TITLE

Assessing the macro-level political, economic and social mechanisms that can deliver an inclusive economy: A protocol for a systematic review of reviews.

PROTOCOL REGISTRATION

Protocol registered on Open Science Framework. DOI: [10.17605/OSF.IO/SWT4E](https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/SWT4E)

AUTHORS

Shifa H. Sarica¹, (shifa.sarica2@phs.scot); Neil Chalmers¹, (neil.chalmers@phs.scot); Graeme Scobie¹, (graeme.scobie@phs.scot); Neil Craig¹, (neil.craig@phs.scot); Gerry McCartney¹, (Gerard.Mccartney@phs.scot); Deborah Shipton¹, (deborah.shipton@phs.scot)

AUTHOR AFFILIATIONS

1. Place and Wellbeing Directorate, Public Health Scotland, 5 Cadogan Street, Glasgow G2 6QE

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

Shifa H. Sarica, Place and Wellbeing Directorate, Public Health Scotland, 5 Cadogan Street, Glasgow G2 6QE

CONTRIBUTIONS

The review was conceived by SHS and DS. SHS and DS undertook initial literature scoping. All co-authors contributed to the search strategy and analysis plan. SHS drafted the protocol, and all co-authors critically reviewed the protocol and approved the final version. SHS acts as the guarantor of this review.

AMENDMENTS

This protocol has no amendments. Any amendments will be thoroughly documented and justified. Significant amendments to and deviations from the protocol will be clearly disclosed when disseminating the findings of the review.

SUPPORT

This work received no external funding. All authors are employees of Public Health Scotland. Public Health Scotland is the organisational sponsor of the review. The sponsor was not involved in developing the review protocol.

ABSTRACT

Background. An inclusive economy is increasingly recognised as an effective way to tackle widening inequalities within populations and ensure nations can “build back better” after the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the different mechanisms that can be used to deliver an inclusive economy are not well established, and the strength and quality of evidence supporting such mechanisms are yet to be synthesised.

Aim. To systematically review the literature to identify the political, economic and social mechanisms that can be used to deliver an inclusive economy.

Search methods. We will search eight peer-reviewed databases including EconLit, Web of Science, Sociological Abstracts, Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts, International Bibliography of the Social Sciences, Proquest Public Health Database, Embase and Medline. Grey literature will be searched using Google Scholar and websites for various governmental and non-governmental organisations.

Selection criteria. We will include literature reviews assessing the impact of social, political and/or economic mechanisms that can deliver an inclusive economy. Relevant exposures include any population-level social, political or economic mechanisms and relevant outcomes include increased equity in any of the following: (i) opportunities, e.g. access to education, training, employment, owning and running businesses, owning and managing community assets, finance; (ii) the experiences of people in different social classes, and (iii) the distribution of the economy’s outcomes, e.g. resources, good quality jobs and living standards, and power, income and wealth.

Data collection and analysis. A modified version of the AMSTAR-2 criteria will be used for critical appraisal. Data will then be synthesised qualitatively (or quantitatively, where applicable) giving greater weight to higher quality reviews.

Discussion: Our review will synthesise the available reviewed evidence on mechanisms that have been evaluated in relation to inclusive economy outcomes. This will help policymakers and practitioners identify potential interventions and levers that can be used to deliver an inclusive economy. We will also assess the depth as well as the strengths and weaknesses in existing reviewed evidence base and identify areas that require further reviews of primary research and evaluation.

Protocol registration. This protocol was registered on Open Science Framework.

Link: <https://osf.io/swt4e>, DOI: [10.17605/OSF.IO/SWT4E](https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/SWT4E)

INTRODUCTION

The past three decades have seen an increasing recognition of widening inequalities within populations (1-3). The OECD Centre for Opportunity and Equality research shows that the average income of the richest 10% of the population is 9.6 times more than that of the poorest 10% across the OECD countries, the highest ratio measured on record, up from 7:1 in the 1980s (4). Widening inequalities within and across populations is a concern not only socially and politically but also economically (2) and in terms of health (5-8). Weighed against its detrimental consequences, the importance of tackling these inequalities has been recognised as an explicit aim of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (9).

The unprecedented social and economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted and galvanised movements around the need to 'build [the economy] back better', where many countries are increasingly looking to build back a more inclusive economy that is more equitable by design (10, 11). Although a standard definition for an inclusive economy has not been established, a scoping review we have recently conducted identified that an inclusive economy is considered to have the following attributes: it is inherently designed to deliver inclusion and equitably distribute the benefits of the economy as well as ensuring an equitable access to resources needed to participate in the economy (12).

If governments want to establish inclusive economies in efforts to build back better following the COVID-19 pandemic, there needs to be a good understanding of which policies work, for whom and in what context for delivering an inclusive economy. However, to the best of our knowledge, a robust synthesis of the evidence base around potential policies does not exist. To address this gap in knowledge, in this study, we aim to adopt a systematic review of reviews methodology to identify, synthesise and assess the quality of evidence around what works to deliver an inclusive economy. This methodology, also known as 'umbrella review', is commonly used in the fields of medicine and public health to systematically synthesise existing evidence in areas requiring multidisciplinary input especially where both the extent and strength of evidence is unknown (13, 14).

Aim and objectives

In this study, we aim to use the review of reviews methodology commonly used in the medical and public health fields to collate and synthesise existing evidence on the political, economic and social mechanisms which can be used to deliver an inclusive economy. In doing so, it will address the following objectives:

- contribute to the evidence base on what works for delivering an inclusive economy with regard to populations and context, i.e. what works for whom and in what context, and
- identify the quality of existing evidence and areas where evidence is missing to inform future work in this area.

Research question

The review question below was formulated using the PICO (**P**opulation, **I**ntervention or exposure, **C**omparison, **O**utcome, **S**tudy design) framework, a framework which is widely used when developing systematic reviews in evidence-based medicine (McKenzie 2019).

What are the population-level political, economic and social mechanisms that can be used to deliver an inclusive economy?

METHODS

Study design and relevant guidelines

This systematic review will include a systematic review of peer-reviewed and grey literature, focusing on reviews of quantitative and qualitative studies. This protocol has been written in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement (15). See Appendix I for details.

The findings of the systematic review will be reported according to the Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (16). Synthesis Without Meta-analysis (SWiM) reporting guidelines (17) will be used in conjunction with PRISMA reporting guidelines if a meta-analysis is deemed inappropriate for reporting the findings.

We will use the adapted Methodological Quality of Systematic Reviews (AMSTAR)-2 criteria when assessing the quality of reviews included in our review (17, 18). For assessing the quality of cumulative evidence, we will adopt the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) approach (19).

Eligibility criteria

Eligibility criteria was informed by the PICOS framework (20). A summary of this framework is included in Table 1, and the inclusion and exclusion criteria are summarised below.

Table 1: Eligibility criteria informed by the PICOS framework

Category	Criteria
Population	Humans only. No restrictions will be applied in terms of geography.
Intervention/exposure	Any social, political and economic intervention or exposure
Comparison	Eligible reviews must compare IE outcomes either within groups (before and after the intervention/exposure) or between groups (exposed versus non-exposed group)
Outcomes	<p>Inclusive economy outcomes defined as outcomes that result in more equity in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) opportunities (such as access to education, training, employment, owning and running businesses; owning and managing community assets; finance), (ii) the experience of work and the market (e.g. work autonomy, pay, earnings from wealth), (iii) the experience of discrimination, and (iv) the distribution of the economy's outcomes (e.g. resources such as quality jobs and living standards, power, income and wealth). <p>Eligible reviews must include at least one relevant inclusive economy outcome.</p>
Study design	Reviews or systematic reviews of empirical studies of quantitative and/or qualitative nature.
Study period	No restrictions

Category	Criteria
Study setting (context)	No restrictions
Publication status	Peer reviewed or grey literature. Excludes book reviews and books.
Publication period	Database inception until May 2020.
Language	English

Inclusion criteria

Inclusion criteria are as follows:

- **Population:** No restrictions will be applied in terms of population of interest. This review will include reviews focusing on populations in any group, community, region, nation, or country.
- **Intervention(s)-exposure(s):** Eligible interventions or exposures include changes to or differences in macro-level political, economic or social institutions or structures. Examples may include introduction of new policy, legislation, or formation of new institutions.
- **Comparison:** Comparator or control groups are not required for inclusion. However, eligible papers must report an assessment of how an exposure of interest impacted a specific IE outcome. These assessments could be comparisons across groups (exposed vs non-exposed group comparisons) or within groups (pre-, post-exposure comparisons).
- **Outcome(s):** Any IE outcome will be included, and any direction of impact (positive, negative, neutral or inconclusive) will be considered.
- **Study design:** This is a review of reviews and hence it will only consider systematic reviews of quantitative and/or qualitative primary studies that evaluate the impact of an exposure on outcome(s) of interest. We will not use standard criteria, for example X, when identifying systematic reviews as we anticipate that our findings will come from a various fields and not all fields adopt such criteria. However, systematic reviews included in our review must provide some detail on their search strategy around at least search terms used or databases searched. Review papers not providing any details on their search strategy such as used search terms or searched databases will be considered as scoping reviews.

- **Publication year, language and status:** No restrictions will be applied in terms of publication year. Only reviews for which English translations are available will be included due to lack of translation facilities available to the research team. Publication status will not inform inclusion. Both peer-reviewed and grey literature will be considered for inclusion.

Exclusion criteria

In accordance with the PICOS framework detailed in Table 1, the following will be excluded:

- Reviews which do not report on differences in IE outcomes (either using before and after comparisons or across different populations)
- Reviews without an English translation due to lack of the team's access to translation resources
- Book reviews and books
- Scoping reviews or commentaries

Information sources

The following bibliometric databases will be searched from inception until May 2020.

- EconLit (ProQuest)
- Web of Science
- Sociological Abstracts (SocAbs, ProQuest)
- Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts (ASSIA, ProQuest)
- International Bibliography of the Social Sciences (IBBS, ProQuest)
- Public Health Database (ProQuest)
- Embase (Ovid)
- Medline (Ovid)

In addition, the following grey literature sources will be searched for the same dates as above.

- Google Scholar: No filters will be used. The first 100 references will be exported from each iteration.
- Centre for Local Economic Strategies: Findings filtered to retrieve 'publications'. All references identified in each search will be exported.

- Joseph Rowntree Foundation: Findings filtered to retrieve 'reports' only. All references identified in each search will be exported.
- Scottish Government: Findings filtered to retrieve the following: publications, impact assessment, independent reports, research/analysis, and statistics. All references identified in each search will be exported.
- UK Government: Findings filtered to retrieve the following: policy papers and consultations, and research and statistics. All references identified in each search will be exported.
- Wellbeing Alliance: Filters unavailable, so no filters will be used. All references identified in each search will be exported.
- Research Papers in Economics: each search term will be combined with relevant key words for systematic reviews (the same as the ones used for bibliometric databases) using the Boolean operator 'and'. All identified references will be exported.
- What Works Scotland: No filters will be used. All references identified in each search will be exported.
- Fraser of Allander of Institute: No filters will be used. All references identified in each search will be exported.
- Royal Society of Arts: Findings filtered to retrieve articles/blogs and publications. All references identified in each search will be exported.
- The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development: Strategy same as that used in Research Papers in Economics. All fields will be searched and all identified references will be exported.
- Institute for Public Policy Research: Findings filtered to retrieve publications, only. All references identified in each search will be exported.
- Health Foundation: Findings filtered to retrieve publications, only. All references identified in each search will be exported.

Search terms will be adapted for grey literature searches as these resources do not usually allow for detailed searches in a similar way to peer-reviewed bibliometric databases. Where possible, findings will be filtered using website-specific algorithms to narrow the results to relevant publications.

We will also systematic review registries and evidence databases including PROSPERO, the Campbell Collaboration and EPPI Centre to identify registered systematic protocols and/or relevant systematic reviews. We will also hand-search the reference lists of included publications for further eligible papers. We will also contact experts in the area to identify relevant papers.

Where full text is not available, or information is missing from identified reviews, the authors of the reviews will be contacted to seek further information.

Search strategy

Pilot search

Pilot searches aiming to develop the final search strategy for this systematic review comprised three main phases as shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Overview of the pilot process used to develop the search strategy

The pilot searches aimed to test and refine the final search terms and consisted of three phases. In the first phase, we conducted scoping searches on ASSIA, EconLit (ProQuest), Web of Science, IBBS, PsychINFO, Medline (Ovid) and Embase using terms related to several political, economic and social concepts and inclusive economy outcomes. Search terms in this phase included keywords such as productivity, distributive/redistributive policy, demand-side policies, supply-side policies, economic resilience, financial inclusion, inclusive growth, inclusive economy and wellbeing economy.

Our goal in the first phase was to identify relevant publications to develop an initial database of relevant search terms to form the spine of the final search terms used in our systematic review. These searches identified a total of 7,593 references, and

represent two distinct academic fields that were likely to return a small number of overlapping findings. During this process, we realised that our search was too sensitive and returned irrelevant study designs. Thus, we added study-design specific words to our searches to increase the specificity of our search. We argue that this is a better strategy than relying on inbuilt database filters to identify study designs, since these filters are not used consistently across databases and vocabulary used for study designs across our bibliometric databases used in this systematic review differ.

Search terms

The final search terms that will be used in our search are detailed in Table 2. These search terms belong to three main categories: exposure, outcome, and study design. Within each category, the terms will be combined with the Boolean operator 'OR', and the search terms across the three categories will be combined with 'AND'. The search strategy will be adapted for each database as appropriate. Database-specific search truncation and wildcard symbols will be used to capture alternative spellings, i.e. British versus American spellings and alternative word endings. See Appendix II for details of the pilot search strategy provided for Embase and EconLit.

Table 2. Search terms

Category	Search terms
Intervention/Exposure	<p>Political economy/economy</p> <p>capital or demand side or supply side or fiscal policy or fiscal responsibility or tax or taxation or redistributive policy or redistributive effect or distributive policy or trade policy or monetary policy or interest rate or inflation or deflation or money supply or credit supply or financial policy or deficit or national budget or national deficit or national debt or social policy or economics or macroeconom* or economic integration or recession or austerity or capitalis* or socialis* or neoliberal* or Marx* or Keynes* or financial economy or microeconomic policy or rent-seeking or lobbying or voting behavior or fiscal policy or political econom*</p> <p>Governance/government</p> <p>decentralization or de-centralization or local authority or local</p>

	<p>government or local councils or municipality or public infrastructure investment or social policy or social investment state or nationali?ation or private?ation or size of government or public ownership or industrial policy or industriali?ation or industrial structure or regulation or government policy or public goods or public fund* or welfare program* or infrastructure or procurement or local taxation or public policy or government or labo?r policy</p> <p>Market/labour market</p> <p>labo?r market or labo?r market reforms or market power or market design or free?market or oligopoly or market regulation or monopoly or market structure or financial market* or externalit* or employment or unemployment or wage* or informal economy or underground economy or employment or unemployment or labo?r economy or labo?r market discrimination or value of life or labo?r supply or labo?r demand</p> <p>Welfare state</p> <p>benefits or social security or social safety net or social protection or social floor or social welfare or welfare or household welfare or welfare programme</p> <p>Bargaining power/workplace participation</p> <p>bargaining power or collective bargaining or unionisation or trade union* or economic participation or social participation or political participation or workplace participation or labo?r managed firms or employee ownership or producer cooperative*</p> <p>Sectors</p> <p>Private sector or public sector or third sector or NGOs or non-governmental organisation* or non-governmental organization* or non-profit organi?ation or nonprofit organi?ation or voluntary sector or civic sector or non?profit sector or community sector or public enterprise* or public-private enterprise* or private</p>
--	--

	<p>enterprise* or formal sector or informal sector or shadow economy or informal institution*</p> <p>Corporation/businesses/financial institutions firm* or bank* or depository institution* or business cycle or business fluctuation or externalit* or business growth or cooperative* or co-operative* or firm behavior* or behavior* of firms or organization behavior* or behavior* of organization or firm choice or transaction cost* or business tax* or subsid* or capitalist enterprise* or cooperative enterprise*</p> <p>Financialisation/debt/household behaviour credit union* or debt or financial inclusion or financial exclusion or financial stability or income or mortgage or microfinance or lending or financial services or household saving* or personal finance or household behavior* or consumer economics or income or wealth or capital or intangible capital</p> <p>Technology/innovation digital or technolog* or innovation or social innovation or intellectual capital or intellectual property</p> <p>People entrepreneur* or human capital or skills or education or training or social capital or social contract or food security or personal income</p> <p>Other natural capital or development or gross domestic product or GDP or gross national income or gross value added or GVA or earth capitalism or environmental economy* or productivity or production or land reform or housing or property right*</p>
Outcome	<p>economic democracy or economic equality or solidarity economy or fair economy or just economy or economic inclusion or inclusive economy or inclusive growth or pro-poor growth or shared prosperity or shared growth or equity or justice</p>

	or equality or inequality or poverty or poverty reduction or reduc* poverty or economic inequality or income inequality or power inequality or wealth inequality or distribution of power or distribution of wealth or distribution of income or resilient economy or wellbeing economy or well-being economy or resilient cities or urban resilience or resilient development or inclusive institution* or economic impact or impact on economy or increase access to opportunities or increased participation in the economy or economic participation or equitable distribution of benefits or social justice or good work or fair work or fair income or job security
Study design	review or systematic review or scoping review or meta?analysis or overview or literature review or review of literature or review of the literature or critical review or review of recent literature or explanation of evidence or synthesis of evidence or synthesis of the evidence or analytical review or research synthesis or meta?regression or realist review

Intervention/exposure: any social, political and economic intervention or exposure;

Outcome: any inclusive economy outcome; Study design: reviews as defined by the review authors.

Data management

Search results will be imported to and de-duplicated in Refworks. References identified through to grey literature publications will be saved in SciWheel. Combined, this collection will form the reference library of the systematic review.

After de-duplication, either in Refworks or SciWheel, references will be imported to Covidence where the records will be managed during the screening process. Covidence will be used for both screening and data extraction. A *priori* data extraction tables will also be created in Covidence.

Selection process

Two independent reviewers will review each title and abstract and any difference in selection will be resolved through discussion or, if necessary, adjudicated by a third reviewer. The same strategy will apply for full-text screening. Prior to screening, the

screening process will be piloted to ensure consistent application of the eligibility criteria.

The reasons for exclusion at the full-text stage will be recorded in Covidence. These justifications will also be reported in the final report within the PRISMA flowchart (16) and a table presenting the details of the excluded studies will be provided in the final report.

Data extraction

A standardised electronic data extraction form created on Covidence will be used during data extraction. This form will be piloted to ensure feasibility and consistency. For piloting, five articles will be selected at random for testing. Two co-authors will independently test the form. During this process, any arising misunderstandings will be cleared and missing or superfluous items will be identified. Any revisions to the data extraction form will require consensus of all co-authors.

Once the extraction form is finalised, two reviewers will independently extract data from at least 10% of the eligible reviews. Good agreement (at least 80%) will be established before the lead reviewer resumes data extraction. Completed data extraction forms will be independently checked by a second reviewer. Any disagreements will be resolved by discussion. Where data from a review is missing, authors of the review will be contacted to obtain or confirm original findings.

It is possible that certain reviews may focus on more than one intervention or outcome. In such cases, information on all relevant exposures and outcomes will be extracted individually.

Data items

Data items will include information on the characteristics of the review, criteria to enable quality assessment (see '**Error! Reference source not found.**' below), and overall findings and insights. Below is a list of items to be extracted from each study. These items will be extracted as reported in the original review, where applicable.

Review characteristics

- ID: unique review ID
- Review reference

- Publication status: grey or peer-reviewed publication
- Review funder
- Any conflicts of interest reported by the review authors
- Other notes (if applicable)

Review methods

- Original review aim
- Review Population
- Review Intervention(s)/exposure(s)
- Definition of review intervention(s)/exposure(s)
- Review Comparator
- Review setting/context
- Review Outcome
- Review outcome definition
- Primary study design: types of primary studies included in the review
- Primary study period: the time period covered by the primary studies included in the review
- Language restriction(s)
- Number of databases searched
- Databases searched
- Theory or framework: does the review provide an *a priori* theory or framework delineating the relationship between the intervention/exposure and outcome?
- Synthesis methods: e.g. narrative synthesis, meta-analysis, etc.

Review-level findings

- Number of primary studies included in the review
- Main results: only findings relevant to our review of reviews will be extracted
- Context for the main results, e.g. time period, country, governance, etc.
- Proposed mechanisms between intervention/exposure and IE outcome
- Consistency/inconsistency of findings reported in the review
- Contextual factors covered at review-level for each outcome: note factors related to political economy, geography, or cultural context

- Primary study quality: Did the review comment on the quality of primary studies it included?
- Evidence gaps identified in the review

Critical appraisal

- Critical appraisal items covered by the AMSTAR-2 criteria (see Quality assessment)
- Summary of AMSTAR-2 quality assessment: critically low, low, moderate, high

Data synthesis

Due to the nature of our research question, we anticipate the eligible papers to originate from a wide range of social sciences. Further, we anticipate a diversity of included populations, interventions, comparators and outcomes, and hence synthesising findings through quantitative meta-analysis methods is unlikely to be feasible. In light of this, we plan to synthesise findings narratively and at review level. We will report our findings in line with the Synthesis Without Meta-analysis (SWiM) guidelines (17).

When synthesising findings, we plan to group them under common themes which may be guided by intervention/exposure, IE outcome or another characteristic such as governance type.

It is possible that different reviews may use the same primary study to provide evidence on a specific theme. Therefore, we will take several steps to avoid double counting of primary studies used as evidence for the same theme. First, in cases where an updated review using the same methodology exists and where the identified primary studies in the latter review includes all those included in the former, we will only include the findings of the updated review in our synthesis. Second, we will tabulate the primary studies identified in each included review across themes to track duplicate citations.

Quality assessment

Generally, systematic reviews include quality assessments focusing on methodological quality, Risk of Bias (RoB) in included primary studies, and quality of

reporting to ensure robust synthesis and evaluation of findings as well as to inform confidence in cumulative evidence (23, 24). In the context of reviews of reviews, included studies constitute review-level evidence, and hence our quality assessment will be confined to review-level assessment. We will not assess the quality and RoB of individual primary studies included in each review. However, where RoB of individual studies in an eligible review is provided, we will include this information in our synthesis.

We will assess the quality of included reviews using a modified version of the A Measurement Tool to Assess systematic Reviews-2 (AMSTAR-2) criteria (18). Although these criteria were developed for use by practitioners and policy makers to assess systematic reviews focusing on health interventions, they work well for our systematic review as their focus remains on methodological quality and transparency.

The quality of the reviews will be assessed at review level and independently by two authors. Any disagreements will be resolved through discussion.

Although review quality will not inform inclusion, a higher emphasis will be given to high quality reviews when synthesising findings. Individual reviews will be categorised into high, moderate, low and critically low quality of evidence according to AMSTAR-2 guidance. Descriptions for each quality category are as follows:

- High: 0-1 non-critical weakness. Consider downgrading quality if the paper has 2 or more non-critical weaknesses
- Moderate: >1 weakness but no critical weaknesses
- Low: 1 critical flow and 0 non-critical weakness
- Critically low: >1 critical flaw

Confidence in cumulative evidence

Assessing the confidence in cumulative evidence is crucial for making appropriate inferences from the findings of a systematic review. Robust tools, such as the GRADE approach (25) developed to summarise the strength of existing evidence base when making clinical practice recommendations, exist in the clinical literature for this purpose. However, such tools are not directly applicable for systematic reviews of reviews, especially those outside the clinical field.

As discussed earlier, this systematic review of reviews will seek to address a research question which is of a multidisciplinary nature, and it does not aim to produce robust guidelines on how to deliver an IE. Rather, it aims to synthesise available evidence to form the basis of future work in this area. Given the lack of standard frameworks for systematic reviews of review, we propose to assess the confidence in cumulative evidence base on an adapted version of the GRADE approach. Below are the steps we will consider during this assessment:

- Step 1: For each theme, consider the overall quality assessment and assign an initial quality ranking according to the following adapted GRADE classification:
 - High quality: Further research is unlikely to change conclusions.
 - Moderate quality: Further research is likely to change conclusions.
 - Low quality: Further research is very likely to change conclusions or sufficient body of evidence does not exist to understand the true effect.
- Step 2: revisit the initial quality ranking to “downgrade” or “upgrade” initial ranking according to the domains detailed in Table 3 bellow.

Table 3. Adapted GRADE domains

Domain	Actions
Quality of included reviews and primary studies in the reviews (as reported in the reviews)	The lower the quality of the reviews and primary studies, the lower the confidence in cumulative evidence. Consider downgrading initial rating if quality is low.
Inconsistency of impact	The higher the inconsistency of the impact of the intervention/exposure in the same context, the lower the confidence in cumulative evidence. Consider downgrading initial rating if inconsistency is apparent.
Imprecision	The higher the quantitative precision around the effect of the intervention, the higher the confidence in cumulative evidence.
Publication/reporting bias	The higher the risk of within-review and

	inter-review publication bias, the lower the confidence in cumulative evidence. Consider downgrading initial rating if it is likely that statistically non-significant findings remain unpublished
Magnitude of effect	Consider upgrading initial rating if observed effect is particularly large.
Dose-response gradient	Upgrade if evidence indicates an apparent dose-response gradient.
Confounding	Consider whether there are unmeasured confounders in the body of evidence and whether these confounders are likely to only reduce the observed effect. If yes, consider upgrading initial rating.

DISSEMINATION OF FINDINGS

We aim to disseminate our findings via Public Health Scotland briefings, peer-reviewed publications, and through conferences and stakeholder networks (largely local and national governments and regional economic partnerships).

REFERENCES

1. OECD. Divided we stand. Why inequality keeps rising. OECD Publishing; 2011. Report No.: <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264119536-en>.
2. OECD. In it together: why less inequality benefits all. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2015. Report No.: <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264235120-en>.
3. Keeley B. How does income inequality affect our lives? In: Income Inequality: The Gap between Rich and Poor. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2015.
4. OECD. Growing unequal? Income distribution and poverty in OECD countries. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2008. Report No.: 9789264044180.
5. Whitehead. M. The concepts and principles of equality and health. Copenhagen, WHO Regional Office for Europe (EUR/ICP/RPD 414), 1990. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe; 1990. Report No.: EUR/ICP/RPD 414.
6. Marmot M. Social determinants of health inequalities. The Lancet. 2005 03/19; 2020/11;365(9464):1099-104.
7. Marmot M, Allen J, Goldblatt P, Boyce T, McNeish D, Grady M, et al. Fair society, healthy lives: the Marmot Review. Strategic review of health inequalities in England post-2010. London: 2010. Report No.: ISBN 9780956487001.

8. Marmot M, Allen J, Boyce T, Goldblatt P, Morrison J. Health inequity in England: the Marmot Review 10 years on. Institute of Health Equity; 2020.
9. United Nations. Transforming our world: the 2030 agenda for sustainable development. United Nations; 2015. Report No.: A/RES/70/1.
10. UNA-UK. Sustainable Development Goals: building back better. UNA-UK; 2020.
11. Marmot, M., Allen J, Goldblatt P, Herd E, Morrison J. Build back fairer: the COVID-19 Marmot Review. The pandemic, socioeconomic and health inequalities in England. London: Institute of Health Equity; 2020.
12. Shipton D, Sarica S, Scobie G, Craig N, McCartney G, Katikireddi SV, et al. Knowing the goal: an inclusive economy that can address the public health challenges of our time. In press 2020.
13. Caird J, Sutcliffe K, Kwan I, Dickson K, Thomas J. Mediating policy-relevant evidence at speed: are systematic reviews of systematic reviews a useful approach? . Evidence & Policy: A Journal of Research, Debate and Practice. 2015;11(1):81-97.
14. Hunt H, Pollock A, Campbell P, Estcourt L, Brunton G. An introduction to overviews of reviews: planning a relevant research question and objective for an overview. Systematic Reviews. 2018 03/01;7(1):39.
15. Shamseer L, Moher D, C. M, Gherzi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 01/02;349:g7647.
16. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. BMJ. 2009 07/21;339:b2535.
17. Campbell M, McKenzie JE, Sowden A, Katikireddi SV, Brennan SE, Ellis S, et al. Synthesis without meta-analysis (SWiM) in systematic reviews: reporting guideline. BMJ. 2020 01/16;368:l6890.
18. Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, Thuku M, Hamel C, Moran J, et al. AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both. BMJ. 2017 09/21;358:j4008.
19. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE guidelines: 4. Rating the quality of evidence—study limitations (risk of bias). J Clin Epidemiol. 2011 04/01; 2020/11;64(4):407-15.
20. McKenzie J, Brennan S, Ryan R, Thomson H, Johnston R, Thomas J. Chapter 3: Defining the criteria for including studies and how they will be grouped for the synthesis. In: Higgins J, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page M, et al, editors. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*. Version 6.1 (updated September 2020) ed. Cochrane; 2020.
21. JEL Classification System / EconLit Subject Descriptors [Internet].; 2020 []. Available from: <https://www.aeaweb.org/econlit/jelCodes.php>.
22. VosViewer. VosViewer. 2020.

23. Boutron I, Page M, Higgins J, Altman D, Lundh A, Hróbjartsson A. Chapter 7: Considering bias and conflicts of interest among the included studies. . In: Higgins J, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page M, et al, editors. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* . 6.1 (updated September 2020) ed. Cochrane; 2020.
24. Schünemann H, Higgins J, Vist G, Glasziou P, Akl E, Skoetz N, et al. Chapter 14: Completing 'Summary of findings' tables and grading the certainty of the evidence. In: Higgins J, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page M, et al, editors. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* . 6.1 (updated September 2020) ed. Cochrane; 2020.
25. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Vist GE, Falck-Ytter Y, Schünemann H,J., et al. What is "quality of evidence" and why is it important to clinicians? *BMJ*. 2008 05/03;336(7651):995-8.

APPENDIX I. PRISMA-P 2015 CHECKLIST

This checklist has been adapted for use with protocol submissions to *Systematic Reviews* from Table 3 in Moher D et al: Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic Reviews* 2015 4:1

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information reported		Page number			
			Yes	No				
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION								
Title								
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	☒	☐	1			
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	☐	☐	Not applicable			
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (e.g., PROSPERO) and registration number in the Abstract	☒	☐	1,4			
Authors								
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, and e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	☒	☐	1			
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	☒	☐	1			
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	☐	☐	Not applicable			
Support								
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	☒	☐	2			
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	☒	☐	2			
Role of sponsor/funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	☒	☐	2			
INTRODUCTION								

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information reported		Page number
			Yes	No	
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	☒	☐	5, 6
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	☒	☐	6
METHODS					
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (e.g., PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	☒	☐	7-9
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (e.g., electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers, or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	☒	☐	9-11
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	☒	☐	28-32
STUDY RECORDS					
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	☒	☐	16
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (e.g., two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (i.e., screening, eligibility, and inclusion in meta-analysis)	☒	☐	16-17
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (e.g., piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	☒	☐	17
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (e.g., PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	☒	☐	17-18
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	☒	☐	Not applicable. All IE outcomes are

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information reported		Page number
			Yes	No	
					considered equally.
Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	☒	☐	19-21
DATA					
Synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesized	☐	☐	Not applicable
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data, and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (e.g., I^2 , Kendall's tau)	☐	☐	Not applicable
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	☐	☐	Not applicable
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	☒	☐	19
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (e.g., publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	☒	☐	20-21
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (e.g., GRADE)	☒	☐	20-21

APPENDIX II. PILOT SEARCHES

Embase(Ovid): 1974 to 11 February 2020

	Search	Results
1	(capital or demand side or demand-side or supply side or supply-side or fiscal policy or fiscal responsibility or tax or taxation or redistributive policy or redistributive effect* or distributive policy or re-distributive policy or trade policy or monetary policy or interest rate or inflation or deflation or money supply or credit supply or financial policy or deficit or national budget or national deficit or national debt or social policy or econom* or macroeconom* or economic integration or recession or austerity or capitalis* or socialis* or neoliberal* or Marx* or Keynes* or financial economy or microeconomic policy or rent-seeking or lobbying or voting behavior or fiscal policy or political econom*).tw.	583192
2	(decentralization or de-centralization or local authority or local government or local councils or municipality or public infrastructure investment or social policy or social investment state or nationalization or privatization or size of government or public ownership or industrial policy or industrialization or industrial structure or regulation or government policy or public goods or public fund* or welfare program* or infrastructure or procurement or local taxation or public policy or government or labor policy).tw.	1159835
3	(labor market or labor market reforms or market power or market design or free-market or oligopoly or market regulation or monopoly or market structure or financial market* or externalities* or employment or unemployment or wage* or informal economy or underground economy or employment or unemployment or labor economy or labor market discrimination or value of life or labor supply or labor demand).tw.	90797
4	(benefits or social security or social safety net or social protection or social floor or social welfare or welfare or household welfare or welfare program*).tw.	448112
5	(bargaining power or collective bargaining or unionization or trade union* or economic participation or social participation or political participation or workplace participation or labor managed firms or employee ownership or producer cooperative*).tw.	5611
6	(Private sector or public sector or third sector or NGOs or non-governmental organisation* or non-governmental organization* or non-profit organization or nonprofit organization or voluntary sector or civic sector or non-profit sector or community sector or public enterprise* or public-private enterprise* or private enterprise* or formal sector or informal sector or shadow economy or informal institution*).tw.	23599
7	(firm* or bank* or depository institution* or business cycle or business fluctuation or externalities* or business growth or cooperative* or co-operative* or firm behavior or behavior of firms or organization behavior or behavior of organization or firm choice or transaction cost* or business tax* or subsidy* or capitalist enterprise* or cooperative enterprise*).tw.	238429

8	(credit union* or debt or financial inclusion or financial exclusion or financial stability or income or mortgage or micro?finance or lending or financial services or household saving* or personal finance or household behavior or consumer economics or income or wealth or capital or intangible capital).tw.	197293
9	(digital or technolog* or innovation or social innovation or intellectual capital or intellectual property).tw.	767142
10	(entrepreneur* or human capital or skills or education or training or social capital or social contract or food security or personal income).tw.	1123572
11	(natural capital or de?growth or gross domestic product or GDP or gross national income or gross value added or GVA or earth capitalism or environmental econom* or productivity or production or land reform or housing or property right*).tw.	1185721
12	1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11	4991321
13	(economic democracy or economic equality or solidarity economy or fair economy or just economy or economic inclusion or inclusive economy or inclusive growth or pro?poor growth or shared prosperity or shared growth or equity or justice or equality or inequality or poverty or poverty reduction or reduc* poverty or economic inequality or income inequality or power inequality or wealth inequality or distribution of power or distribution of wealth or distribution of income or resilient economy or wellbeing economy or well-being economy or resilient cities or urban resilience or resilient development or inclusive institution* or economic impact or impact on economy or increase access to opportunities or increased participation in the economy or economic participation or equitable distribution of benefits or social justice or good work or fair work or fair income or job security).tw.	97216
14	(review or systematic review or scoping review or meta?analysis or overview or literature review or review of literature or review of the literature or critical review or review of recent literature or explanation of evidence or synthesis of evidence or synthesis of the evidence or analytical review or research synthesis or meta?regression or realist review).tw.	2041001
15	12 and 13 and 14	6860
16	limit 15 to human	5914

EconLit (Proquest): 1886 to 12 February 2020

Search	Results
<p>((ti(capital OR demand side OR supply-side OR "fiscal policy" OR "fiscal responsibility" OR tax OR taxation OR "redistributive policy" OR "redistributive effect*" OR "distributive policy" OR "re-distributive policy" OR "trade policy" OR "monetary policy" OR "interest rate" OR inflation OR deflation OR "money supply" OR "credit supply" OR "financial policy" OR deficit OR "national budget" OR "national deficit" OR "national debt" OR "social policy" OR econom* OR macroeconom* OR "economic integration" OR recession OR austerity OR capitalis* OR socialis* OR neoliberal* OR Marx* OR Keynes* OR "financial economy" OR "microeconomic policy" OR rent-seeking OR lobbying OR "voting behavior?" OR "fiscal policy" OR "political econom*") OR ab(capital OR demand side OR supply-side OR "fiscal policy" OR "fiscal responsibility" OR tax OR taxation OR "redistributive policy" OR "redistributive effect*" OR "distributive policy" OR "re-distributive policy" OR "trade policy" OR "monetary policy" OR "interest rate" OR inflation OR deflation OR "money supply" OR "credit supply" OR "financial policy" OR deficit OR "national budget" OR "national deficit" OR "national debt" OR "social policy" OR econom* OR macroeconom* OR "economic integration" OR recession OR austerity OR capitalis* OR socialis* OR neoliberal* OR Marx* OR Keynes* OR "financial economy" OR "microeconomic policy" OR rent-seeking OR lobbying OR "voting behavior?" OR "fiscal policy" OR "political econom*")) OR (ti(decentrali?ation OR de-centrali?ation OR "local authority" OR "local government" OR "local councils" OR municipality OR "public infrastructure investment" OR "social policy" OR "social investment state" OR nationali?ation OR private?ation OR "size of government" OR "public ownership" OR "industrial policy" OR industriali?ation OR "industrial structure" OR regulation OR "government policy" OR "public goods" OR "public fund*" OR "welfare program*" OR infrastructure OR procurement OR "local taxation" OR "public policy" OR government OR "labo?r policy") OR ab(decentrali?ation OR de-centrali?ation OR "local authority" OR "local government" OR "local councils" OR municipality OR "public infrastructure investment" OR "social policy" OR "social investment state" OR nationali?ation OR private?ation OR "size of government" OR "public ownership" OR "industrial policy" OR industriali?ation OR "industrial structure" OR regulation OR "government policy" OR "public goods" OR "public fund*" OR "welfare program*" OR infrastructure OR procurement OR "local taxation" OR "public policy" OR government OR "labo?r policy")) OR (ti(labo?r market OR "labo?r market reforms" OR "market power" OR "market design" OR free-market OR oligopoly OR "market regulation" OR monopoly OR "market structure" OR "financial market*" OR externalit* OR employment OR unemployment OR wage* OR "informal economy" OR "underground economy" OR employment OR unemployment OR "labo?r economy" OR "labo?r market discrimination" OR "value of life" OR labo?r supply OR "labo?r demand") OR ab(labo?r market OR "labo?r market reforms" OR "market power" OR "market design" OR free-market OR oligopoly OR "market regulation" OR monopoly OR "market structure" OR "financial market*" OR externalit* OR employment OR unemployment OR wage* OR "informal economy" OR "underground economy" OR employment OR unemployment OR "labo?r economy" OR "labo?r market discrimination" OR "value of life" OR labo?r supply OR "labo?r demand")) OR (ti(benefits OR "social security" OR "social safety net" OR "social protection" OR "social floor" OR "social welfare" OR welfare OR "household welfare" OR "welfare program*") OR ab(benefits OR "social security" OR "social safety net" OR "social protection" OR "social floor" OR "social welfare" OR welfare OR "household welfare" OR "welfare program*")) OR (ti("bargaining power" OR "collective bargaining" OR unioni?ation OR "trade union*" OR "economic participation" OR "social participation" OR "political participation" OR "workplace</p>	919

participation" OR "labor managed firms" OR "employee ownership" OR "producer cooperative") OR
 ab("bargaining power" OR "collective bargaining" OR unionization OR "trade union" OR "economic
 participation" OR "social participation" OR "political participation" OR "workplace participation" OR
 "labor managed firms" OR "employee ownership" OR "producer cooperative")) OR (ti("Private
 sector" OR "public sector" OR "third sector" OR NGOs OR "non-governmental organization" OR
 "non-profit organization" OR "voluntary sector" OR "civic sector" OR "non-profit sector" OR
 "community sector" OR "public enterprise" OR "public-private enterprise" OR "private enterprise"
 OR "formal sector" OR "informal sector" OR "shadow economy" OR "informal institution") OR
 ab("Private sector" OR "public sector" OR "third sector" OR NGOs OR "non-governmental
 organization" OR "non-profit organization" OR "voluntary sector" OR "civic sector" OR "non-profit
 sector" OR "community sector" OR "public enterprise" OR "public-private enterprise" OR "private
 enterprise" OR "formal sector" OR "informal sector" OR "shadow economy" OR "informal
 institution")) OR (ti(firm* OR bank* OR "depository institution" OR "business cycle" OR "business
 fluctuation" OR externalit* OR "business growth" OR co-operative* " or " firm behavior " or "
 behavior of firms " or " organization behavior " or " behavior of organization " or " firm choice " or "
 transaction cost* " or " business tax* " or subsid* or " capitalist enterprise* " or " cooperative
 enterprise* " ") OR ab(firm* OR bank* OR "depository institution" OR "business cycle" OR "business
 fluctuation" OR externalit* OR "business growth" OR co-operative* " or " firm behavior " or "
 behavior of firms " or " organization behavior " or " behavior of organization " or " firm choice " or "
 transaction cost* " or " business tax* " or subsid* or " capitalist enterprise* " or " cooperative
 enterprise* " ") OR (ti("credit union" OR debt OR "financial inclusion" OR "financial exclusion" OR
 "financial stability" OR income OR mortgage OR micro-finance OR lending OR "financial services" OR
 "household saving" OR "personal finance" OR "household behavior" OR "consumer economics" OR
 income OR wealth OR capital OR "intangible capital") OR ab("credit union" OR debt OR "financial
 inclusion" OR "financial exclusion" OR "financial stability" OR income OR mortgage OR micro-finance
 OR lending OR "financial services" OR "household saving" OR "personal finance" OR "household
 behavior" OR "consumer economics" OR income OR wealth OR capital OR "intangible capital")) OR
 (ti(digital OR technolog* OR innovation OR "social innovation" OR "intellectual capital" OR "intellectual
 property") OR ab(digital OR technolog* OR innovation OR "social innovation" OR "intellectual capital"
 OR "intellectual property")) OR (ti(entrepreneur* OR "human capital" OR skills OR education OR
 training OR "social capital" OR "social contract" OR "food security" OR "personal income") OR
 ab(entrepreneur* OR "human capital" OR skills OR education OR training OR "social capital" OR
 "social contract" OR "food security" OR "personal income")) OR (ti("natural capital" OR de-growth OR
 "gross domestic product" OR GDP OR "gross national income" OR "gross value added" OR GVA OR
 "earth capitalism" OR "environmental economy" OR productivity OR production OR "land reform" OR
 housing OR "property right") OR ab("natural capital" OR de-growth OR "gross domestic product" OR
 GDP OR "gross national income" OR "gross value added" OR GVA OR "earth capitalism" OR
 "environmental economy" OR productivity OR production OR "land reform" OR housing OR "property
 right")) AND (ti("economic democracy" OR "economic equality" OR "solidarity economy" OR "fair
 economy" OR "just economy" OR "economic inclusion" OR "inclusive economy" OR "inclusive growth"
 OR "pro-poor growth" OR "shared prosperity" OR "shared growth" OR equity OR justice OR equality
 OR inequality OR poverty OR "poverty reduction" OR "reduce poverty" OR "economic inequality" OR
 "income inequality" OR "power inequality" OR "wealth inequality" OR "distribution of power" OR
 "distribution of wealth" OR "distribution of income" OR "resilient economy" OR "well-being economy"

OR "resilient cities" OR "urban resilience" OR "resilient development" OR "inclusive institution*" OR "economic impact" OR "impact on economy" OR "increase access to opportunities" OR "increased participation in the economy" OR "economic participation" OR "equitable distribution of benefits" OR "social justice" OR "good work" OR "fair work" OR "fair income" OR "job security") OR ab("economic democracy" OR "economic equality" OR "solidarity economy" OR "fair economy" OR "just economy" OR "economic inclusion" OR "inclusive economy" OR "inclusive growth" OR "pro?poor growth" OR "shared prosperity" OR "shared growth" OR equity OR justice OR equality OR inequality OR poverty OR "poverty reduction" OR "reduc* poverty" OR "economic inequality" OR "income inequality" OR "power inequality" OR "wealth inequality" OR "distribution of power" OR "distribution of wealth" OR "distribution of income" OR "resilient economy" OR "well-being economy" OR "resilient cities" OR "urban resilience" OR "resilient development" OR "inclusive institution*" OR "economic impact" OR "impact on economy" OR "increase access to opportunities" OR "increased participation in the economy" OR "economic participation" OR "equitable distribution of benefits" OR "social justice" OR "good work" OR "fair work" OR "fair income" OR "job security")) AND ti(review OR "systematic review" OR "scoping review" OR meta-analysis OR overview OR "literature review" OR "review of literature" OR "review of the literature" OR "critical review" OR "review of recent literature" OR "explanation of evidence" OR "synthesis of evidence" OR "synthesis of the evidence" OR "analytical review" OR "research synthesis" OR meta-regression OR "realist review")