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| **Title of Research Presentation** Review of priority setting practices in the governance of multi-sector health promotion decision settings |
| **Maximum 2500 characters (including spaces but excluding title)**  **Background/Objectives:** Many of the challenges faced in contemporary health promotion practice arise from the need to address ‘wicked problems’… complex situations involving behavioural and environmental factors which call for action from multiple policy sectors. They focus upon determinants of health. Yet little to no research attention has been devoted to understanding how the attendant multisectoral collaborative decision-making tables reach their choices about priorities for action. This paper investigates how the methods and tools developed through four decades of research into healthcare priority setting and resource allocation might be applied in these contexts, to inform effective and accountable governance that promotes health; the research additionally will illuminate how the particular challenges of multi-sector decision-making settings may indicate the need for refinement in that literature.  **Methods:** We conduct a systematic literature review with major databases including Medline, CINAHL and Google Scholar. In context of this literature, we compare experiences in three well-documented case examples of intersectoral health promotion action against the precepts and processes outlined by three established methods for health-related priority setting.  **Results:** Most priority setting research is based upon experiences within single organizations, so little is known empirically about how to apply methods and tools within an intersectoral context for health promotion. The literature considers mainly the perspectives of public sector managers, with less know about validated methods in contexts where partners include elected policy-makers, the private sector, and/or community representatives. Effective priority setting involves as one dimension the ability to understand and operate within governance networks. Formal priority setting provides transparency and accountability for resource allocation decisions; intersectoral action is a sphere wherein such choices typically are murky and so greater openness through the use of publicly known and replicable processes would be welcomed.  **Discussion:** When multiple organizations and sectors are involved in making priority setting decisions to address wicked problems of population health, a variety of organizational and individual needs and interests come into play; how best to acknowledge these in a way that also promotes effective public action upon determinants of health is an area in which ongoing research is sorely needed.  **Keywords**  **Priority setting; intersectoral action; determinants of health** |