

Supplementary 3. ADEPT criteria associated with each determinant of policy impact

Determinant	Criteria
Accessibility	1. The policy is accessible (hard copy and online)
Policy background	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The scientific grounds of the policy are established</li> <li>2. The goals are drawn from a conclusive review of literature</li> <li>3. The source of the health policy is explicit               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Authority (one or more persons, books, scientific articles or sources of information)</li> <li>b. Quantitative or qualitative analysis</li> </ol> </li> <li>c. Deduction (premises that have been established from authority, observation, intuition or all three)</li> <li>4. The policy encompasses some set of feasible alternatives</li> </ol>
Goals	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The goals are explicitly stated</li> <li>2. The goals are concrete enough to be evaluated later</li> <li>3. The goal is clear in its intent and in the mechanism with which to achieve the desired goals</li> <li>4. The action centers on improving the health of the population</li> <li>5. The policy is supported by evidence of external consistency in logically drawing a health outcome from the goals and policy outcome</li> <li>6. The policy is supported by internal validity in logically drawing a health outcome from the goals and policy outcome</li> </ol>
Resources	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Financial resources are addressed               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The cost of condition to community has been mentioned</li> <li>b. Estimated financial resources for implementation of the policy is given</li> <li>c. Allocated financial resources for implementation of the policy are clear</li> <li>d. There are rewards/sanctions for spending the allocated resources on appropriate programs</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Human resources are addressed</li> <li>3. Organizational capacity is addressed</li> </ol>
Monitoring and Evaluation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The policy indicates monitoring and evaluation mechanisms</li> <li>2. The policy nominates a committee or independent body to perform the evaluation</li> <li>3. The outcome measures are identified for each of the explicit and implicit objectives</li> <li>4. The data, for evaluation, are collected before, during and after the introduction of the new policy</li> <li>5. Follow up takes place after a sufficient period to allow the effects of policy change to become evident</li> <li>6. Other factors that could have produced the change (other than policy) are identified</li> <li>7. Criteria for evaluation are adequate and clear</li> </ol>
Opportunities	<p>Public opportunities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Multiple stakeholders are involved</li> <li>2. Primary concerns of stakeholders are recognized and acknowledged to obtain longer term support</li> </ol> <p>Political Opportunities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The political climate has either worsened or improved</li> <li>2. Cooperation between public and private organizations has either worsened or improved</li> <li>3. The lobby for the action has either worsened or improved</li> </ol>
Obligations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The obligations of the various implementers are specified – who must do what?</li> <li>2. Scientific results are compelling for action</li> </ol>

Source: Cheung et al (2010) [30]