

## 8.1 Methods used to inform commissioner deliberations and recommendations

One of the five desirable criteria for global commissions (see **section 1.1** for the full list) is that the commission is enabled by the use of systematic and transparent methods to review the evidence (e.g., data analytics and evidence syntheses) that informed deliberations about sections (e.g., infographics, tables and text boxes) and recommendations.

We used three main types of methods to inform commissioners' deliberations and recommendations:

- examinations of existing evidence syntheses on the many topics addressed by the Evidence Commission (the search for which was led by Kaelan Moat and which was particularly important for **sections 3.3 to 3.6 and 4.11**) or, in their absence, single studies or landmark reports and papers (the search for which was led by John Lavis and Kaelan Moat and which was particularly important for **sections 1.1, 1.6, 1.7, 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 3.1, 3.7, 4.2, 4.5, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9, 4.12, 4.13, 5.1 to 5.4, 6.1 and 6.2**)
- analyses of global commissions addressing societal challenges that published reports since 1 January 2016 or that are currently underway (which were led by Kartik Sharma and supported by Hannah Gillis and which resulted in sections **1.1, 2.5, 3.8 and 4.15**, and which informed analyses by John Lavis and which resulted in **sections 7.1 and 7.3**)
- analyses of two one-stop shops for evidence syntheses (which were led by James McKinlay and Cristian Mansilla and which resulted in **section 4.5**).

The selection of examples throughout the report was based on the rich experiences of commissioners and secretariat staff.

The search for existing evidence syntheses focused first on the most appropriate one-stop shops for evidence syntheses and then on more general bibliographic databases and Google. When relevant evidence syntheses could not be found, the search for single studies and landmark reports and papers focused on general bibliographic databases and Google. The landmark reports included those produced by:

- standing global report-producing bodies that issued one-off reports specifically focused on using evidence to address societal challenges, such as the World Development Report 2021 that addressed data analytics (at least in part)
- national and sub-national commissions specifically focused on using evidence to address societal challenges, such as the Obama-era Commission on Evidence-based Policymaking (and the related and more recent Biden-era presidential memorandum and Office of Management and Budget memorandum).(1)

Additional evidence syntheses and single studies, as well as landmark reports and papers, were identified by commissioners and secretariat staff. A targeted search for definitions of the forms in which evidence is typically encountered resulted in **section 4.2**, a thematic analysis of a listserv discussion about living evidence products informed **section 4.7**, a close collaboration with an Indigenous commissioner (Daniel Iberê Alves da Silva) resulted in **section 4.10**, the participant-observer role of many secretariat staff informed **section 4.13**, and a recently completed analysis by a secretariat staff member (Kartik Sharma) resulted in **section 5.5**.

The search for global commissions (or organizations that convene, act as the secretariat for and/or fund commissions) involved a combination of key informants (including commissioners, other knowledgeable individuals, and COVID-19 Evidence Network to support Decision-making (COVID-END) partners and advocating working-group members), Google searches, literature searches and website reviews. From this 'population' of commissions, we purposively sampled commissions using three inclusion criteria:

- global scope (e.g., not regional, national or sub-national), and note that we excluded guideline panels, modified Delphi processes, and treaty-negotiation processes
- most recent report published on or after 1 January 2016 (i.e., the start of the SDG era)
- makes recommendations that can be acted upon by key societal actors (e.g., not just recommendations by and for researchers or research funders).

For the 73 completed Lancet Commissions, we excluded 16 based on lack of global scope, 20 based on report publication date, and 26 based on a lack of link to at least one non-health SDG. We also identified three in-progress Lancet Commissions through the Reform for Resilience Commission report. We maintained a list of 'near misses' (reports that partially met but not fully meet our inclusion criteria). We may have missed global commissions that used the term 'eminent persons' in their title because this term was not part of our original search.

We extracted and analyzed data about the 54 global commissions (48 completed, one that had issued a report but not yet its final report, and five in progress) and their 70 reports to prepare four sections and inform one section:

- commissions by desirable attributes of commissions (**section 1.1**)
- commission reports by challenge type (**section 2.5**)
- commission reports by decision-maker type (**section 3.8**)
- commission reports by evidence type (**section 4.15**)
- recommendations (**section 7.1**).

For the latter section, we conducted a thematic analysis to identify completed commissions' recommendations that could be endorsed or built upon, and to identify active commissions' interim recommendations (or signals about likely recommendations) that could be endorsed or built upon and/or co-shaped in consultation with them. For all of these sections we focused on what was reported (which may be less than what was actually done). Additional details about recommendation-counting rules are available upon request. We did not conduct interviews or review websites. A list of the global commissions and their reports is provided in an annex ([8.8](#)) at the end of these appendices.

Two approaches were used to elicit input from commissioners in drafting the recommendations:

- thematic analysis of recommendations from all global commissions reporting since 1 January 2016 that identified recommendations that speak to similar issues as the Evidence Commission (which were the focus of **section 7.1**)
- 'running list' of potential recommendations that emerged from calls and emails with commissioners, advisors and others.

Several formats were proposed to commissioners, which could be selected individually or in combination:

- recommendations (or calls to action), each directed at one or more specific category of actors, describing the action(s) that need to be taken, and specifying a timeline over which it should be taken (i.e., using a 'roadmap' approach)
- draft resolution for consideration by the UN, the G20 or other multilateral organization
- model legislation that could be adapted by government policymakers (such as Foundations for Evidence-Based Policy Act of 2018, or the Evidence Act, in the US)
- agreement or charter that governments, associations and other supporters can sign on to.

Having opted for a recommendations format, the commissioners provided several rounds of feedback on the draft recommendations:

- brief discussions in the September, October and November calls with commissioners
- three rounds of online surveys, the first of which led to a change from wording each recommendation as a single sentence to the combination of a brief 'headline' and set of points that elaborate on the headline.