

**Table 1** Researcher-made checklist to assess priority setting activities

Criteria	Options		Definition
	Rank	Score	
<b>Date</b>	High	3	After 2010
	Moderate	2	2000–2010
	Low	1	Before 2000
<b>Composition of stakeholders</b>	Excellent	3	Stakeholders analysts and all stakeholders engagement such as researchers, managers, policy-makers, private sector, nongovernmental organizations and community
	Appropriate	2	All stakeholders engagement but no analysts
	Moderate	1	Just researchers, managers and policy-makers
	Inappropriate	0	Only researchers
<b>Transparency</b>	Excellent	3	Using or providing guidelines, justification of stakeholders by workshops, meetings
	Appropriate	2	Using guidelines
	Moderate	1	Just workshops
	Inappropriate	0	Nothing
<b>Considering high-level documents</b>	Excellent	3	National development plans, organizational plans, especially strategic plans, completely considered and priorities conformity is checked
	Good	2	Above-mentioned plans are considered without monitoring plan
	Moderate	1	Considering upstream plans just mentioned
	Weak	0	No reference to any plan
<b>Appeal/publicizing</b>	Excellent	3	Using mechanisms such as public meetings and newsletters, with a mechanism for getting feedback
	Good	2	Using ordinary mechanisms such as listing priorities in websites, and a mechanism for getting feedback
	Moderate	1	Just mechanisms for presenting results to community and stakeholders – no feedback
	Weak	0	No mechanism or evidence
<b>Vulnerable groups</b>	Excellent	3	Full consideration of vulnerable groups as one of the stakeholders and criteria
	Good	2	Consideration at criteria definition or as one of stakeholders
	Moderate	1	Implicitly referred
	Weak	0	Not mentioned
<b>System analysis &amp; implementation plan</b>	Excellent	3	Target population health status, health research system and health system analysts and implementation plan
	Good	2	Target population health status, health research system and health system analysts or implementation plan
	Moderate	1	Just health research system analysts
	Weak	0	No analysis
<b>Literature review and political, socioeconomic context analysis</b>	Excellent	3	Literature review, scope of priority setting, users, values and principles, political and health context evaluation
	Good	2	Literature review and context analysts
	Moderate	1	Just literature review
	Weak	0	Nothing
<b>Using criteria</b>	Excellent	3	Valid criteria are used with complete explanation about score points and scoring systems identification
	Good	2	Valid criteria are used without any explanation about score points and scoring systems identification
	Moderate	1	Criteria are used but without referring to their validity
	Weak	0	Prioritization is done based on participants scores without any criteria