a useful framework, which has meaning to jurors and which can produce recommendations.	Gooberman-Hill <i>et al.</i> 2008

## References

- Abelson J, Eyles J, McLeod CB, Collins P, McMullan C, Forest PG (2003) Does deliberation make a difference? Results from a citizens panel study of health goals priority setting. *Health Policy* **66**(1), 95–106. [doi:10.1016/S0168-8510\(03\)00048-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-8510(03)00048-4)
- Abelson J, Forest PG, Eyles J, Casebeer A, Martin E, Mackean G (2007) Examining the role of context in the implementation of a deliberative public participation experiment: results from a Canadian comparative study. *Social Science & Medicine* **64**(10), 2115–2128. [doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.01.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.01.013)
- Aditya T (2010) Usability issues in applying participatory mapping for neighborhood infrastructure planning. *Transactions in GIS* **14**, 119–147. [doi:10.1111/j.1467-9671.2010.01206.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9671.2010.01206.x)
- Agger A (2012) Towards tailor-made participation: how to involve different types of citizens in participatory governance? *The Town Planning Review* **83**(1), 29–45. [doi:10.3828/tpr.2012.2](https://doi.org/10.3828/tpr.2012.2)
- Alborz A, Wilkin D, Smith K (2002) Are primary care groups and trusts consulting local communities? *Health & Social Care in the Community* **10**(1), 20–27. [doi:10.1046/j.0966-0410.2001.00338.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0966-0410.2001.00338.x)
- Avard D, Stanton Jean M, Grégoire G, Page M (2010) Public involvement in health genomics: the reality behind the policies. *International Journal of Consumer Studies* **34**(5), 508–524. [doi:10.1111/j.1470-6431.2010.00914.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1470-6431.2010.00914.x)
- Baggett S, Jefferson B, Jeffrey P (2008) Just how different are stakeholder group opinions on water management issues? *Desalination* **218**(1–3), 132–141. [doi:10.1016/j.desal.2006.08.025](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.desal.2006.08.025)
- Berry R, Higgs G, Fry R, Langford M (2011) Web-based GIS approaches to enhance public participation in wind farm planning. *Transactions in GIS* **15**(2), 147–172. [doi:10.1111/j.1467-9671.2011.01240.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9671.2011.01240.x)
- Boivin A, Lehoux P, Burgers J, Grol R (2014) What are the key ingredients for effective public involvement in health care improvement and policy decisions? A randomized trial process evaluation. *The Milbank Quarterly* **92**(2), 319–350. [doi:10.1111/1468-0009.12060](https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0009.12060)
- Boote J, Baird W, Beecroft C (2010) Public involvement at the design stage of primary health research: a narrative review of case examples. *Health Policy* **95**(1), 10–23. [doi:10.1016/j.healthpol.2009.11.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2009.11.007)
- Brackertz N, Meredyth D (2009) Community consultation in Victorian local government: a case of mixing metaphors? *Australian Journal of Public Administration* **68**(2), 152–166. [doi:10.1111/j.1467-8500.2009.00627.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8500.2009.00627.x)
- Bryner G (2001) Cooperative instruments and policy making: assessing public participation in US environmental regulation. *European Environment* **11**(1), 49–60. [doi:10.1002/eet.245](https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.245)
- Burkardt N, Ponds PD (2006) Using role analysis to plan for stakeholder involvement: a Wyoming case study. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* **34**(5), 1306–1313. [doi:10.2193/0091-7648\(2006\)34\[1306:URATPF\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.2193/0091-7648(2006)34[1306:URATPF]2.0.CO;2)
- Burroughs R (1999) When stakeholders choose: process, knowledge, and motivation in water quality decisions. *Society & Natural Resources* **12**(8), 797–809. [doi:10.1080/089419299279326](https://doi.org/10.1080/089419299279326)

- Calland R, Nakhooda S (2012) Participatory democracy meets the hard rock of energy policy: South Africa's national integrated resource plan. *Democratization* **19**(5), 912–931. [doi:10.1080/13510347.2012.709688](https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2012.709688)
- Carman KL, Mallery C, Maurer M, Wang G, Garfinkel S, Yang M, Gilmore D, Windham A, Ginsburg M, Sofaer S, Gold M, Pathak-Sen E, Davies T, Siegel J, Mangrum R, Fernandez J, Richmond J, Fishkin J, Chao AS (2015) Effectiveness of public deliberation methods for gathering input on issues in healthcare: results from a randomized trial. *Social Science & Medicine* **133**, 11–20. [doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.03.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.03.024)
- Carr DS, Selin SW, Schuett MA (1998) Managing public forests: understanding the role of collaborative planning. *Environmental Management* **22**(5), 767–776. [doi:10.1007/s002679900146](https://doi.org/10.1007/s002679900146)
- Church J, Saunders D, Wanke M, Pong R, Spooner C, Dorgan M (2002) Citizen participation in health decision-making: past experience and future prospects. *Journal of Public Health Policy* **23**(1), 12–32. [doi:10.2307/3343116](https://doi.org/10.2307/3343116)
- Crawford MJ, Aldridge T, Bhui K, Rutter D, Manley C, Weaver T, Tyrer P, Fulop N (2003) User involvement in the planning and delivery of mental health services: a cross-sectional survey of service users and providers. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica* **107**(6), 410–414. [doi:10.1034/j.1600-0447.2003.00049.x](https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0447.2003.00049.x)
- Dalton TM (2005) Beyond biogeography: a framework for involving the public in planning of US marine protected areas. *Conservation Biology* **19**(5), 1392–1401. [doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2005.00116.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2005.00116.x)
- De Vries R, Stanczyk A, Wall IF, Uhlmann R, Damschroder LJ, Kim SY (2010) Assessing the quality of democratic deliberation: a case study of public deliberation on the ethics of surrogate consent for research. *Social Science & Medicine* **70**(12), 1896–1903. [doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.02.031](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.02.031)
- Del Furia L, Wallace-Jones J (2000) The effectiveness of provisions and quality of practices concerning public participation in EIA in Italy. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* **20**(4), 457–479. [doi:10.1016/S0195-9255\(00\)00035-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-9255(00)00035-4)
- del Rio V, Levi D (2009) Internet-based surveys and urban design education: a community outreach graduate project in Redding, CA. *Urban Design International* **14**(4), 192–206. [doi:10.1057/udi.2009.20](https://doi.org/10.1057/udi.2009.20)
- DesRoches CT (2007) Policy advice for public participation in British Columbia forest management. *Forestry Chronicle* **83**(5), 672–681. [doi:10.5558/tfc83672-5](https://doi.org/10.5558/tfc83672-5)
- Evans-Cowley J, Hollander J (2010) The new generation of public participation: internet-based participation tools. *Planning Practice and Research* **25**(3), 397–408. [doi:10.1080/02697459.2010.503432](https://doi.org/10.1080/02697459.2010.503432)
- Frankish CJ, Kwan B, Ratner PA, Wharf Higgins J, Larsen C (2002) Challenges of citizen participation in regional health authorities. *Social Science & Medicine* **54**(10), 1471–1480. [doi:10.1016/S0277-9536\(01\)00135-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(01)00135-6)
- Fredericks J, Foth M (2013) Augmenting public participation: enhancing planning outcomes through the use of social media and web 2.0. *Australian Plants* **50**(3), 244–256. [doi:10.1080/07293682.2012.748083](https://doi.org/10.1080/07293682.2012.748083)
- Goberman-Hill R, Horwood J, Calnan M (2008) Citizens' juries in planning research priorities: process, engagement and outcome. *Health Expectations* **11**(3), 272–281. [doi:10.1111/j.1369-7625.2008.00502.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1369-7625.2008.00502.x)

- Goold SD, Biddle AK, Klipp G, Hall CN, Danis M (2005) Choosing healthplans all together: a deliberative exercise for allocating limited health care resources. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* **30**(4), 563–601. [doi:10.1215/03616878-30-4-563](https://doi.org/10.1215/03616878-30-4-563)
- Griebler U, Nowak P (2012) Student councils: a tool for health promoting schools? Characteristics and effects. *Health Education* **112**(2), 105–132. [doi:10.1108/09654281211203402](https://doi.org/10.1108/09654281211203402)
- Guttman N, Shalev C, Kaplan G, Abulafia A, Bin-Nun G, Goffer R, Ben-Moshe R, Tal O, Shani M, Lev B (2008) What should be given a priority – costly medications for relatively few people or inexpensive ones for many? The Health Parliament public consultation initiative in Israel. *Health Expectations* **11**(2), 177–188. [doi:10.1111/j.1369-7625.2007.00485.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1369-7625.2007.00485.x)
- Hamlett PW, Cobb MD (2006) Potential solutions to public deliberation problems: structured deliberations and polarization cascades. *Policy Studies Journal* **34**(4), 629–648. [doi:10.1111/j.1541-0072.2006.00195.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.2006.00195.x)
- Hartz-Karp J, Anderson P, Gasti J, Felicetti A (2010) The Australian citizens' parliament: forging shared identity through public deliberation. *Journal of Public Affairs* **10**(4), 353–371. [doi:10.1002/pa.370](https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.370)
- Higgs G, Berry R, Kidner D, Langford M (2008) Using IT approaches to promote public participation in renewable energy planning: prospects and challenges. *Land Use Policy* **25**(4), 596–607. [doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2007.12.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2007.12.001)
- Johnson DE, Dagg S (2003) Achieving public participation in coastal zone environmental impact assessment. *Journal of Coastal Conservation* **9**(1), 13–18. [doi:10.1652/1400-0350\(2003\)009\[0013:APPICZ\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1652/1400-0350(2003)009[0013:APPICZ]2.0.CO;2)
- Kashefi E, Mort M (2004) Grounded citizens' juries: a tool for health activism? *Health Expectations* **7**(4), 290–302. [doi:10.1111/j.1369-7625.2004.00295.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1369-7625.2004.00295.x)
- Khisty CJ, Leleur S (1997) Citizen participation through communicative action: towards a new framework and synthesis. *Journal of Advanced Transportation* **31**(2), 119–137. [doi:10.1002/atr.5670310203](https://doi.org/10.1002/atr.5670310203)
- Kitzhaber JA (1993) Prioritising health services in an era of limits: the Oregon experience. *British Medical Journal* **307**, 373–377. [doi:10.1136/bmj.307.6900.373](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.307.6900.373)
- Klenk NL, Hickey GM (2011) A virtual and anonymous, deliberative and analytic participation process for planning and evaluation: the Concept Mapping Policy Delphi. *International Journal of Forecasting* **27**(1), 152–165. [doi:10.1016/j.ijforecast.2010.05.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2010.05.002)
- Lamers M, Ottow B, Francois G, Korff YV (2010) Beyond dry feet? Experiences from a participatory water-management planning case in the Netherlands. *Ecology and Society* **15**(1), art14. [doi:10.5751/ES-03204-150114](https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-03204-150114)
- Leach WD (2006) Public involvement in USDA forest service policymaking: a literature review. *Journal of Forestry* **104**(1), 43–49.
- Lehoux P, Daudelin G, Abelson J (2012) The unbearable lightness of citizens within public deliberation processes. *Social Science & Medicine* **74**(12), 1843–1850. [doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.02.023](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.02.023)

- Li KK, Abelson J, Giacomini M, Contandriopoulos D (2015) Conceptualizing the use of public involvement in health policy decision-making. *Social Science & Medicine* **138**, 14–21. [doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.05.023](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.05.023)
- Litva A, Coast J, Donovan J, Eyles J, Shepherd M, Tacchi J, Abelson J, Morgan K (2002) ‘The public is too subjective’: public involvement at different levels of health-care decision making. *Social Science & Medicine* **54**(12), 1825–1837. [doi:10.1016/S0277-9536\(01\)00151-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(01)00151-4)
- Loubier S, Rinaudo JD, Garin P, Boutet A (2005) Preparing public participation at the catchment level: comparison of three methodologies applied to the Hérault river basin. *Water Science and Technology* **52**(12), 33–41.
- MacMillan CM (2010) Auditing citizen engagement in heritage planning: the views of citizens. *Canadian Public Administration* **53**(1), 87–106. [doi:10.1111/j.1754-7121.2010.00113.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-7121.2010.00113.x)
- Mandarano L, Meenar M, Steins C (2010) Building social capital in the digital age of civic engagement. *Journal of Planning Literature* **25**(2), 123–135. [doi:10.1177/0885412210394102](https://doi.org/10.1177/0885412210394102)
- McCoy DC, Hall JA, Ridge M (2012) A systematic review of the literature for evidence on health facility committees in low- and middle-income countries. *Health Policy and Planning* **27**(6), 449–466. [doi:10.1093/heapol/czr077](https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czr077)
- Mendoza E, Perz S, Aguilar C (2007) The ‘knowledge exchange train’: a model for capacity building for participatory governance in the south-western Amazon. *Development in Practice* **17**(6), 791–799. [doi:10.1080/09614520701628451](https://doi.org/10.1080/09614520701628451)
- Menon D, Stafinski T (2011) Role of patient and public participation in health technology assessment and coverage decisions. *Expert Review of Pharmacoeconomics & Outcomes Research* **11**(1), 75–89. [doi:10.1586/erp.10.82](https://doi.org/10.1586/erp.10.82)
- Mitton C, Smith N, Peacock S, Evoy B, Abelson J (2009) Public participation in health care priority setting: a scoping review. *Health Policy* **91**(3), 219–228. [doi:10.1016/j.healthpol.2009.01.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2009.01.005)
- Molster C, Maxwell S, Youngs L, Kyne G, Hope F, Dawkins H, O’Leary P (2013) Blueprint for a deliberative public forum on biobanking policy: were theoretical principles achievable in practice? *Health Expectations* **16**(2), 211–224. [doi:10.1111/j.1369-7625.2011.00701.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1369-7625.2011.00701.x)
- Mullen C (2008) Representation or reason: consulting the public on the ethics of health policy. *Health Care Analysis* **16**(4), 397–409. [doi:10.1007/s10728-007-0068-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10728-007-0068-2)
- Mustajoki J, Hämäläinen RP, Marttunen M (2004) Participatory multicriteria decision analysis with Web-HIPRE: a case of lake regulation policy. *Environmental Modelling & Software* **19**(6), 537–547. [doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2003.07.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2003.07.002)
- Neudoerffer RC, Malhotra P, Ramana PV (2001) Participatory rural energy planning in India – a policy context. *Energy Policy* **29**(5), 371–381. [doi:10.1016/S0301-4215\(00\)00132-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-4215(00)00132-4)

- North N, Werko S (2002) Widening the debate? Consultation and participation in local health care planning in the English and Swedish health services. *International Journal of Health Services* **32**(4), 781–798. [doi:10.2190/7475-XLOB-WPYH-EK7B](https://doi.org/10.2190/7475-XLOB-WPYH-EK7B)
- Oliver SR, Rees R, Clarke-Jones L, Milne R, Oakley A, Gabbay J, Stein K, Buchanan P, Gyte G (2008) A multidimensional conceptual framework for analysing public involvement in health services research. *Health Expectations* **11**(1), 72–84. [doi:10.1111/j.1369-7625.2007.00476.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1369-7625.2007.00476.x)
- Parkins JR, Mitchell RE (2005) Public participation as public debate: a deliberative turn in natural resource management. *Society & Natural Resources* **18**(6), 529–540. [doi:10.1080/08941920590947977](https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920590947977)
- Poetz A (2012) ‘Risk is a social thing, not just a mathematical thing’: a model for stakeholder engagement in decision making. *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy* **3**(2), 1–32. [doi:10.1515/1944-4079.1105](https://doi.org/10.1515/1944-4079.1105)
- Rossmann D, Shanahan EA (2012) Defining and achieving normative democratic values in participatory budgeting processes. *Public Administration Review* **72**(1), 56–66. [doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02480.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02480.x)
- Rowe G, Frewer LJ (2005) A typology of public engagement mechanisms. *Science, Technology & Human Values* **30**(2), 251–290. [doi:10.1177/0162243904271724](https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243904271724)
- Sevenant M, Antrop M (2010) Transdisciplinary landscape planning: does the public have aspirations? experiences from a case study in Ghent (Flanders, Belgium). *Land Use Policy* **27**(2), 373–386. [doi:10.1016/j.landusepol.2009.05.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2009.05.005)
- Sneddon C, Fox C (2007) Power, development, and institutional change: participatory governance in the Lower Mekong basin. *World Development* **35**(12), 2161–2181. [doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2007.02.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2007.02.002)
- Sultana P, Abeyasekera S (2008) Effectiveness of participatory planning for community management of fisheries in Bangladesh. *Journal of Environmental Management* **86**(1), 201–213. [doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2006.12.027](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2006.12.027)
- Summers A, McKeown K (1996) Local voices: evolving a realistic strategy on public consultation. *Public Health* **110**(3), 145–150. [doi:10.1016/S0033-3506\(96\)80067-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0033-3506(96)80067-9)
- Tenbenseel T (2002) Interpreting public input into priority-setting: the role of mediating institutions. *Health Policy* **62**(2), 173–194. [doi:10.1016/S0168-8510\(02\)00017-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-8510(02)00017-9)
- Webler T, Tuler S (2006) Four perspectives on public participation process in environmental assessment and decision making: combined results from 10 case studies. *Policy Studies Journal* **34**(4), 699–722. [doi:10.1111/j.1541-0072.2006.00198.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.2006.00198.x)
- Webler T, Tuler S, Krueger R (2001) What is a good public participation process? Five perspectives from the public. *Environmental Management* **27**(3), 435–450. [doi:10.1007/s002670010160](https://doi.org/10.1007/s002670010160)
- Whitty JA, Littlejohns P (2015) Social values and health priority setting in Australia: an analysis applied to the context of health technology assessment. *Health Policy* **119**(2), 127–136. [doi:10.1016/j.healthpol.2014.09.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2014.09.003)

Yassi A, Lockhart K, Sykes M, Buck B, Stime B, Spiegel JM (2013) Effectiveness of joint health and safety committees: a realist review. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine* **56**(4), 424–438.  
[doi:10.1002/ajim.22143](https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.22143)