



Health inequalities in European cities: Perceptions and beliefs among local policymakers

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2013-004454
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	15-Nov-2013
Complete List of Authors:	Morrison, Joana; University College London, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health; CIBERESP, Pons-Vigués, Mariona; Institut Universitari d'Investigació en Atenció Primària Jordi Gol (IDIAP Jordi Gol), ; Universitat de Girona, Becares, Laia; University of Manchester, Burström, Bo; Karolinska Institutet, Department of Public Health Sciences, Division of Social Medicine Gandarillas, Ana; Subdirección General de Promoción de la Salud y Prevención. Consejería de Sanidad. Comunidad de Madrid (Subdirectorato-General for Health Promotion and Prevention. Madrid Regional Health Authority), Domínguez-Berjón, Felicitas; Subdirección General de Promoción de la Salud y Prevención. Consejería de Sanidad. Comunidad de Madrid (Subdirectorato-General for Health Promotion and Prevention. Madrid Regional Health Authority), Díez, Elia; Agència de Salut Pública de Barcelona, ; Agència de Salut Pública de Barcelona Costa, Giuseppe; University of Turin, Department of Clinical and Biological Science Ruíz, Milagros; University College London, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health Pikhart, Hynek; University College London, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health Marinacci, Chiara; Epidemiology Department, Local Health Unit TO3, ; Ministry of Health, Italy, Hoffmann, Rasmus; Erasmus Medical Centre, Santana, Paula; Centro de Estudos de Geógrafa e Ordenamento do Território (CEGOT), Departamento de Geografia, Universidade de Coimbra, Borrell, Carme; Agència de Salut Pública de Barcelona; CIBERESP,
Primary Subject Heading:	Health policy
Secondary Subject Heading:	Qualitative research, Public health, Epidemiology
Keywords:	Health inequalities, Public policies, Municipal government, Policymaker, Knowledge, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

For peer review only

Tables

Table 1. Description of the 19 informants*

Identifica tion	City (Country)	Status	Profile	Party
1	Amsterdam (Netherlands)	Officer	Health	NA
2	Barcelona (Spain)	Politician	Health	Eco-socialism
3	Barcelona (Spain)	Politician	Non-Health	Eco-socialism
4	Brussels (Belgium)	Officer	Health	NA
5	Cluj-Napoca (Romania)	Officer	Health	NA
6	Helsinki (Finland)	Officer	Health	NA
7	Lisbon (Portugal)	Politician	Non-Health	Social democracy
8*	London (United Kingdom)	Officer	Health	NA
9*	London (United Kingdom)	Officer	Health	NA
10	Madrid (Spain)	Officer	Health	NA
11	Madrid (Spain)	Officer	Health	NA
12	Paris (France)	Officer	Health	NA
13	Prague (Czech Republic)	Officer	Health	NA
14	Prague (Czech Republic)	Officer	Health	NA
15	Rotterdam (Netherlands)	Officer	Non-Health	NA
16	Stockholm (Sweden)	Politician	Health	Christian democratic
17	Stockholm (Sweden)	Politician	Health	Social democracy
18	Turin (Italy)	Politician	Non-Health	Social democracy
19	Turin (Italy)	Politician	Non-Health	Social democracy

^ NA= Not applicable

* Both informants 8 and 9 from London were interviewed together. The information was generated through 18 in-depth interviews.

Table 2. Further verbatim quoted by the interviewees responding to topics in the interview guide

Verbatim		ID*
"Can you explain your point of view on health inequalities and their causes?"	"In Prague there exist some people socially excluded voluntarily and it is very hard to provide health care for those people."	13
"Is tackling health inequalities a priority of the city government?"	"For us, it is. It is a priority for a very important part of Madrid Health."	11
	"You cannot make a separate health policy. Health is a right granted to all persons."	5
"Do you have periodic information on health inequalities?"	"There is no information. There is no assessment."	7
	"Yes, we have periodic information on health inequalities and their social determinants...we want to comprehend inequalities, we want them to surface through knowledge because it legitimises developing policies to tackle them."	3
"Are there policies aimed at reducing health inequalities?"	"The National Support Team model is to work with local partnerships. It's not to work with the health service."	8
"Which opportunities and barriers do you face when reducing health inequalities?"	"We come across them all the time and a very important one is the financial issue. Every year we have less money and the crisis only makes it worse."	13

* Participant identification

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Box 1. Interview topic guide

Topics
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Can you explain your point of view on health inequalities in [name of city]?</i>• <i>Which do you consider are the causes of these health inequalities?</i>• <i>Is tackling health inequalities a priority in [name of city] or your local area?</i>• <i>Do you have periodic information on health inequalities and policies designed to reduce them?</i>• <i>Are there policies aimed at reducing health inequalities in [name of city]? Could you name and describe them?</i>• <i>Do these policies cover different areas?</i>• <i>Were these policies designed with the participation of different social agents?</i>• <i>Sometimes some opportunities arise which may enable the implementation of interventions or policies. Please, can you provide any experience or thoughts about this?</i>• <i>Which barriers do you face when reducing health inequalities?</i>• <i>Do you know of policies funded with European structural funds?</i>

Health inequalities in European cities: Perceptions and beliefs among local policymakers

Authors:

Joana Morrison, Mariona Pons-Vigués, Laia Bécares, Bo Bürstrom, Ana Gandarillas, Felicitas Domínguez-Berjón, Èlia Diez, Giuseppe Costa, Milagros Ruiz, Hynek Pikhart, Chiara Marinacci, Rasmus Hoffmann, Paula Santana, Carme Borrell, and partners from the INEQ-CITIES Project

Affiliations

- University College London, London, UK
- Agència de Salut Pública de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain
- CIBER de Epidemiología y Salud Pública (CIBERESP), Spain
- Institut Universitari d'Investigació en Atenció Primària Jordi Gol (IDIAP Jordi Gol), Barcelona, Spain
- Universitat de Girona, Girona, Spain
- University of Manchester, Manchester, UK
- Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden
- Subdirección General de Promoción de la Salud y Prevención. Consejería de Sanidad. Comunidad de Madrid (Subdirectorate-General for Health Promotion and Prevention. Madrid Regional Health Authority), Spain.
- Erasmus Medical Centre,
- Institut d'Investigació Biomèdica de Sant Pau (IIB Sant Pau), Barcelona, Spain
- Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain
- Centro de Estudos de Geógrafa e Ordenamento do Território (CEGOT), Departamento de Geografia, Universidade de Coimbra, Coimbra

Corresponding author

Joana Morrison

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

University College London
Dept. of Epidemiology and Public Health
1-19 Torrington Place, London WC1E 6BT
T: +44 (0)20 7679 1711
j.morrison@ucl.ac.uk

Word account: 4108

For peer review only

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2013-004454 on 28 May 2014. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on June 13, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l'Enseignement Supérieur (ABES). Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

ABSTRACT

Introduction

Policymakers are responsible for decision and policy making in the form of laws, guidelines, and regulations. Their knowledge, beliefs and perceptions are relevant in the implementation of these but little is known on the subject and whether it varies across European cities. The objective of this study was to describe the knowledge and beliefs of public policymakers on social inequalities in health and policies to reduce them in cities from different parts of Europe during 2010 and 2011.

Methods

This is a phenomenological qualitative study conducted in thirteen European cities in 2010-2011. The study population consisted of elected politicians and officers with a directive status from these cities. The information was collected by interviewing 19 informants individually. A thematic interpretive content analysis was performed with the support of Atlas.Ti software.

Results

Health inequalities were perceived by most policy makers as differences in life expectancy between population with economic, social and geographical differences. Reducing health inequalities was a priority for the majority of cities which use surveys as sources of information to analyse these inequalities. The majority of policies and interventions were targeted at modifying health behaviours and few were inter-sectoral. Bureaucracy, funding and population beliefs were the main barriers.

Conclusions

It is essential to promote inter-sectoral collaboration and participatory policymaking processes and improving local and national collaboration as well as further monitoring and research. Furthermore it is crucial to train policy-makers and officers and provide them with proven effective measure to tackle health inequalities.

Keywords: Health inequalities, public policies, municipal government, policymaker, knowledge, qualitative research, urban health.

Word count: 5550

Limitations

- Not all the INEQ-cities partners had previous experience with qualitative research methods and their techniques of data collection.
- The topic guide was sent to some of the interviewees beforehand upon request, therefore, it is possible that they may have prepared the answers for the interview.
- In some cities, either officers or politicians were interviewed; it might have been more desirable to have one of each for every city.
- As the interviewees were selected by INEQ-Cities partners from each city, in some cases these were chosen by convenience sampling.

Strengths

- The interviewees included many examples of their everyday experiences and realities providing rich and detailed information.
- Carrying out the interview, an activity seldom performed previously among policymakers, possibly drew them to review the issue, update their knowledge and learn about the INEQ-Cities project and its results on health inequalities in their cities.
- Since this is an exploratory study, possibly one of the first of its kind in comparing policymaker's knowledge and beliefs across several cities of Europe, it will hopefully be a stepping stone for further qualitative research on the topic.
- This study has the important advantage of having collected information from quite a large number of cities throughout Europe.

Introduction

Health inequalities in urban environments are complex (1,2), affect the entire population throughout the health gradient (3) and require a multi-sectoral approach to address multiple social and economic determinants (4). To that effect, although city governments' competences and authorities vary, these have jurisdiction to develop strategic plans and policies, provide services and deliver interventions which may address health inequalities (5-7).

Within governments, policymakers are responsible for decision and policy-making in the form of laws, guidelines, and regulations (8), therefore, their knowledge, beliefs and perceptions are relevant in the implementation of these. Whether the concept of the social determinants of health inequalities is imbedded in their discourse (9,10) in addition to the information on health issues provided to them as reports or surveys by sources such as research centres or universities, may determine the course of the policy-making process (11,12). Furthermore, their perceptions regarding the responsibilities and priorities of city governments and their strategic plans possibly influence the policies in place (5,13). Hence, these issues along with how policymakers make use of their knowledge will influence decision making and affect how health inequalities are addressed by city governments (8,14,15).

The majority of studies exploring the knowledge and beliefs of health inequalities have explored lay perceptions (16-19), furthermore, the few studies describing expert's beliefs focus on researchers and policymakers working in regional and national governments (9,20-22). To our knowledge, there are only a small number of studies concentrating on policymakers working in city governments (23) but no qualitative studies have compared the perceptions of policymakers in different European cities. Therefore, the objective of this study is to describe public policymakers' knowledge and beliefs regarding social inequalities in health and policies which aim to reduce these in thirteen European cities during 2010 and 2011.

Methods

Methodological development

We carried out a descriptive and exploratory qualitative research study from a phenomenological perspective (24) as it sought to capture policymakers' unique accounts of reality in order to capture a breadth of discourses on health inequalities (25). Data was collected from thirteen cities (Amsterdam, Barcelona, Brussels, Cluj-Napoca, Helsinki,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Lisbon, London, Madrid, Paris, Prague, Rotterdam, Stockholm and Turin; see Table 1) from eleven different European countries participating in the Socio-economic inequalities in mortality: evidence and policies in cities of Europe 2009-2012 (INEQ-Cities) project (26) during the years 2010 and 2011.

Participants and sampling technique

The study population consisted of nineteen public policymakers, selected through convenience sampling, see Table 1 (25,27), working in the aforementioned cities' governments during the research period. A sample of elected politicians which included councillors and or aldermen and high ranked, non-elected, officers was selected. Policymakers were chosen from the health sector as well as other non-health sectors to provide a wider range of discourses. Interviews were performed by INEQ-Cities' partners, who interviewed a maximum of two participants, in their respective cities. Furthermore, subjects were chosen only if they held a decision making position.

Data collection and generation techniques

Eighteen semi-structured interviews were carried out, within these, seventeen were individual and one had two informants. They were performed from November 2010 to June 2011 using an open-ended question topic guide (Box 1). The interviews provided information on the participant's knowledge and beliefs with regards to health inequalities and policies to address these, as well as the role of the municipal government. The interview topic guide was developed following the requirements listed in INEQ-cities' description of work and was further discussed with other project partners. Three pilot interviews were performed in Barcelona to test the topic guides and final versions of the guide were distributed to the project partners in the abovementioned cities who then conducted the interviews. The sessions were carried out in each city's native language and lasted between 45 minutes and an hour. Interviews were then translated to English by each partner and several sent the transcripts to the informants for approval.

Processing and analysis of information

Transcripts and summaries were analysed on the basis of a thematic interpretive content analysis (24). Interviews were read numerous times until researchers reached pre-analytical intuitions on each of the interviewee's discourses and texts were then coded using predefined and emergent categories. Following, the text was divided following these categories before performing an analysis of the written content and finally it was articulated into results. Two research members carried out the analysis process independently (28) with

1
2
3 the support of Atlas.Ti software (29) and compared the main findings with the original data.
4 The working manuscript was sent to informants through each project partner for approval.
5
6
7

8 **Ethical considerations**

9 Informed consent was obtained through verbal means and the information was anonymised
10 and confidential. No participants received a salary or reward as participation was completely
11 voluntary and the study received formal ethical approval by a research ethics committee
12 (Hospital del Mar de Barcelona Research Ethics Committee).
13
14
15
16
17

18 **Results**

19 Three emerging discourses were identified among the interviewees which varied depending
20 on the city where they worked. While London's informants focused on structural
21 determinants as the main causes of health inequalities and described universal policies
22 aimed at these, Prague and Cluj-Napoca's interviewees were not as familiar with the
23 concept of the social health inequalities. Finally, informants from the remaining cities had a
24 mixed approach: although they referred to the wider determinants as the causes of health
25 inequalities, they also suggested downstream interventions to address these. It was not
26 possible, however, to distinguish differences in discourses between officers and politicians or
27 health and non-health informants. Presented below, the results have been arranged in seven
28 sections following the major topics explored in the interviews. The informant's identification
29 (Id) can be seen in Table 1 and one verbatim from each city was selected to illustrate the
30 results described below in Table 2.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 **Health inequalities and their causes and information regarding health** 41 **inequalities**

42 Two broad discourses were found within the informant's perceptions and knowledge of
43 health inequalities. The first one corresponds to the majority of informants who were aware
44 of such inequalities and described them as differences in health. These were expressed, for
45 example, as differences in life expectancy.
46
47
48
49
50

51 ***We have large differences in health: people live five years longer in areas such as***
52 ***Kungsholmen (inner city area of Stockholm municipality) compared to areas such as Järva***
53 ***fältet”*** Stockholm health politician, ID 16
54
55

56 They also explained that health inequalities existed among the population according to their
57 levels of education or income, gender, age and the neighbourhood in which they lived.
58
59
60

1
2
3 ***“There are factors which relate to education, employment or unemployment, living conditions,***
4 ***income, social relations and ways of life. Also the social exclusion of young people generates***
5 ***inequalities in health.”*** Helsinki health officer, ID 6.
6
7
8

9
10 In addition, the interviewee from Lisbon pointed out that inequalities were increasing as did
11 the informant from Brussels who understood them as a gradient.
12

13 The second discourse corresponded to informants from Cluj-Napoca and Prague did not
14 have a clear concept on social health inequalities, as described in the quote below.
15
16

17
18 ***“In this city we cannot talk about this concept. It is estimated that there are no legal criteria to***
19 ***make any differences between individuals in terms of access and use of medical care.”*** Cluj-
20 Napoca health officer, ID 5.
21
22

23 Concerning the causes of inequalities, the majority of the interviewees, identified a strong
24 relationship between economic position, educational level and health. Furthermore, low
25 income was perceived as the main cause of unhealthy lifestyle behaviours and reduced
26 access to health care which lead to health inequalities. In addition, other social determinants
27 were highlighted, such as gender, age group, type of household and residential segregation.
28 The current economic crisis and reduced public expenditure were considered to exacerbate
29 the problem and reduce the capacity of action of the local system. In contrast, interviewees
30 from Prague and Cluj-Napoca considered that health inequalities were chiefly a result of
31 individual responsibility.
32
33

34 To monitor health inequalities, the majority of the informants mentioned relying on health
35 surveys which were published periodically in their cities and mortality statistics from their
36 statistics authority (see Table 2, and quote below).
37
38

39
40 ***“To track differences in health, a health survey is conducted every four years.”*** Amsterdam
41 health officer, ID 1.
42
43
44

45
46 London’s interviewees described the need to integrate the different sources of information
47 into one to make access to information easier. Informants from Lisbon and Prague declared
48 not having information or assessment of health inequalities. Furthermore, the interviewee
49 from Cluj-Napoca explained that periodic data of health inequalities was not available as this
50 concept was not applicable.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Reducing health inequalities as a priority of the city government and policies and programs to reduce them

Most interviewees reported that reducing health inequalities was an objective of the city government included in either strategic plans or in specific laws. However interviewees from Prague and Cluj-Napoca did not consider it to be a priority of their municipal governments, whereas the informant from Lisbon had the opinion that even though it should be a priority, it was not.

“Tackling inequalities in health should be a priority in the Lisbon Metropolitan Area and is not, directly, a hotly debated topic.” Lisbon non-health politician, ID 7

The interviewees of Paris and Brussels explained that their city governments did not have jurisdiction over health matters as these are responsibility of the regional authorities.

“In France, health is not a responsibility of the cities, although historically it was the cities that were in charge of sanitary aspects.” Paris health officer, ID 12.

That’s not easy to answer, as not all the areas are governed on the level of the communities or on the city level.” Belgium, health officer, ID 4.

When asked about their knowledge of policies that address health inequalities, policymakers described actions aimed at deprived populations and at modifying attitudes and unhealthy behaviours, such as smoking and poor diets. They emphasised the importance of preventive measures and health promotion and education. Policies to improve access to health care services were also quoted as an important means to reduce health inequalities by most interviewees. However, the informants from London highlighted the need to address health inequalities throughout the general population rather than focusing on the most deprived sectors and developing long-term policies aimed at the social determinants, not only proximal factors, such as physical activity and a healthy diet. Moreover, the informant from Madrid described tackling health inequalities at the local level and the informant from Turin highlighted local interventions aimed at addressing unemployment.

“We have to work on the processes...I’m talking from the micro level, which is where I have more experience, but I think that’s where the solution lies, in the micro level.” Madrid health politician, ID 10.

1
2
3 The informants from Prague, however, did not mention any policies implemented by their city
4 government and referred to national health plans as a reference for health-related issues.
5
6
7

8 9 **Inter-sectoral collaboration and participation of social agents in policymaking**

10
11 Interviewees from Madrid, London, Rotterdam and Lisbon referred to strategic plans which
12 fostered inter-sectoral collaboration between different administrations, citizens' and non-
13 profit associations and established local partnerships. Barcelona and Turin, in turn,
14 described inter-sectoral collaboration established only between two sectors, for example
15 between health and welfare or health and education. While Lisbon stated examples of
16 housing policies for groups at risk of exclusion, some informants suggested that inter-
17 sectoral collaboration slowed down the policymaking process and perceived that having
18 different sectors collaborate proved to be difficult.
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 *“Yes. Action on inequalities in health is synonymous with disciplinary cross-cutting. In this*
27 *sense, this theme is incorporated in several areas such as education, social service,*
28 *environmental and cultural policies, among others, addressed in the municipal master plan.”*
29
30 Lisbon, non-health politician, ID 7.
31
32
33

34
35 With respect to community organisations participating in the policymaking process, the
36 majority of the informants thought their city governments collaborated with these, however
37 informants from Rotterdam, Turin and Stockholm considered it was very limited.
38
39
40

41
42 *“The social networks exist but they need public support. There is no doubt that there should*
43 *be more shared responsibility among private sector and public services or welfare systems.”*
44
45 Turin non-health politician, ID 18.
46
47

48 49 **Barriers and opportunities encountered**

50
51 One of the principal barriers described was the lack of awareness on changing lifestyle
52 habits among the population. Informants from Stockholm and Lisbon considered the
53 obstacles addressing health inequalities to be essentially related to the population's cultural
54 beliefs. Bureaucratic restraints and resistance from other levels of the administration along
55 with miscommunication with the private sector as well as budget restrictions were described
56 as important barriers by the majority of interviewees. London's one explained that
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 implementing financial policies from within a city government was complicated in the context
4 of globalisation.
5
6

7 ***“We come across them all the time and a very important one is the financial issue. Every year***
8 ***we have less money and the crisis only makes it worse.”*** Barcelona health politician, ID 2.
9

10
11 However, informants also referred to opportunities which enabled policy implementation. For
12 example, the interviewees from Barcelona and Rotterdam made reference to working at the
13 community level or with different sectors which led to learning opportunities. Community
14 groups were seen as essentially important in liaising with hard to reach groups. The
15 interviewee from Brussels suggested that the migrant population promoted healthy lifestyle
16 behaviours due to some of their healthier traditions.
17
18

19 ***“There are definitely opportunities. Other services have problems as well and see the benefits***
20 ***of cooperation with groups who work with migrant population.”*** Brussels health officer ID 4.
21
22

23 Discussion

24 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to explore policymakers' perceptions on
25 health inequalities and policies to reduce these throughout various European cities from
26 diverse geographical areas and with different socio-economic and political contexts. We
27 have shown that the policymakers we interviewed perceived health inequalities as
28 differences in life expectancy among the population defined by their economic, social and
29 geographical background. Regarding the causes of health inequalities, these were perceived
30 as being caused by low-income levels, unhealthy lifestyle behaviours and barriers in
31 accessing health care. Most of the informants agreed that reducing these inequalities was a
32 priority for their local governments and referred to periodic surveys as information sources to
33 monitor them. The majority of policies and interventions were targeted at modifying health
34 behaviours and few relied upon inter-sectoral collaboration. Furthermore, bureaucracy,
35 funding and the population's attitudes and beliefs towards healthy lifestyles were considered
36 important barriers.
37
38

39 It may be of interest to note that most informants described upstream determinants such as
40 socio-economic and structural factors as the causes of health inequalities but nevertheless
41 focused on describing downstream policies and programmes. This could be due to the fact
42 that the informants work in city governments and even though they are aware of the main
43 causes of health inequalities, their daily routines involve work with downstream policies and
44 programmes. In this regard, city councils as a general norm have little or no authority over
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 upstream determinants (30) or over health when it is under the authority of higher levels of
4 government; such was the case of Paris and Brussels. In this sense, policymakers seemed
5 to refer to items within their mandate, so even if they understood structural determinants
6 were important in addressing health inequalities, the activities they described were focused
7 within their own jurisdiction. Notwithstanding, targeted interventions which do not aim at
8 reducing inequalities throughout the whole gradient, may end up being diluted into multiple
9 small downstream initiatives and are less effective in reducing health inequalities (31). This
10 also carries the risk of health inequalities becoming the responsibility of each individual,
11 which is already an existing trend (4,32) and downplaying the responsibilities and
12 competences of the city government which will constitute a barrier for local city governments
13 in tackling inequalities (10). Moreover it has been widely argued that if interventions are not
14 delivered carefully, they are likely to increase inequalities as those who are most in need,
15 might not benefit from the intervention (33). However, as described elsewhere (7), the
16 majority of research on health inequalities relates to downstream determinants and focuses
17 on individual lifestyle factors (34), so little is provided to policymakers on the wider
18 determinants and the underlying causes of the causes of health inequalities (35).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Furthermore, with the exception of Brussels' and London's interviewees, the concept of the
30 socioeconomic gradient in health was not present among respondents; their understanding
31 of reducing health inequalities connoted reducing the differences between the most deprived
32 groups and the rest of the city's population. Therefore, their discourses did not seem to
33 acknowledge that inequalities affect the entire population and not only the most
34 disadvantaged populations (36).
35
36
37
38

39 Except for Lisbon and the Central-eastern European cities, most of the informants
40 mentioned having access to information on health inequalities through periodical surveys or
41 health reports. Those with access to regular information on health inequalities would be
42 more likely to see the underpinning structural causes and be willing to act upon them.
43 Furthermore, Prague and Cluj-Napoca expressed not being aware of the existence of
44 inequalities in their cities possibly because they were not as familiar with the concept,
45 however there are relevant studies on health inequalities in the Czech Republic (37-39) and
46 in Romania (40). Nevertheless, the overarching INEQ-Cities project (INEQ-Cities, 2012) will
47 provide the cities included in the project with further data on health inequalities at the small
48 area level. However, knowledge on health inequalities is not necessarily related to being
49 provided with information on health as Lisbon's informant was familiar with the concept but
50 stated not having access to periodical information policymaker (17,41). Notwithstanding,
51 data on health indicators and inequalities is important for various reasons; to understand
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 how causal pathways are established, to design effective policies and interventions and
4 furthermore, because the lack of information could mean governments do not recognise the
5 problem and therefore little is done to address it (3, 12). While elsewhere it was concluded
6 that researchers do not provide policymakers with befitting and timely information (15,21,42),
7 constantly requiring more evidence runs the risk of delaying having to face the problem and
8 making decisions (11). Nevertheless, evidence on the social determinants of health, and
9 particularly on effective interventions and policies needs further research.
10
11

12
13
14
15 The majority of the informants understood that reducing health inequalities was a priority for
16 their city government but only the city governments of Amsterdam, Barcelona, Helsinki,
17 London, Madrid, Rotterdam, Lisbon and Stockholm had health plans, and within these only
18 London has a specific plan for reducing health inequalities, as has also been described
19 elsewhere (12). Our findings partly reflect the different stages of awareness and action
20 undertaken in the cities as it describes a spectrum of different approaches towards
21 inequalities adopted by countries throughout Europe. We understand that a strong political
22 will is inherent to tackling health inequalities and therefore policymakers need to be supplied
23 with information on the social determinants and how the gradient operates (4).
24
25

26
27
28
29
30
31 The lack of awareness in city governments regarding the multidisciplinary nature of effective
32 policies to reduce health inequalities together with the existence of structural arrangements
33 which are very difficult to overcome might explain why only five cities described inter-sectoral
34 collaboration. It was viewed by the majority of the informants as a slow and difficult process.
35 Furthermore a similar study (23) observed that the structure of political responsibilities in the
36 Canadian context offered important constraints for inter-sectoral collaboration. However,
37 encouraging it is important; it has been described in a previous study (43) that inter-sectoral
38 collaboration is a recognized relationship between the health and other sectors in order
39 to achieve health outcomes in a more effective way than from the health sector alone.
40 Furthermore, only five cities described participatory processes and collaborating with social
41 actors. Including other stakeholders in policy-making processes is an important step to city
42 governance and empowerment, both decisive in reducing health inequalities more effectively
43 (10,30). However, there are many different barriers which policymakers encounter when
44 trying to establish collaborative relationships such as an overall lack of awareness of health
45 inequalities among those who work in the city government, difficulties to coordinate with
46 other authorities, a lack of mandate, and limited resources (1, 2).
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 Together with the barriers mentioned above, lack of awareness on health inequalities and
57 bureaucratic restraints were the main barriers to reduce health inequalities as quoted by the
58
59
60

1
2
3 interviewees and have been categorised elsewhere as ideological and institutional (3).
4 Institutional limitations are related to values attitudes and opinions; one possible explanation
5 why this approach has been underlined is that informants seemed to focus mostly on
6 lifestyles and healthy behaviours instead of structural determinants as the causes of health
7 inequalities. Furthermore, the second group of barriers referring to rigid bureaucracy and
8 funding might also be reinforced by the ideological barriers and exacerbated by the social
9 and financial crisis and subsequent austerity measures.
10
11
12
13

14 15 16 17 **Limitations**

18 It may be worth noting that some of the partners participating in the INEQ-cities project were
19 new to qualitative methods and its techniques of data collection. Nevertheless, we consider it
20 a positive fact that researchers from a more quantitative paradigm have participated in this
21 activity. Furthermore, methodological guidance and a detailed research protocol were made
22 available to them. It should be also taken into account that in some cases, the politicians
23 explained their political discourses and it was a difficult task to make them follow the topic
24 guide. As the topic guide was sent to some of the interviewees beforehand upon request, it
25 is possible that they may have prepared the answers for the interview. Moreover, in some
26 cities, either officers or politicians were interviewed; it might have been more desirable to
27 have one of each for every city. Moreover, as the interviewees were selected by INEQ-Cities
28 partners from each city, in some cases these were chosen by convenience sampling.
29 Nevertheless, the study included quite a large set of informants and does not aim to
30 exhaustively represent the discourses of all the policymakers in the cities included in the
31 study.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 42 **Strengths**

43 As a relevant strength of the study, the interviewees included many examples of their
44 everyday experiences and realities providing rich and detailed information. They expressed
45 their own beliefs and describing them provides very valuable information on the governance
46 of cities given the key role of policymakers. Moreover, carrying out the interview, an activity
47 seldom performed previously, possibly drew politicians to review the issue, update their
48 knowledge and learn about the INEQ-Cities project and its results on health inequalities in
49 their cities. This exploratory study, possibly one of the first of its kind in comparing
50 policymaker's knowledge and beliefs across several cities of Europe, will hopefully be a
51 stepping stone for further qualitative research on the topic and has the important advantage
52 of having information from quite a large number of cities (44).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Conclusions and recommendations

The majority of the interviewed policymakers gave an account of interventions focused on the immediate determinants and aimed at modifying lifestyles and behaviours in the more disadvantaged classes. Very few described inter-sectoral action although for most cities reducing health inequalities was a priority and policymakers had access to periodic information.

It is essential to promote inter-sectoral collaboration and participatory policymaking processes and improving local and national collaboration as well as further monitoring and research. Furthermore it is crucial to train policymakers and officers and provide them with proven effective measures to tackle health inequalities (4). More funding should be put towards academic research on effective universal policies, evaluation of their impact and training of policymakers and officers on health inequalities in city governments. More evidence is needed to translate to policymakers the importance, effectiveness and cost-benefit of policies to reduce health inequalities. Further advocacy must be carried out to place health inequalities and their implications in the municipal government's agenda and in city health plans.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the informants who participated in the interviews and the interviewers who carried them out. This article has been partially funded by the project INEQ-CITIES, "Socioeconomic inequalities in mortality: evidence and policies of cities of Europe"; project funded by the Executive Agency for Health and Consumers-DG Sanco (Commission of the European Union), project n°2008 12 13 and CIBERESP Epidemiología y Salud Pública.

Funding

This work was supported by the Executive Agency for Health and Consumers-DG Sanco (Commission of the European Union), project n°2008 12 13 and CIBERESP Epidemiología y Salud Pública.

Contributorship Statement

All authors made substantial contributions to conception and design of the study and interviews. They carried out the interviews in their own cities and translated these and provided a summary or transcription. Once the data was analysed by the coordinating centre, the authors interpreted the results and provided critical feedback as well as sending the results to informants and providing the coordinating centre with comments or suggestions made by them. Authors also participated in drafting the article and reviewed it critically several times, making substantial comments and suggestions regarding form, analysis and concepts. Authors also reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript and provided their approval for publication.

Conflicts of interests

The authors declare not to have any conflicts of interest.

Data Sharing Statement

The additional unpublished data from this study are the recordings of the interviews and their transcriptions. This supplementary data is stored in the coordinating centre and the recordings of the interviews were kept by the institutions which carried them out. This data has not been made available to anyone.

References

- (1) Kilroy A. Intra-urban spatial inequalities: cities as 'urban regions'. World Development Report. MIT and UNDP. World Development Report 2009; December 2007, p. 1-27.
- (2) UN-HABITAT/WHO. Hidden cities: unmasking and overcoming health inequities in urban settings. 2010; Available at: http://www.hiddencities.org/downloads/WHO_UN-HABITAT_Hidden_Cities_Web.pdf. Accessed 12/11/2012.
- (3) Commission on Social Determinants of Health. Closing the gap in a generation: Health equity through action on the social determinants of health. Geneva: WHO; 2008.
- (4) Centre for Health Development. Our cities, our health, our future. Acting on social determinants for health equity in urban settings. Geneva: Report to the WHO Commission on Social Determinants of Health from the Knowledge Network on Urban Settings; 2008. Available at: http://www.who.int/social_determinants/resources/knus_final_report_052008.pdf. Accessed 08/14/2012.
- (5) Borrell C, Morrison J, Burstrom B, Pons-Vigues M, Hoffmann R, Gandarillas A, et al. Comparison of health policy documents of European cities: are they oriented to reduce inequalities in health? *J Public Health Policy*. 2013 Jan;34(1):100-20.
- (6) Borrell C, Pons-Vigues M, Morrison J, Diez E. Factors and processes influencing health inequalities in urban areas. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2013 May;67(5):389-91.
- (7) Collins PA. Do great local minds think alike? Comparing perceptions of the social determinants of health between non-profit and governmental actors in two Canadian cities. *Health Educ Res*. 2012 Jun;27(3):371-84.
- (8) Lavis JN. Ideas, Policy Learning and Policy Change: The determinants-of-Health Synthesis in Canada and the United Kingdom. 1998, McMaster University Centre for Health Economics and Policy Analysis Working Paper Series 98-6.
- (9) Lavis JN. Ideas at the margin or marginalized ideas? Nonmedical determinants of health in Canada. *Health Aff. (Millwood)* 2002 Mar-Apr;21(2):107-12.
- (10) Liverpool WHO Collaborating Centre for Policy Research on Social Determinants of Health. How can the Health Equity Impact of Universal Policies be Evaluated? Insights into

1
2
3 approaches and next steps. Editors: Milton B, Moonan M, Taylor-Robinson David,
4 Whitehead M. Copenhagen; WHO; 2011.

5
6
7 (11) Whitehead M. Diffusion of ideas on social inequalities in health: a European
8 perspective. *Milbank Q.* 1998;76(3):469-92.

9
10
11 (12) Borrell C, Bartoll X, García-Altés A, Pasarín M I, Piñeiro M, Villalbí J.R y and the
12 Barcelona Health Report group 2008. Twenty five years of health reports in Barcelona: a
13 commitment to transparency and a tool for action. *Rev Esp Salud Publica.* 2011; 85(5):449-
14 58.

15
16
17 (13) Collins PA, Hayes MV. The role of urban municipal governments in reducing health
18 inequities: A meta-narrative mapping analysis. *International Journal for Equity in Health.* Int J
19 Equity Health. 2010; 25;9:13.

20
21
22 (14) Lavis JN. Research, public policymaking, and knowledge-translation processes:
23 Canadian efforts to build bridges. *J Contin Educ Health Prof.* 2006;26(1):37-45.

24
25
26 (15) Lavis JN, Posada FB, Haines A, Osei E. Use of research to inform public policymaking.
27 *Lancet.* 2004; 5;364(9445):1615-21.

28
29
30 (16) Popay J, Bennett S, Thomas C, Williams G, Gatrell A, Bostock L. Beyond 'beer, fags,
31 egg and chips'? Exploring lay understandings of social inequalities in health. *Sociol Health*
32 *Ill.* 2003 Jan;25(1):1-23.

33
34
35 (17) Macintyre S. Evidence in the development of health policy. *Public Health.*
36 2012;126(3):217-19.

37
38
39 (18) Macintyre S, McKay L, Ellaway A. Lay concepts of the relative importance of different
40 influences on health; are there major socio-demographic variations? *Health Educ Res.* 2006
41 Oct;21(5):731-39.

42
43
44 (19) Davidson R, Mitchell R, Hunt K. Location, location, location: the role of experience of
45 disadvantage in lay perceptions of area inequalities in health. *Health Place.* 2008
46 Jun;14(2):167-81.

47
48
49 (20) Whitehead M, Petticrew M, Graham H, Macintyre SJ, Bambra C, Egan M. Evidence for
50 public health policy on inequalities: 2: assembling the evidence jigsaw. *J Epidemiol*
51 *Community Health.* 2004 Oct;58(10):817-21.

- 1
2
3 (21) Petticrew M, Whitehead M, Macintyre SJ, Graham H, Egan M. Evidence for public
4 health policy on inequalities: 1: The reality according to policymakers. J Epidemiol
5 Community Health. 2004 Oct;58(10):811-16.
6
7
8 (22) Lavis JN, Ross SE, Stoddart GL, Hohenadel JM, McLeod CB, Evans RG. Do Canadian
9 civil servants care about the health of populations? Am J Public Health. 2003 Apr;93(4):658-
10 63.
11
12 (23) Collins PA, Abelson J, Eyles JD. Knowledge into action? Understanding ideological
13 barriers to addressing health inequalities at the local level. Health Policy. 2007
14 Jan;80(1):158-71.
15
16 (24) Reeves S, Albert M, Kuper A, Hodges BD. Why use theories in qualitative research?
17 BMJ. 2008 Aug;337:a949.
18
19 (25) Maxwell JA. Qualitative research design. An interactive approach. Qualitative research
20 design. An interactive approach. Second ed. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE; 2005.
21
22 (26) INEQ-Cities. INEQ-Cities socio-economic inequalities in mortality: Evidence and
23 Policies in Cities of Europe. Available at: <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/ineqcities/>. Accessed 05/20/
24 2013.
25
26 (27) Silverman D. Doing qualitative research. A practical handbook. Second ed. London:
27 SAGE; 2005.
28
29 (28) Mays N, Pope C. Qualitative research in health care - Assessing quality in qualitative
30 research. Br Med J 2000 JAN 1;320(7226):50-52.
31
32 (29) ATLAS.ti. Atlas. ti Qualitative data analysis software. 2010-2011;Scientific Software
33 Development, GmbH.
34
35 (30) The Commission to Reduce Social Inequalities in Health in Spain. A proposal of policies
36 and interventions to reduce social inequalities in health in Spain. Gac Sanit. 2012 Mar-
37 Apr;26(2):182-89.
38
39 (31) M Marmot, J Allen, P Goldblatt, T Boyce, D McNeish, M Grady, I Geddes. Fair Society,
40 Healthy Lives. "The Marmot Review". Strategic Review of Health Inequalities in England
41 post-2010.
42
43 (32) Vlahov D, Freudenberg N, Proietti F, Ompad D, Quinn A, Nandi V, Galea S. Urban as a
44 determinant of health. J Urban Health. 2007;84:16-26.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 (33) Lorenc T, Petticrew M, Welch V, Tugwell P. What types of interventions generate
4 inequalities? Evidence from systematic reviews. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2013
5 Feb;67(2):190-193.
6
7
8 (34) Whitehead M. What can be done about inequalities in health? *Lancet*. 1991 Oct
9 26;338(8774):1059-63.
10
11 (35) Geoffrey Rose. Sick individuals and sick populations. *Int J Epidemiol*. 1985;14:32-8.
12
13 (36) Whitehead M, Dahlgren G. Concepts and principles for tackling social inequities in
14 health. *Levelling up (part 1)*. Denmark: WHO; 2006.
15
16 (37) Spilkova J, Dzurova D, Pikhart H. Inequalities in smoking in the Czech Republic:
17 societal or individual effects? *Health Place*. 2011 Jan;17(1):215-21.
18
19 (38) Dzurova D, Spilkova J, Pikhart H. Social inequalities in alcohol consumption in the
20 Czech Republic: a multilevel analysis. *Health Place*. 2010 May;16(3):590-97.
21
22 (39) Pikhart H, Drbohlav D, Dzurova D. The self-reported health of legal and illegal/irregular
23 immigrants in the Czech Republic. *Int J Public Health*. 2010 Oct;55(5):401-11.
24
25 (40) Florescu L, Balanica G, Vremera T, Matei M. Cross-sectional study to evaluate risk
26 factors in infant malnutrition. *Rev Med Chir Soc Med Nat Iasi*. 2011 Jul-Sep;115(3):699-04.
27
28 (41) Katikireddi SV, Higgins M, Bond L, Bonell C, Macintyre S. How evidence based is
29 English public health policy? *BMJ*. 2011 Nov;343:d7310.
30
31 (42) Petticrew M, Roberts H. Systematic reviews--do they 'work' in informing decision-
32 making around health inequalities? *Health Econ Policy Law*. 2008 Apr;3(2):197-211.
33
34 (43) Solar O, Irwin A. A conceptual framework for action on the social determinants of
35 health. Discussion paper for the Commission on Social Determinants of Health. 2007.
36
37 (44) INEQ-CITIES Socio-economic inequalities in mortality: evidence and policies in cities of
38 Europe. INEQ-CITIES Atlas. Available at: <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/ineqcities/atlas>. Accessed:
39 10/10/2012.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Health inequalities in European cities: Perceptions and beliefs among local policymakers

Authors:

Joana Morrison, Mariona Pons-Vigués, Laia Bécares, Bo Bürstrom, Ana Gandarillas, Felicitas Domínguez-Berjón, Èlia Diez, Giuseppe Costa, Milagros Ruiz, Hynek Pikhart, Chiara Marinacci, Rasmus Hoffmann, Paula Santana, Carme Borrell, and partners from the INEQ-CITIES Project

Affiliations

- University College London, London, UK
- Agència de Salut Pública de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain
- CIBER de Epidemiología y Salud Pública (CIBERESP), Spain
- Institut Universitari d'Investigació en Atenció Primària Jordi Gol (IDIAP Jordi Gol), Barcelona, Spain
- Universitat de Girona, Girona, Spain
- University of Manchester, Manchester, UK
- Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden
- Subdirección General de Promoción de la Salud y Prevención. Consejería de Sanidad. Comunidad de Madrid (Subdirectorate-General for Health Promotion and Prevention. Madrid Regional Health Authority), Spain.
- Erasmus Medical Centre,
- Institut d'Investigació Biomèdica de Sant Pau (IIB Sant Pau), Barcelona, Spain
- Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain
- Centro de Estudos de Geógrafa e Ordenamento do Território (CEGOT), Departamento de Geografia, Universidade de Coimbra, Coimbra

Corresponding author

Joana Morrison

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

University College London
Dept. of Epidemiology and Public Health
1-19 Torrington Place, London WC1E 6BT
T: +44 (0)20 7679 1711
j.morrison@ucl.ac.uk

Word account: 4108

For peer review only

BMJ Open : first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2013-004454 on 28 May 2014. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on June 13, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l'Enseignement Supérieur (ABES).
Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

Health inequalities in European cities: Perceptions and beliefs among local policymakers

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2013-004454.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	25-Mar-2014
Complete List of Authors:	Morrison, Joana; University College London, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health; CIBERESP, Pons-Vigués, Mariona; Institut Universitari d'Investigació en Atenció Primària Jordi Gol (IDIAP Jordi Gol), ; Universitat de Girona, Becares, Laia; University of Manchester, Burström, Bo; Karolinska Institutet, Department of Public Health Sciences, Division of Social Medicine Gandarillas, Ana; Subdirección General de Promoción de la Salud y Prevención. Consejería de Sanidad. Comunidad de Madrid (Subdirectorato-General for Health Promotion and Prevention. Madrid Regional Health Authority), Domínguez-Berjón, Felicitas; Subdirección General de Promoción de la Salud y Prevención. Consejería de Sanidad. Comunidad de Madrid (Subdirectorato-General for Health Promotion and Prevention. Madrid Regional Health Authority), Díez, Elia; Agència de Salut Pública de Barcelona, ; Agència de Salut Pública de Barcelona Costa, Giuseppe; University of Turin, Department of Clinical and Biological Science Ruíz, Milagros; University College London, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health Pikhart, Hynek; University College London, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health Marinacci, Chiara; Epidemiology Department, Local Health Unit TO3, ; Ministry of Health, Italy, Hoffmann, Rasmus; Erasmus Medical Centre, Santana, Paula; Centro de Estudos de Geógrafa e Ordenamento do Território (CEGOT), Departamento de Geografia, Universidade de Coimbra, Borrell, Carme; Agència de Salut Pública de Barcelona; CIBERESP,
Primary Subject Heading:	Health policy
Secondary Subject Heading:	Qualitative research, Public health, Epidemiology
Keywords:	Health inequalities, Public policies, Municipal government, Policymaker, Knowledge, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2013-004454 on 28 May 2014. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on June 13, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l'Enseignement Supérieur (ABES).
Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

Health inequalities in European cities: Perceptions and beliefs among local policymakers

Authors:

Joana Morrison, Mariona Pons-Vigués, Laia Bécares, Bo Bürstrom, Ana Gandarillas, Felicitas Domínguez-Berjón, Èlia Diez, Giuseppe Costa, Milagros Ruiz, Hynek Pikhart, Chiara Marinacci, Rasmus Hoffmann, Paula Santana, Carme Borrell, and partners from the INEQ-CITIES Project

Affiliations

- University College London, London, UK
- Agència de Salut Pública de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain
- CIBER de Epidemiología y Salud Pública (CIBERESP), Spain
- Institut Universitari d'Investigació en Atenció Primària Jordi Gol (IDIAP Jordi Gol), Barcelona, Spain
- Universitat de Girona, Girona, Spain
- University of Manchester, Manchester, UK
- Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden
- Subdirección General de Promoción de la Salud y Prevención. Consejería de Sanidad. Comunidad de Madrid (Subdirectorate-General for Health Promotion and Prevention. Madrid Regional Health Authority), Spain.
- Erasmus Medical Centre,
- Institut d'Investigació Biomèdica de Sant Pau (IIB Sant Pau), Barcelona, Spain
- Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain
- Centro de Estudos de Geógrafa e Ordenamento do Território (CEGOT), Departamento de Geografia, Universidade de Coimbra, Coimbra

Corresponding author

Joana Morrison

University College London

Dept. of Epidemiology and Public Health

1-19 Torrington Place, London WC1E 6BT

T: +44 (0)20 7679 1711

j.morrison@ucl.ac.uk

Keywords Health inequalities, public policies, municipal government, policymaker, knowledge, qualitative research, urban health

Word count: 4212

Abstract

Objective To describe the knowledge and beliefs of public policymakers on social inequalities in health and policies to reduce them in cities from different parts of Europe during 2010 and 2011.

Design Phenomenological qualitative study.

Setting Thirteen European cities.

Participants Nineteen elected politicians and officers with a directive status from thirteen European cities.

Main outcome Policymaker's knowledge and beliefs.

Results Three emerging discourses were identified among the interviewees, depending on the city of the interviewee. Health inequalities were perceived by most policy makers as differences in life expectancy between population with economic, social and geographical differences. Reducing health inequalities was a priority for the majority of cities which use surveys as sources of information to analyse these. Bureaucracy, funding and population beliefs were the main barriers.

Conclusions The majority of the interviewed policymakers gave an account of interventions focusing on the immediate determinants and aimed at modifying lifestyles and behaviours in the more disadvantaged classes. More funding should be put towards academic research on effective universal policies, evaluation of their impact and training policymakers and officers on health inequalities in city governments.

Limitations

- Respondents possibly participated due to their willingness, accessibility as well as interest in the area of health inequalities and therefore may be more sensitive to the issue.
- The data was collected 3-4 years ago so parties governing in the cities may have changed.
- In some cities, either officers or politicians were interviewed; it might have been more desirable to have one of each for every city.
- As the interviewees were selected by INEQ-Cities partners from each city, these were chosen by opportunity sampling.

Strengths

- The interviewees included many examples of their everyday experiences and realities providing rich and detailed information.
- Carrying out the interview, an activity seldom performed previously among policymakers, possibly drew them to review the issue, update their knowledge and learn about the INEQ-Cities project and its results on health inequalities in their cities.
- Since this is an exploratory study, possibly one of the first of its kind in comparing policymaker's knowledge and beliefs across several cities of Europe, it will hopefully be a stepping stone for further qualitative research on the topic.
- This study has the important advantage of having collected information from quite a large number of cities throughout Europe.

Introduction

Health inequalities in urban environments are complex[1,2] affect the entire population throughout the health gradient[3] and require a multi-sectoral approach to address multiple social and economic determinants.[4] To that effect, although city governments' competences and authorities vary, they are endowed with jurisdiction to develop strategic plans and policies, provide services and deliver interventions which may address health inequalities.[5-7]

Within governments, policymakers are responsible for decision and policy-making in the form of laws, guidelines, and regulations[8] and their knowledge, beliefs and perceptions are relevant in the implementation of these. It is important to know whether the concept of the social determinants of health inequalities is imbedded in their discourse[9,10] in addition to the information on health issues provided to them as reports or surveys. These topics, explored in this study, may determine the course of the policy-making process.[11,12] Furthermore, their perceptions regarding the responsibilities and priorities of city governments and the city government's strategic plans possibly influence the policies in place.[13,14] These issues along with how policymakers make use of their knowledge will influence decision making and affect how health inequalities are addressed by city governments.[8,15,16]

The majority of studies exploring the knowledge and beliefs of health inequalities have explored lay perceptions[17-20] and the few studies describing expert beliefs focused on researchers and policymakers working in regional and national governments.[9,21,22] To our knowledge, there are only a small number of studies focusing on policymakers in the city government[5,6,14,23] and this is among the first qualitative studies to compare the perceptions of policymakers in different European cities. The use of rigorous qualitative research methods has been on the rise in health services and health policy research[24] to explore the experiences of participants and the meanings they attribute to them, to contribute new knowledge and to provide new perspectives.[25] It is consistent with developments in the social and policy sciences at large and has been described to reflect the need for more in-depth understanding of naturalistic settings the importance of understanding context and the complexity of implementing social change.[26] Selecting policymakers from different European cities provided a description of the different socio-political realities and contexts according to the participant's daily experiences to provider a richer and wider view on reducing health inequalities at the municipal level throughout the continent. Notwithstanding their

1
2
3 diversity, the participant cities share important commonalities as European
4 democracies and urban settings, allowing to explore the study object from a new view.
5 Previous studies[13] in the project have analysed written policy documents in these
6 cities. The objective of this study is to further increase the understanding of how
7 policies are realised, through the perception and beliefs of public policy makers in
8 thirteen European cities during 2010 and 2011.
9
10
11
12
13

14 **Methods**

15 **Methodological development**

16 We carried out a descriptive and exploratory qualitative research study from a
17 phenomenological perspective[27] as it sought to capture policymakers' unique
18 accounts of reality in order to capture a breadth of discourses on health
19 inequalities[28]. Data was collected from thirteen cities (Amsterdam, Barcelona,
20 Brussels, Cluj-Napoca, Helsinki, Lisbon, London, Madrid, Paris, Prague, Rotterdam,
21 Stockholm and Turin; see Table 1 for information on the cities' profiles) from eleven
22 different European countries participating in the project; Socio-economic inequalities in
23 mortality: evidence and policies in cities of Europe 2009-2012 (INEQ-Cities)[29] during
24 the years 2010 and 2011.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Participants and sampling technique**

34 The study population consisted of nineteen public policymakers, selected through
35 opportunity sampling[28], see Table 2, working in the aforementioned cities'
36 governments during the research period. A sample of elected politicians which included
37 councillors and or aldermen and high ranked, non-elected, officers was selected.
38 Policymakers were chosen from the health sector as well as other non-health sectors
39 to provide a wider range of discourses. Interviews were performed by INEQ-Cities'
40 partners, who interviewed a maximum of two participants, in their respective cities.
41 Furthermore, subjects were chosen only if they held a decision making position.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Data collection and generation techniques**

50 Seventeen semi-structured individual interviews and one semi-structured interview
51 where two informants participated were carried out from November 2010 to June 2011
52 using an open-ended question topic guide (Box 1). The interviews provided information
53 on the participant's knowledge and beliefs of health inequalities and policies to address
54 these, as well as the role of the municipal government. The interview topic guide was
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 developed following the requirements listed in INEQ-cities' description of work and was
4 further discussed with other project partners. Three pilot interviews were performed in
5 Barcelona to test the topic guides and final versions of the guide were distributed to the
6 project partners in the abovementioned cities who then conducted the interviews. The
7 sessions were carried out in each city's native language and lasted between 45
8 minutes and an hour, where clarification of the topics was needed, some interviewers
9 made city-specific questions. The interviewers belonged to partner groups from the
10 INEQ-Cities project. A data collection manual designed by the authors of this study was
11 sent to each partner and interviewer, providing guidelines on how to perform the
12 interview to ensure that these were carried out in a standardised way. Interviews were
13 translated to English by each partner and several sent the transcripts and summaries
14 to the informants for approval. The summaries and the transcripts were sent to the
15 authors carrying out the analysis in English.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **Processing and analysis of information**

25 All transcripts and summaries were analysed centrally on the basis of a thematic
26 interpretive content analysis[27] by 2 researchers (JM and MP). Interviews were read
27 numerous times until researchers reached pre-analytical intuitions on each of the
28 interviewee's discourses and texts were then coded using predefined and emergent
29 categories. The text was divided following these categories before performing an
30 analysis of the written content and finally the content was articulated into results. Two
31 research members carried out the analysis process independently with the support of
32 Atlas.Ti software,[30] and compared the main findings with the original data. The
33 working manuscript was sent to informants through each project partner for
34 approval.[31]
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Ethical considerations**

44 Informed consent was obtained through verbal means and the information was
45 anonymised and confidential. No participants received a salary or reward as
46 participation was completely voluntary and the study received formal ethical approval
47 by a research ethics committee (Hospital del Mar de Barcelona Research Ethics
48 Committee).
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 **Results**

56 Three emerging discourses were identified among the interviewees, as follows,
57 depending on the city of the interviewee: London's informants focused on structural
58
59
60

determinants as the main causes of health inequalities and described universal policies aimed at these, Prague and Cluj-Napoca's interviewees were not as familiar with the concept of the social health inequalities. Informants from other cities had a mixed approach, although they referred to the wider determinants as the causes of health inequalities, they also suggested downstream interventions to address these. It was not possible, however, to distinguish differences in discourses between officers and politicians or health and non-health informants. Table 3 shows a summary of the responses giving by each city's participants. Presented below, the results have been arranged in six sections following the major topics explored in the interviews. The informant's identification (ID) can be seen in Table 2.

Knowledge on health inequalities and their causes

Two broad discourses were found within the informant's perceptions and knowledge of health inequalities. The first discourse corresponds to the majority of informants who were aware of such inequalities and described them as differences in health. These were expressed, for example, as differences in life expectancy.

We have large differences in health: people live five years longer in areas such as Kungsholmen (inner city area of Stockholm municipality) compared to areas such as Järva fältet" Stockholm health politician, ID 16

They also explained that health inequalities existed among the population according to their levels of education or income, gender, age and the neighbourhood in which they lived.

"There are factors which relate to education, employment or unemployment, living conditions, income, social relations and ways of life. Also the social exclusion of young people generates inequalities in health." Helsinki health officer, ID 6.

In addition, the interviewee from Lisbon pointed out that inequalities were increasing as did the informant from Brussels who understood them as a gradient.

The second discourse corresponded to informants from Cluj-Napoca and Prague did not have a clear concept on social health inequalities, as described in the quote below.

"In this city we cannot talk about this concept. It is estimated that there are no legal criteria to make any differences between individuals in terms of access and use of medical care." Cluj-Napoca health officer, ID 5.

1
2
3 Concerning the causes of inequalities, the majority of the interviewees, identified a
4 strong relationship between economic position, educational level and health.
5 Furthermore, low income was perceived as the main cause of unhealthy lifestyle
6 behaviours and reduced access to health care which lead to health inequalities. Other
7 social determinants were also highlighted, such as gender, age group, type of
8 household and residential segregation. The current economic crisis and reduced public
9 expenditure were considered to exacerbate the problem and reduce the capacity of
10 action of the local system.
11
12

13
14
15
16
17 In contrast, interviewees from Prague and Cluj-Napoca considered that health
18 inequalities were chiefly a result of individual responsibility.
19

20 21 **Reducing health inequalities as a priority for the city government**

22 Most interviewees reported that reducing health inequalities was an objective of the city
23 government included in either strategic plans or in specific laws. However interviewees
24 from Prague and Cluj-Napoca did not consider it to be a priority of their municipal
25 governments, whereas Lisbon informant's considered it was not a priority even though
26 they thought it should be.
27
28

29
30
31
32 ***"Tackling inequalities in health should be a priority in the Lisbon Metropolitan Area and***
33 ***is not, directly, a hotly debated topic."*** Lisbon non-health politician, ID 7
34

35
36 The interviewees of Paris and Brussels explained that their city governments did not
37 have jurisdiction over health matters as these are the responsibility of the regional
38 authorities.
39

40
41
42 ***"In France, health is not a responsibility of the cities, although historically it was the***
43 ***cities that were in charge of sanitary aspects."*** Paris health officer, ID 12.
44

45
46 ***That's not easy to answer, as not all the areas are governed on the level of the***
47 ***communities or on the city level."*** Belgium, health officer, ID 4.
48

49 **Information on health inequalities**

50 To monitor health inequalities, the majority of the informants mentioned relying on
51 health surveys which were published periodically in their cities and mortality statistics
52 from their statistics authority.
53
54

55
56
57 ***"To track differences in health, a health survey is conducted every four years."***
58 Amsterdam health officer, ID 1.
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

London's interviewees described the need to integrate the different sources of information into one to make access to information easier. Informants from Lisbon and Prague declared not having information or assessment of health inequalities. Furthermore, the interviewee from Cluj-Napoca explained that periodic data of health inequalities was not available as this concept was not applicable.

Knowledge on policies and programs implemented

When asked about their knowledge of policies that address health inequalities, policymakers described actions aimed at deprived populations and at modifying attitudes and unhealthy behaviours, such as smoking and poor diets. They emphasised the importance of preventive measures and health promotion and education. Policies to improve access to health care services were also quoted as an important means to reduce health inequalities by most interviewees. However, the informants from London highlighted the need to address health inequalities throughout the general population rather than focusing on the most deprived sectors and developing long-term policies aimed at the social determinants, not only proximal factors, such as physical activity and fruit intake. Moreover, the informant from Turin highlighted local interventions aimed at addressing unemployment and the interviewee from Madrid described tackling health inequalities at the local level.

"We have to work on the processes...I'm talking from the micro level, which is where I have more experience, but I think that's where the solution lies, in the micro level."

Madrid health politician, ID 10.

The informants from Prague, however, did not mention any policies implemented by their city government and referred to national health plans as a reference for health-related issues.

Inter-sectoral collaboration and participation of social agents in policymaking

Interviewees from Madrid, London, Rotterdam and Lisbon referred to strategic plans which fostered inter-sectoral collaboration between different administrations, citizens' and non-profit associations and established local partnerships. Barcelona and Turin, in

1
2
3 turn, described inter-sectoral collaboration established only between two sectors, for
4 example between health and welfare or health and education. While Lisbon cited
5 examples of housing policies for groups at risk of exclusion, some informants
6 suggested that inter-sectoral collaboration slowed down the policymaking process and
7 perceived that having different sectors collaborate proved to be difficult.
8
9

10
11 ***“Yes. Action on inequalities in health is synonymous with disciplinary cross-cutting. In
12 this sense, this theme is incorporated in several areas such as education, social service,
13 environmental and cultural policies, among others, addressed in the municipal master
14 plan.”*** Lisbon, non-health politician, ID 7.
15
16
17

18
19 With respect to community organisations participating in the policymaking process, the
20 majority of the informants thought their city governments collaborated with these,
21 however informants from Rotterdam, Turin and Stockholm considered it was very
22 limited.
23
24
25

26
27 ***“The social networks exist but they need public support. There is no doubt that there
28 should be more shared responsibility among private sector and public services or
29 welfare systems.”*** Turin non-health politician, ID 18.
30
31
32

33 34 35 **Barriers and opportunities encountered**

36 One of the principal barriers described was the lack of awareness on changing
37 unhealthy lifestyles among the population. Informants from Stockholm and Lisbon
38 considered the obstacles addressing health inequalities to be essentially related to
39 imbedded cultural beliefs which made adopting healthier lifestyles difficult. Bureaucratic
40 restraints and resistance from other levels of the administration along with
41 miscommunication with the private sector as well as budget restrictions were described
42 as important barriers by the majority of interviewees. London’s interviewee explained
43 that implementing financial policies from within a city government was complicated in
44 the context of globalisation.
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 ***“We come across them all the time and a very important one is the financial issue. Every
52 year we have less money and the crisis only makes it worse.”*** Barcelona health politician,
53 ID 2.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Informants also referred to opportunities which enabled policy implementation. For
4 example, the interviewees from Barcelona and Rotterdam made reference to working
5 at the community level or with different sectors which led to learning opportunities.
6 Community groups were seen as especially important in liaising with hard to reach
7 groups. The interviewee from Brussels suggested that the migrant population promoted
8 healthy lifestyle behaviours, as some of their customs had healthy components.
9
10

11
12
13 ***“There are definitely opportunities. Other services have problems as well and see the***
14 ***benefits of cooperation with groups who work with migrant population.”*** Brussels health
15 officer ID 4.
16
17

18 19 20 Discussion

21 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to explore policymakers'
22 perceptions on health inequalities and policies to reduce these throughout various
23 European cities from diverse geographical areas and with different socio-economic and
24 political contexts. Three discourses were identified depending on the city of the
25 interviewee: 1) London's approach focused on upstream determinants and policies; 2)
26 Cluj-Napoca and Prague's where informants were less acquainted with social health
27 inequalities and 3) the rest of the cities' informants who perceived health inequalities as
28 differences in life expectancy among the population defined by their economic, social
29 and geographical background. Regarding the causes of health inequalities, these were
30 seen as being caused by low-income levels, unhealthy lifestyle behaviours and barriers
31 in accessing health care. Most of the informants agreed that reducing these inequalities
32 was a priority of their local governments and referred to periodic surveys as information
33 sources to monitor them. Nearly all policies and interventions were targeted at
34 modifying health behaviours and some relied upon inter-sectoral collaboration.
35 Furthermore, bureaucracy, funding and the population's attitudes and beliefs towards
36 healthy lifestyles were considered important barriers.
37
38

39 The majority of informants described upstream determinants such as socio-economic
40 and structural factors as the causes of health inequalities but nevertheless focused on
41 describing downstream policies and programmes. This could be due to the fact that the
42 informants work in city governments and even though they are aware of the main
43 causes of health inequalities, their daily routines involve work with downstream policies
44 and programmes. In this regard, some city councils may have limited authority over
45 upstream determinants[4,32] or over health when it is under the authority of higher
46 levels of government; such was the case of Paris and Brussels. In this sense,
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 policymakers seemed to refer to what was within their mandate, so even if they
4 understood structural determinants were important in addressing health inequalities,
5 the activities they described were focused within their own jurisdiction. Downstream,
6 interventions targeted at disadvantaged populations such as some of the ones
7 described by the interviewees, which do not aim at reducing inequalities throughout the
8 whole gradient, may end up being diluted into multiple small downstream initiatives and
9 are less effective in reducing health inequalities.[33,34] This also carries the risk of
10 health inequalities becoming the responsibility of each individual, which is already an
11 existing trend,[35] and downplaying the responsibilities and competences of the city
12 government which will constitute a barrier for the local city governments in tackling
13 inequalities. Moreover it has been widely argued that if interventions are not delivered
14 carefully, they are likely to increase inequalities as those who are most in need, might
15 not benefit from the intervention.[36] However, as described elsewhere,[5] the majority
16 of research on health inequalities relates to downstream determinants and focuses on
17 individual lifestyle factors,[37] so little information is provided to policymakers on the
18 wider determinants and the underlying causes of the causes of health inequalities.[38]

19
20
21 Furthermore, with the exception of Brussels' and London's interviewees, the concept of
22 the socioeconomic gradient in health was not present among respondents; their
23 understanding of reducing health inequalities connoted reducing the differences
24 between the most deprived groups and the rest of the city's population. Therefore, their
25 discourses did not seem to acknowledge that inequalities affect the entire population
26 and not only the most disadvantaged populations.[39]

27
28
29 Except for Lisbon and the Central-eastern European cities, most of the informants
30 mentioned having access to information on health inequalities through periodical
31 surveys or health reports. Those with access to regular information on health
32 inequalities would be more likely to see the underpinning structural causes and be
33 willing to act upon them. Furthermore, Prague and Cluj-Napoca expressed not being
34 aware of the existence of inequalities in their cities possibly because they were not as
35 familiar with the concept. There are relevant studies on health inequalities in the Czech
36 Republic[40,41] and in Romania.[42] Nevertheless, the overarching INEQ-Cities
37 project[29] will provide the cities included in the project with further data on health
38 inequalities at the small area level. Data on health indicators and inequalities is
39 important for various reasons: to understand how causal pathways are established and
40 to design effective policies and interventions.[4,11] While elsewhere it was concluded
41 that researchers do not provide policymakers with befitting and timely information

1
2
3 [15,22,43] constantly requiring more evidence runs the risk of delaying having to face
4 the problem and making decisions.[44] Nevertheless, additional evidence on the social
5 determinants of health, and particularly on effective interventions and policies is
6 important.
7
8

9
10
11 The majority of the informants understood that reducing health inequalities was a
12 priority for their city government. However, only the city governments of Amsterdam,
13 Barcelona, Helsinki, London, Madrid, Rotterdam, Lisbon and Stockholm had health
14 plans, and within these only London has a specific plan for reducing health inequalities,
15 as has also been described elsewhere.[13] Our findings partly reflect the different
16 stages of awareness and action undertaken in the cities as it describes a spectrum of
17 different approaches towards inequalities adopted by countries throughout Europe. We
18 understand that a strong political will is inherent to tackling health inequalities along
19 with supplying policymakers with information on the social determinants and how the
20 gradient operates.[33]
21
22

23
24
25
26
27
28 Many of the participants described participation between sectors at some level, even
29 though not all cities showed the same involvement. A study carried out also within the
30 INEQ-Cities project analysing policy documents of some of the cities included in this
31 study showed similar results.[13] Another study[23] observed that the structure of
32 political responsibilities in the Canadian context offered important constraints for inter-
33 sectoral collaboration. Encouraging the continuation of collaborative strategies may
34 have a substantial impact on reducing health inequalities, previous research has shown
35 that inter-sectoral collaboration between the health and other sectors is essential to
36 achieving health outcomes in a more effective way than from the health sector
37 alone.[45] Fewer cities described participatory processes and collaborating with social
38 actors. Including other stakeholders in policy-making processes is an important step to
39 city governance and empowerment, both decisive in reducing health inequalities more
40 effectively.[34,46] However, there are many different barriers which policymakers
41 encounter when trying to establish collaborative relationships such as an overall lack of
42 awareness of health inequalities among those who work in the city government,
43 difficulties to coordinate with other authorities, a lack of mandate, and limited
44 resources.[16,8]
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 Along with the barriers mentioned above, lack of awareness on health inequalities and
55 bureaucratic restraints were the main barriers to reduce health inequalities as quoted
56 by the interviewees and have been categorised elsewhere as ideological and
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 institutional.[23] Institutional limitations are related to values attitudes and opinions; one
4 possible explanation why this approach has been underlined is that informants seemed
5 to focus mostly on lifestyles and healthy behaviours instead of structural determinants
6 as the causes of health inequalities. Furthermore, the second group of barriers
7 referring to rigid bureaucracy and funding might also be reinforced by the ideological
8 barriers and exacerbated by the social and financial crisis and subsequent austerity
9 measures.
10
11
12
13

14 **Limitations and strengths**

15
16 It should be also taken into account that in some cases, the politicians interviewed
17 gave political discourses and it was a difficult task to make them follow the topics.
18 Participants were selected through an opportunity sampling, they might not be the most
19 representative informants in their fields; other respondents might have wider
20 knowledge on the subject or they possibly participated due to their willingness,
21 accessibility as well as interest in the area of health inequalities and therefore may be
22 more sensitive to the issue. The interviews were carried out by different interviewers
23 from each city in their native language so that participants could express themselves
24 more freely. The results of politicians and officers have been presented together as we
25 found no differences in their discourses. Nevertheless, the informants included in this
26 study were selected following the pre-established criteria so both elected and non-
27 elected informants were highly positioned in their municipal government's structure and
28 had decision making competences. The data was collected 3-4 years ago so parties
29 governing in the cities may have changed and the elected officials may not be working
30 in decision making positions at the present moment. However, describing these beliefs
31 provides very valuable information on the governance of cities given the key role of
32 policymakers.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 As a relevant strength of the study, the interviewees included many examples of their
46 everyday experiences and realities providing rich and detailed information. They
47 expressed their own beliefs and describing them provides very valuable information on
48 the governance of cities given the key role of policymakers. Moreover, carrying out the
49 interview, an activity seldom performed previously, probably drew politicians to review
50 the issue, update their knowledge and learn about the INEQ-Cities project (INEQ-Cities
51 2012). The findings of the present study to some extent mirrors the findings of the
52 analysis of health policy documents in the same cities, and illustrates the different
53 stages at which cities are concerning work on health inequalities.[13] This exploratory
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 study, possibly one of the first of its kind in comparing policymaker's knowledge and
4 beliefs across several cities of Europe, will hopefully be a stepping stone for further
5 studies and also has the important advantage of having information from quite a large
6 number of cities.
7
8
9

10 **Conclusions and recommendations**

11 The majority of the interviewed policymakers gave an account of interventions focusing
12 on the immediate determinants and aimed at modifying lifestyles and behaviours in the
13 more disadvantaged classes. Some described inter-sectoral action explicitly and for
14 most cities reducing health inequalities was a priority and policymakers had access to
15 periodic information.
16
17
18
19

20 Future collaboration between the research centres from Cluj-Napoca and Prague and
21 their local governments could possibly foster more awareness about health inequalities
22 and their causes and the importance of addressing them. Providing decision makers
23 from the municipal governments with information on policies aimed at addressing
24 upstream determinants alongside health indicators should be encouraged further to
25 promote knowledge on their role in addressing health inequalities.
26
27
28
29
30

31 More funding should be put towards academic research on effective universal policies,
32 evaluation of their impact and training policymakers and officers on health inequalities
33 in city governments. Further advocacy must be carried out to place health inequalities
34 and their implications in the municipal government's agenda and in city health plans.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the informants who participated in the interviews and the interviewers who carried them out and all the partners involved in the INEQ-Cities project. This article has been partially funded by the project: INEQ-Cities, "Socioeconomic inequalities in mortality: evidence and policies of cities of Europe"; project funded by the Executive Agency for Health and Consumers-DG Sanco (Commission of the European Union), project n°2008 12 13 and CIBERESP Epidemiología y Salud Pública.

Funding

This work was supported by the Executive Agency for Health and Consumers-DG Sanco (Commission of the European Union), project n°2008 12 13 and CIBERESP Epidemiología y Salud Pública

Contributorship Statement

All authors made substantial contributions to conception and design of the study and interviews. They carried out the interviews in their own cities and translated these and provided a summary or transcription. Once the data was analysed by the coordinating centre, the authors interpreted the results and provided critical feedback as well as sending the results to informants and providing the coordinating centre with comments or suggestions made by them. Authors also participated in drafting the article and reviewed it critically several times, making substantial comments and suggestions regarding form, analysis and concepts. Authors also reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript and provided their approval for publication.

Conflicts of interests

The authors declare not to have any conflicts of interest.

Data sharing statement

No additional data are available.

References

1. Kilroy A. Intra-urban spatial inequalities: cities as 'urban regions'. World development report. MIT and UNDP. 2009;1-27.
2. UN-HABITAT/WHO. Hidden cities: unmasking and overcoming health inequities in urban settings. 2010; Available at: http://www.hiddencities.org/downloads/WHO_UN-HABITAT_Hidden_Cities_Web.pdf. Accessed 12 of November 2013.
3. Commission on Social Determinants of Health, WHO. Closing the gap in a Generation. Health equity through action on the social determinants of health. Available at: http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2008/WHO_IER_CSDH_08.1_eng.pdf. Accessed 8 of February 2014.
4. World Health Organization (WHO). Centre for Health Development. Our cities, our health, our future. Acting on social determinants for health equity in urban settings. Report to the WHO Commission on Social Determinants of Health from the Knowledge Network on Urban Settings. 2008; Available at: http://www.who.int/social_determinants/resources/knus_final_report_052008.pdf. Accessed 14 of August 2013.
5. Collins PA. Do great local minds think alike? Comparing perceptions of the social determinants of health between non-profit and governmental actors in two Canadian cities. Health Educ Res 2012;27:371-84.
6. Collins PA, Hayes MV. Examining the capacities of municipal governments to reduce health inequities: a survey of municipal actors' perceptions in Metro Vancouver. Can J Public Health 2013;104:304-10.
7. Borrell C, Pons-Vigues M, Morrison J, et al. Factors and processes influencing health inequalities in urban areas. J Epidemiol Community Health 2013;67:389-91.
8. Lavis JN.. Ideas, Policy Learning and Policy Change: The determinants-of-Health Synthesis in Canada and the United Kingdom 1998.
9. Lavis JN. Ideas at the margin or marginalized ideas? Nonmedical determinants of health in Canada. Health Aff (Millwood) 2002;21:107-12.
10. Liverpool WHO Collaborating Centre for Policy Research on Social Determinants of Health. How can the health equity impact of universal policies be evaluated? Insights into approaches and next steps. Editors: Milton B, Moonan M, Taylor-Robinson David, Whitehead M Copenhagen, 2011.
11. Borrell C, Bartoll X, García-Altés A, et al. A quarter of a century of health reports in Barcelona: A commitment to transparency and a tool for action. Rev Esp Salud Publica;85:449-58.
12. Whitehead M. Diffusion of ideas on social inequalities in health: a European perspective. Milbank Q 1998;76:469-92.
13. Borrell C, Morrison J, Burstrom B, et al. Comparison of health policy documents of European cities: are they oriented to reduce inequalities in health? J Public Health Policy 2013;34:100-20.
14. Collins PA, Hayes MV. The role of urban municipal governments in reducing health inequities: A meta-narrative mapping analysis. Int J Equity Health 2010;9:13.

- 1
2
3 15. Lavis JN, Posada FB, Haines A, et al. Use of research to inform public policymaking. *Lancet* 2004;364:1615-21.
4
5
6 16. Lavis JN. Research, public policymaking, and knowledge-translation processes: Canadian
7 efforts to build bridges. *J Contin Educ Health Prof* 2006;26:37-45.
8
9 17. Davidson R, Mitchell R, Hunt K. Location, location, location: the role of experience of
10 disadvantage in lay perceptions of area inequalities in health. *Health Place* 2008;2:167-81.
11
12 18. Macintyre S, McKay L, Ellaway A. Lay concepts of the relative importance of different
13 influences on health; are there major socio-demographic variations? *Health Educ Res*
14 2006;21:731-39.
15
16 19. Macintyre S. Evidence in the development of health policy. *Public Health* 2012 3;126:217-
17 19.
18
19 20. Popay J, Bennett S, Thomas C, et al. Beyond 'beer, fags, egg and chips'? Exploring lay
20 understandings of social inequalities in health. *Sociol Health Illn* 2003;25:1-23.
21
22 21. Lavis JN, Ross SE, Stoddart GL, Hohenadel JM, McLeod CB, Evans RG. Do Canadian civil
23 servants care about the health of populations? *Am J Public Health* 2003;93:658-63.
24
25 22. Petticrew M, Whitehead M, Macintyre SJ, et al. Evidence for public health policy on
26 inequalities: 1: The reality according to policymakers. *J Epidemiol Community Health*
27 2004;58:811-16.
28
29 23. Collins PA, Abelson J, Eyles JD. Knowledge into action? understanding ideological barriers
30 to addressing health inequalities at the local level. *Health Policy* 2007;80:158-71.
31
32 24. Sofaer S. Qualitative research methods. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2002;14:329-36.
33
34 25. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research
35 (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality*
36 *in Health Care* 2007;19:349-57.
37
38 26. Shortell SM. The emergence of qualitative methods in health services research. *Health Serv*
39 *Res* 1999;34:1083-90.
40
41 27. Reeves S, Albert M, Kuper A, et al. Why use theories in qualitative research? *Br Med J*
42 2008;337:49.
43
44 28. Maxwell JA. Qualitative research design. An interactive approach. Qualitative research
45 design. An interactive approach. Second ed. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE; 2005.
46
47 29. INEQ-CITIES Socio-economic inequalities in mortality: evidence and policies in cities of
48 Europe. INEQ-CITIES Atlas. Available at: <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/ineqcities/atlas>. Accessed 10th
49 of October, 2013.
50
51 30. ATLAS.ti. Atlas. ti Qualitative data analysis software. 2010-2011 Scientific Software
52 Development GmbH.
53
54 31. Mays N, Pope C. Qualitative research in health care - Assessing quality in qualitative
55 research. *Br Med J* 2000;320:50-2.
56
57 32. Vlahov D, Freudenberg N, Proietti F, et al. Urban as a determinant of health. *J Urban*
58 *Health* 2007;84:16-26.
59
60

- 1
2
3 33. Marmot M, Commission Social Determinants Hlt. Achieving health equity: from root causes
4 to fair outcomes. *Lancet* 2007;370:1153-63.
5
6 34. The Commission to Reduce Social Inequalities in Health in Spain. A proposal of policies and
7 interventions to reduce social inequalities in health in Spain. *Commission to Reduce Social*
8 *Inequalities in Health in Spain*. *Gac Sanit* 2012;26:182-89.
9
10 35. WHO. Review of social determinants and the health divide in the WHO European Region.
11 2013.
12
13 36. Lorenc T, Petticrew M, Welch V, et al. What types of interventions generate inequalities?
14 Evidence from systematic reviews. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2013;67:190-93.
15
16 37. Whitehead M DG. What can be done about inequalities in health? *Lancet* 1991;338:1059-
17 63.
18
19 38. Rose G. Sick individuals and sick populations. *Int J Epidemiol* 1985;14:32-38.
20
21 39. Whitehead M DG. Whitehead M, Dahlgren G. Concepts and principles for tackling social
22 inequities in health. *Levelling up (part 1)*. Denmark 2006.
23
24 40. Dzurova D, Spilkova J, Pikhart H. Social inequalities in alcohol consumption in the Czech
25 Republic: a multilevel analysis. *Health Place* 2010;16:590-97.
26
27 41. Pikhart H, Drbohlav D, Dzurova D. The self-reported health of legal and illegal/irregular
28 immigrants in the Czech Republic. *Int J Public Health* 2010;55:401-11.
29
30 42. Florescu L, Balanica G, Vremera T,. Cross-sectional study to evaluate risk factors in infant
31 malnutrition. *Rev Med Chir Soc Med Nat Iasi* 2011;115:699-704.
32
33 43. Petticrew M, Roberts H. Systematic reviews--do they 'work' in informing decision-making
34 around health inequalities? *Health Econ Policy Law* 2008;3:197-211.
35
36 44. Whitehead M. Diffusion of Ideas on Social Inequalities in Health: A European Perspective.
37 *Milbank Q* 1998;76:469-92.
38
39 45. Solar O Irwin A. A conceptual framework for action on the social determinants of health.
40 Discussion paper for the Commission on Social Determinants of Health. 2007.
41
42 46. Bambra C. Going beyond The three worlds of welfare capitalism: regime theory and public
43 health research. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2007;61:1098-102.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. City profile indicators¹

City	Year of the indicator	Population aged 0 – 14 %	Population aged 65 and older %	Population aged 16 - 64 in the labour market %	Unemployment %	Immigrant population %
Amsterdam	2001	16.1	11.3	72.0	13.3	48.3
Barcelona	2005	12.3	20.8	57.2	8.7	21.5
Brussels	2001	18.3	15.4	64.9	18.2	26.3
Helsinki	2004	14.5	13.8	78.9	9.1	7.3
Lisbon	2001	14.9	15.4	73.3	7.6	5.7
London	2001	20.2	12.0	67.6	5.2	24.9
Madrid	2005	12.8	18.7	74.1	8.2	14.1
Paris	2007	14.4	14.1	75.5	11.3	20
Prague	2006	12.3	15.6	74.8	3.5	7.6
Rotterdam	2001	17.2	14.3	69	9	45
Stockholm	2005	18	14.1	76	5.3	24.3
Turin	2005	11.4	23.4	67.8	11.4	5.6

1. The information was provided by each city and proceeds from different information sources

Table 2. Description of the 19 informants*

Identification	City (Country)	Status	Profile	Party
1	Amsterdam (Netherlands)	Officer	Health	NA
2	Barcelona (Spain)	Politician	Health	Eco-socialism
3	Barcelona (Spain)	Politician	Non-Health	Eco-socialism
4	Brussels (Belgium)	Officer	Health	NA
5	Cluj-Napoca (Romania)	Officer	Health	NA
6	Helsinki (Finland)	Officer	Health	NA
7	Lisbon (Portugal)	Politician	Non-Health	Social democracy
8*	London (United Kingdom)	Officer	Health	NA
9*	London (United Kingdom)	Officer	Health	NA
10	Madrid (Spain)	Officer	Health	NA
11	Madrid (Spain)	Officer	Health	NA
12	Paris (France)	Officer	Health	NA
13	Prague (Czech Republic)	Officer	Health	NA
14	Prague (Czech Republic)	Officer	Health	NA
15	Rotterdam (Netherlands)	Officer	Non-Health	NA
16	Stockholm (Sweden)	Politician	Health	Christian democratic
17	Stockholm (Sweden)	Politician	Health	Social democracy
18	Turin (Italy)	Politician	Non-Health	Social democracy
19	Turin (Italy)	Politician	Non-Health	Social democracy

^ NA= Not applicable

* Both informants 8 and 9 from London were interviewed together. The information was generated through 18 in-depth interviews

Table 3. Summary of cities' discourses

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

City	Knowledge on HI ¹ and their causes	Reducing HI as a priority for the city government	Information on health inequalities	Knowledge on policies and programs	Intersectoral collaboration/ participation of social agents	Barriers	Opportunities
Amsterdam	Economic, genetic, environmental, ethnic factors	It is a priority, through changing economic and political factors	Health survey, city memo, collaboration with academics	The city has a Health Plan	There is specific collaboration with other sectors	Funding and the administrative organisation	Health topics are placed in the agenda of organisations
Barcelona	Capitalist economic system, different life expectancy between neighbourhoods structural poverty, traditional and emerging inequalities	HI is a priority but mostly for the health sector and at the local level	Annual city health report and health policy evaluation. Social observatory	Urban regeneration policies. Non-health policies with health outcomes, Health in the neighbourhoods strategy to reduce HI	Not a formal intersectorality, council organisation still compartmentalised. 18 plans with community action, civil society	Financial restraints, factual powers	Proximity to the community and intersectorality
Brussels	Gradient in health, socio-economic position, lack of redistribution mechanisms, segregation, personal traits, access to health care	Reducing HI is an absolute priority	Death certificates, census, national health survey, more data is needed on children	No specific policies aimed at health inequalities	Collaboration is transversal with 3 political structures. Social agents are advisory bodies and also participate in action plans	The liberal course of EU ² . Geographic proximity of actors	Migrant population contribute to healthy lifestyles
Cluj-Napoca	Health inequalities are not an issue	Reducing HI is not a priority, health is a right for all people	The city has the population health statistics	There are preventive measures for the whole population	There is close cooperation with municipalities	Funding and administrative restraints are a barrier	
Helsinki	Sex, education, unemployment, living conditions, social relations, exclusion of young people and ways of life	Strategy of city council 2009-2012. Resources directed at reducing HI	There is some information because it is a strategy of the city	Healthy Helsinki project to reduce HI. Non-smoking and responsible alcohol consumption programmes	There is not enough intersectorality. Steering committees include various social agents. Intersectorality might be slow	Difficulty to obtain funding. Administrative structures	Funding and good cooperation create opportunities
Lisbon	Socioeconomic, demographic, income and age inequalities. Housing conditions	Reducing HI is not explicitly a priority, but it should be. We have the Municipal master plan	There is no information or assessment	Policies and plan targeted at aging	Intersectorality is inherent in tackling health inequalities	Cultural, economic and legislative obstacles	Initiatives with multiple dimensions

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

London	Social determinants in a global context. Lack of evidence base of strategies. Policies directed at most deprived instead of all population	The informants did not answer explicitly that reducing HI was a priority	There is not a must on information. Data is pieced together	Primary care interventions, employment programmes, partnership approach, no knowledge on EU funds	There is intersectoral work with local partnerships not only health services	Little capacity to influence the upstream determinants of inequalities	Promoting local integration and pool resources
Madrid	Socio-economic inequalities, housing, lifestyles, education, income, cultural behaviours. Inequalities at the district level, access to healthcare services	A priority to be dealt with by health care systems	Yes, through research and the annual report	Plan Vallecas to change behaviours. Law for health, programme for the homeless with tuberculosis, for sexual trade workers, for women of Roma ethnicity, children at risk	Plan Vallecas which is multidisciplinary, community and participatory. The aim is to work transversally but it is difficult. Neighbours' associations and participation at the micro level	Relations with other institutions, budget delimitation, lack of awareness of the population, little information on the impact of programmes	To integrate the actions on the groups affected by health inequalities
Paris	Access to health care	Health is not responsibility of the city government or a priority	Epidemiological information and on local health issues for specific municipalities	City policy: measures at the city level, preventive measures, public Health programmes in the neighbourhoods	City health workshops	The consideration of health in the context of urban policy	
Prague	Social status, poverty, chosen lifestyle, voluntarily socially excluded	Health inequalities are not a priority	National plan of social politics but no periodic support	Health 21, strategic plan of Prague	Complex a to work with different sectors, social agents make themselves heard	Legislative and coordination issues, financial barriers	NGO's ³ are very close to the socially excluded
Rotterdam	Socioeconomic differences	Yes, with a broad view on health. Health is a precondition for the life of the city	Health is included in a general biannual survey	Directed at unhealthy behaviour of low SES, air quality and traffic, health plan	Work, participation, education. "Healthy in the city": city health plan. "From complaint to strength", depression and diabetes. Many joint projects but no collaboration with social actors	Long timeframe in cooperating with other networks. Different levels in institutions have trouble communicating	Benefits of cooperation
Stockholm	Structural differences: housing segregation, education level, age group, income, migration criminal acts/safety and living conditions. Health inequalities in Stockholm are very large	Based on health care services. Legislation is there but the educated are the ones who benefit. Accessibility to health care is the highest priority	Public health survey produced every four years, review of health care services, Karolinska Institute Public Health Academy reports	Wide range of choice of health providers, addressed at behavioural and cultural determinants, resources for prevention are too small	Action plan for health, Hard for actors to cooperate voluntary organisations which strengthen the community but nonexistent in participatory process	Lack of competence, knowledge and methods to change behaviours	Resources, Evidenced based health prevention, Engaged people working in health centres

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

For peer review only

Turin	Housing conditions, overcrowding, economic and employment crisis, deterioration of social conditions	The city has a direct and privileged approach to dealing with inequality but there are conflicts of interest	No use of effectiveness indicators for evaluation and modification of policies	Policies not addressed at specific groups, traffic calming and public transport development, security, social housing, local welfare strategies	Sentinel events arise interest but there is a conflict of interests in the political administration	Structural policies tend to be slow	Social cooperatives for housing by improving existing assets
-------	--	--	--	---	---	-------------------------------------	--

- 1. HI: Health Inequalities
- 2. EU: European Union
- 3. NGOs Non-Governmental Organisations

Health inequalities in European cities: Perceptions and beliefs among local policymakers

Authors:

Joana Morrison, Mariona Pons-Vigués, Laia Bécares, Bo Bürstrom, Ana Gandarillas, Felicitas Domínguez-Berjón, Èlia Diez, Giuseppe Costa, Milagros Ruiz, Hynek Pikhart, Chiara Marinacci, Rasmus Hoffmann, Paula Santana, Carme Borrell, and partners from the INEQ-CITIES Project

Affiliations

- University College London, London, UK
- Agència de Salut Pública de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain
- CIBER de Epidemiología y Salud Pública (CIBERESP), Spain
- Institut Universitari d'Investigació en Atenció Primària Jordi Gol (IDIAP Jordi Gol), Barcelona, Spain
- Universitat de Girona, Girona, Spain
- University of Manchester, Manchester, UK
- Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden
- Subdirección General de Promoción de la Salud y Prevención. Consejería de Sanidad. Comunidad de Madrid (Subdirectorate-General for Health Promotion and Prevention. Madrid Regional Health Authority), Spain.
- Erasmus Medical Centre,
- Institut d'Investigació Biomèdica de Sant Pau (IIB Sant Pau), Barcelona, Spain
- Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain
- Centro de Estudos de Geógrafa e Ordenamento do Território (CEGOT), Departamento de Geografia, Universidade de Coimbra, Coimbra

Corresponding author

Joana Morrison

University College London

Dept. of Epidemiology and Public Health

1-19 Torrington Place, London WC1E 6BT

T: +44 (0)20 7679 1711

j.morrison@ucl.ac.uk

Keywords Health inequalities, public policies, municipal government, policymaker, knowledge, qualitative research, urban health

Word count: 4212

Abstract

Objective To describe the knowledge and beliefs of public policymakers on social inequalities in health and policies to reduce them in cities from different parts of Europe during 2010 and 2011.

Design Phenomenological qualitative study.

Setting Thirteen European cities.

Participants Nineteen elected politicians and officers with a directive status from thirteen European cities.

Main outcome Policymaker's knowledge and beliefs.

Results Three emerging discourses were identified among the interviewees, depending on the city of the interviewee. Health inequalities were perceived by most policy makers as differences in life expectancy between population with economic, social and geographical differences. Reducing health inequalities was a priority for the majority of cities which use surveys as sources of information to analyse these. Bureaucracy, funding and population beliefs were the main barriers.

Conclusions The majority of the interviewed policymakers gave an account of interventions focusing on the immediate determinants and aimed at modifying lifestyles and behaviours in the more disadvantaged classes. More funding should be put towards academic research on effective universal policies, evaluation of their impact and training policymakers and officers on health inequalities in city governments.

Limitations

- Respondents possibly participated due to their willingness, accessibility as well as interest in the area of health inequalities and therefore may be more sensitive to the issue.
- The data was collected 3-4 years ago so parties governing in the cities may have changed.
- In some cities, either officers or politicians were interviewed; it might have been more desirable to have one of each for every city.
- As the interviewees were selected by INEQ-Cities partners from each city, these were chosen by opportunity sampling.

Strengths

- The interviewees included many examples of their everyday experiences and realities providing rich and detailed information.
- Carrying out the interview, an activity seldom performed previously among policymakers, possibly drew them to review the issue, update their knowledge and learn about the INEQ-Cities project and its results on health inequalities in their cities.
- Since this is an exploratory study, possibly one of the first of its kind in comparing policymaker's knowledge and beliefs across several cities of Europe, it will hopefully be a stepping stone for further qualitative research on the topic.
- This study has the important advantage of having collected information from quite a large number of cities throughout Europe.

Introduction

Health inequalities in urban environments are complex[1,2] affect the entire population throughout the health gradient[3] and require a multi-sectoral approach to address multiple social and economic determinants.[4] To that effect, although city governments' competences and authorities vary, they are endowed with jurisdiction to develop strategic plans and policies, provide services and deliver interventions which may address health inequalities.[5-7]

Within governments, policymakers are responsible for decision and policy-making in the form of laws, guidelines, and regulations[8] and their knowledge, beliefs and perceptions are relevant in the implementation of these. It is important to know whether the concept of the social determinants of health inequalities is imbedded in their discourse[9,10] in addition to the information on health issues provided to them as reports or surveys. **These topics, explored in this study,** may determine the course of the policy-making process.[11,12] Furthermore, their perceptions regarding the responsibilities and priorities of city governments and the city government's strategic plans possibly influence the policies in place.[13,14] These issues along with how policymakers make use of their knowledge will influence decision making and affect how health inequalities are addressed by city governments.[8,15,16]

The majority of studies exploring the knowledge and beliefs of health inequalities have explored lay perceptions[17-20] and the few studies describing expert beliefs focused on researchers and policymakers working in regional and national governments.[9,21,22] To our knowledge, there are only a small number of studies focusing on policymakers in the city government[5,6,14,23] **and this is among the first** qualitative studies to compare the perceptions of policymakers in different European cities. **The use of rigorous qualitative research methods has been on the rise in health services and health policy research[24] to explore the experiences of participants and the meanings they attribute to them, to contribute new knowledge and to provide new perspectives.[25] It is consistent with developments in the social and policy sciences at large and has been described to reflect the need for more in-depth understanding of naturalistic settings the importance of understanding context and the complexity of implementing social change.[26] Selecting policymakers from different European cities provided a description of the different socio-political realities and contexts according to the participant's daily experiences to provider a richer and wider view on reducing health inequalities at the municipal level throughout the continent. Notwithstanding their**

1
2
3 diversity, the participant cities share important commonalities as European
4 democracies and urban settings, allowing to explore the study object from a new view.
5 Previous studies[13] in the project have analysed written policy documents in these
6 cities. The objective of this study is to further increase the understanding of how
7 policies are realised, through the perception and beliefs of public policy makers
8 in
9 thirteen European cities during 2010 and 2011.
10
11
12
13

14 **Methods**

15 **Methodological development**

16 We carried out a descriptive and exploratory qualitative research study from a
17 phenomenological perspective[27] as it sought to capture policymakers' unique
18 accounts of reality in order to capture a breadth of discourses on health
19 inequalities[28]. Data was collected from thirteen cities (Amsterdam, Barcelona,
20 Brussels, Cluj-Napoca, Helsinki, Lisbon, London, Madrid, Paris, Prague, Rotterdam,
21 Stockholm and Turin; see Table 1 for information on the cities' profiles) from eleven
22 different European countries participating in the project; Socio-economic inequalities in
23 mortality: evidence and policies in cities of Europe 2009-2012 (INEQ-Cities)[29] during
24 the years 2010 and 2011.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Participants and sampling technique**

34 The study population consisted of nineteen public policymakers, selected through
35 opportunity sampling[28], see Table 2, working in the aforementioned cities'
36 governments during the research period. A sample of elected politicians which included
37 councillors and or aldermen and high ranked, non-elected, officers was selected.
38 Policymakers were chosen from the health sector as well as other non-health sectors
39 to provide a wider range of discourses. Interviews were performed by INEQ-Cities'
40 partners, who interviewed a maximum of two participants, in their respective cities.
41 Furthermore, subjects were chosen only if they held a decision making position.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Data collection and generation techniques**

50 Seventeen semi-structured individual interviews and one semi-structured interview
51 where two informants participated were carried out from November 2010 to June 2011
52 using an open-ended question topic guide (Box 1). The interviews provided information
53 on the participant's knowledge and beliefs of health inequalities and policies to address
54 these, as well as the role of the municipal government. The interview topic guide was
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 developed following the requirements listed in INEQ-cities' description of work and was
4 further discussed with other project partners. Three pilot interviews were performed in
5 Barcelona to test the topic guides and final versions of the guide were distributed to the
6 project partners in the abovementioned cities who then conducted the interviews. The
7 sessions were carried out in each city's native language and lasted between 45
8 minutes and an hour, where clarification of the topics was needed, some interviewers
9 made city-specific questions. The interviewers belonged to partner groups from the
10 INEQ-Cities project. A data collection manual designed by the authors of this study was
11 sent to each partner and interviewer, providing guidelines on how to perform the
12 interview to ensure that these were carried out in a standardised way. Interviews were
13 translated to English by each partner and several sent the transcripts and summaries
14 to the informants for approval. The summaries and the transcripts were sent to the
15 authors carrying out the analysis in English.

22 23 24 **Processing and analysis of information**

25 All transcripts and summaries were analysed centrally on the basis of a thematic
26 interpretive content analysis[27] by 2 researchers (JM and MP). Interviews were read
27 numerous times until researchers reached pre-analytical intuitions on each of the
28 interviewee's discourses and texts were then coded using predefined and emergent
29 categories. The text was divided following these categories before performing an
30 analysis of the written content and finally the content was articulated into results. Two
31 research members carried out the analysis process independently with the support of
32 Atlas.Ti software,[30] and compared the main findings with the original data. The
33 working manuscript was sent to informants through each project partner for
34 approval.[31]

35 36 37 **Ethical considerations**

38 Informed consent was obtained through verbal means and the information was
39 anonymised and confidential. No participants received a salary or reward as
40 participation was completely voluntary and the study received formal ethical approval
41 by a research ethics committee (Hospital del Mar de Barcelona Research Ethics
42 Committee).

43 44 45 **Results**

46 Three emerging discourses were identified among the interviewees, as follows,
47 depending on the city of the interviewee: London's informants focused on structural
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

determinants as the main causes of health inequalities and described universal policies aimed at these, Prague and Cluj-Napoca's interviewees were not as familiar with the concept of the social health inequalities. Informants from other cities had a mixed approach, although they referred to the wider determinants as the causes of health inequalities, they also suggested downstream interventions to address these. It was not possible, however, to distinguish differences in discourses between officers and politicians or health and non-health informants. Table 3 shows a summary of the responses giving by each city's participants. Presented below, the results have been arranged in six sections following the major topics explored in the interviews. The informant's identification (ID) can be seen in Table 2.

Knowledge on health inequalities and their causes

Two broad discourses were found within the informant's perceptions and knowledge of health inequalities. The first discourse corresponds to the majority of informants who were aware of such inequalities and described them as differences in health. These were expressed, for example, as differences in life expectancy.

We have large differences in health: people live five years longer in areas such as Kungsholmen (inner city area of Stockholm municipality) compared to areas such as Järva fältet” Stockholm health politician, ID 16

They also explained that health inequalities existed among the population according to their levels of education or income, gender, age and the neighbourhood in which they lived.

“There are factors which relate to education, employment or unemployment, living conditions, income, social relations and ways of life. Also the social exclusion of young people generates inequalities in health.” Helsinki health officer, ID 6.

In addition, the interviewee from Lisbon pointed out that inequalities were increasing as did the informant from Brussels who understood them as a gradient.

The second discourse corresponded to informants from Cluj-Napoca and Prague did not have a clear concept on social health inequalities, as described in the quote below.

“In this city we cannot talk about this concept. It is estimated that there are no legal criteria to make any differences between individuals in terms of access and use of medical care.” Cluj-Napoca health officer, ID 5.

1
2
3 Concerning the causes of inequalities, the majority of the interviewees, identified a
4 strong relationship between economic position, educational level and health.
5 Furthermore, low income was perceived as the main cause of unhealthy lifestyle
6 behaviours and reduced access to health care which lead to health inequalities. Other
7 social determinants were also highlighted, such as gender, age group, type of
8 household and residential segregation. The current economic crisis and reduced public
9 expenditure were considered to exacerbate the problem and reduce the capacity of
10 action of the local system.
11
12

13
14
15
16
17 In contrast, interviewees from Prague and Cluj-Napoca considered that health
18 inequalities were chiefly a result of individual responsibility.
19

20 21 **Reducing health inequalities as a priority for the city government**

22 Most interviewees reported that reducing health inequalities was an objective of the city
23 government included in either strategic plans or in specific laws. However interviewees
24 from Prague and Cluj-Napoca did not consider it to be a priority of their municipal
25 governments, whereas Lisbon informant's considered it was not a priority even though
26 they thought it should be.
27
28
29
30

31
32 *"Tackling inequalities in health should be a priority in the Lisbon Metropolitan Area and*
33 *is not, directly, a hotly debated topic."* Lisbon non-health politician, ID 7
34

35
36 The interviewees of Paris and Brussels explained that their city governments did not
37 have jurisdiction over health matters as these are the responsibility of the regional
38 authorities.
39

40
41 *"In France, health is not a responsibility of the cities, although historically it was the*
42 *cities that were in charge of sanitary aspects."* Paris health officer, ID 12.
43
44

45
46 *That's not easy to answer, as not all the areas are governed on the level of the*
47 *communities or on the city level."* Belgium, health officer, ID 4.
48

49 **Information on health inequalities**

50 To monitor health inequalities, the majority of the informants mentioned relying on
51 health surveys which were published periodically in their cities and mortality statistics
52 from their statistics authority.
53
54

55
56 *"To track differences in health, a health survey is conducted every four years."*
57 Amsterdam health officer, ID 1.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

London's interviewees described the need to integrate the different sources of information into one to make access to information easier. Informants from Lisbon and Prague declared not having information or assessment of health inequalities. Furthermore, the interviewee from Cluj-Napoca explained that periodic data of health inequalities was not available as this concept was not applicable.

Knowledge on policies and programs implemented

When asked about their knowledge of policies that address health inequalities, policymakers described actions aimed at deprived populations and at modifying attitudes and unhealthy behaviours, such as smoking and poor diets. They emphasised the importance of preventive measures and health promotion and education. Policies to improve access to health care services were also quoted as an important means to reduce health inequalities by most interviewees. However, the informants from London highlighted the need to address health inequalities throughout the general population rather than focusing on the most deprived sectors and developing long-term policies aimed at the social determinants, not only proximal factors, such as physical activity and fruit intake. Moreover, the informant from Turin highlighted local interventions aimed at addressing unemployment and the interviewee from Madrid described tackling health inequalities at the local level.

"We have to work on the processes...I'm talking from the micro level, which is where I have more experience, but I think that's where the solution lies, in the micro level."

Madrid health politician, ID 10.

The informants from Prague, however, did not mention any policies implemented by their city government and referred to national health plans as a reference for health-related issues.

Inter-sectoral collaboration and participation of social agents in policymaking

Interviewees from Madrid, London, Rotterdam and Lisbon referred to strategic plans which fostered inter-sectoral collaboration between different administrations, citizens' and non-profit associations and established local partnerships. Barcelona and Turin, in

1
2
3 turn, described inter-sectoral collaboration established only between two sectors, for
4 example between health and welfare or health and education. While Lisbon cited
5 examples of housing policies for groups at risk of exclusion, some informants
6 suggested that inter-sectoral collaboration slowed down the policymaking process and
7 perceived that having different sectors collaborate proved to be difficult.
8
9

10
11
12 ***“Yes. Action on inequalities in health is synonymous with disciplinary cross-cutting. In***
13 ***this sense, this theme is incorporated in several areas such as education, social service,***
14 ***environmental and cultural policies, among others, addressed in the municipal master***
15 ***plan.”*** Lisbon, non-health politician, ID 7.
16
17

18
19
20
21 With respect to community organisations participating in the policymaking process, the
22 majority of the informants thought their city governments collaborated with these,
23 however informants from Rotterdam, Turin and Stockholm considered it was very
24 limited.
25
26

27
28 ***“The social networks exist but they need public support. There is no doubt that there***
29 ***should be more shared responsibility among private sector and public services or***
30 ***welfare systems.”*** Turin non-health politician, ID 18.
31
32

33 34 35 **Barriers and opportunities encountered**

36 One of the principal barriers described was the lack of awareness on changing
37 **unhealthy** lifestyles among the population. Informants from Stockholm and Lisbon
38 considered the obstacles addressing health inequalities to be essentially related to
39 **imbedded cultural beliefs which made adopting healthier lifestyles difficult**. Bureaucratic
40 restraints and resistance from other levels of the administration along with
41 miscommunication with the private sector as well as budget restrictions were described
42 as important barriers by the majority of interviewees. London's **interviewee** explained
43 that implementing financial policies from within a city government was complicated in
44 the context of globalisation.
45
46
47
48
49

50
51
52 ***“We come across them all the time and a very important one is the financial issue. Every***
53 ***year we have less money and the crisis only makes it worse.”*** Barcelona health politician,
54 ID 2.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Informants also referred to opportunities which enabled policy implementation. For
4 example, the interviewees from Barcelona and Rotterdam made reference to working
5 at the community level or with different sectors which led to learning opportunities.
6 Community groups were seen as especially important in liaising with hard to reach
7 groups. The interviewee from Brussels suggested that the migrant population promoted
8 **healthy** lifestyle behaviours, as some of their customs had healthy components.
9

10
11
12
13 *“There are definitely opportunities. Other services have problems as well and see the*
14 *benefits of cooperation with groups who work with migrant population.” Brussels health*
15 *officer ID 4.*
16
17

18 Discussion

19
20 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to explore policymakers’
21 perceptions on health inequalities and policies to reduce these throughout various
22 European cities from diverse geographical areas and with different socio-economic and
23 political contexts. **Three discourses were identified depending on the city of the**
24 **interviewee: 1) London’s approach focused on upstream determinants and policies; 2)**
25 **Cluj-Napoca and Prague’s where informants were less acquainted with social health**
26 **inequalities and 3) the rest of the cities’ informants who** perceived health inequalities as
27 differences in life expectancy among the population defined by their economic, social
28 and geographical background. Regarding the causes of health inequalities, these were
29 seen as being caused by low-income levels, unhealthy lifestyle behaviours and barriers
30 in accessing health care. Most of the informants agreed that reducing these inequalities
31 was a priority of their local governments and referred to periodic surveys as information
32 sources to monitor them. Nearly all policies and interventions were targeted at
33 modifying health behaviours and **some** relied upon inter-sectoral collaboration.
34 Furthermore, bureaucracy, funding and the population’s attitudes and beliefs towards
35 healthy lifestyles were considered important barriers.
36
37

38
39
40
41 **The majority of informants** described upstream determinants such as socio-economic
42 and structural factors as the causes of health inequalities but nevertheless focused on
43 describing downstream policies and programmes. This could be due to the fact that the
44 informants work in city governments and even though they are aware of the main
45 causes of health inequalities, their daily routines involve work with downstream policies
46 and programmes. In this regard, some city councils **may have limited** authority over
47 upstream determinants[4,32] or over health when it is under the authority of higher
48 levels of government; such was the case of Paris and Brussels. In this sense,
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 policymakers seemed to refer to what was within their mandate, so even if they
4 understood structural determinants were important in addressing health inequalities,
5 the activities they described were focused within their own jurisdiction. **Downstream,**
6 **interventions targeted at disadvantaged populations such as some of the ones**
7 **described by the interviewees,** which do not aim at reducing inequalities throughout the
8 whole gradient, may end up being diluted into multiple small downstream initiatives and
9 are less effective in reducing health inequalities.[33,34] This also carries the risk of
10 health inequalities becoming the responsibility of each individual, which is already an
11 existing trend,[35] and downplaying the responsibilities and competences of the city
12 government which will constitute a barrier for the local city governments in tackling
13 inequalities. Moreover it has been widely argued that if interventions are not delivered
14 carefully, they are likely to increase inequalities as those who are most in need, might
15 not benefit from the intervention.[36] However, as described elsewhere,[5] the majority
16 of research on health inequalities relates to downstream determinants and focuses on
17 individual lifestyle factors,[37] so little **information** is provided to policymakers on the
18 wider determinants and the underlying causes of the causes of health inequalities.[38]

19
20
21 Furthermore, with the exception of Brussels' and London's interviewees, the concept of
22 the socioeconomic gradient in health was not present among respondents; their
23 understanding of reducing health inequalities connoted reducing the differences
24 between the most deprived groups and the rest of the city's population. Therefore, their
25 discourses did not seem to acknowledge that inequalities affect the entire population
26 and not only the most disadvantaged populations.[39]

27
28
29 Except for Lisbon and the Central-eastern European cities, most of the informants
30 mentioned having access to information on health inequalities through periodical
31 surveys or health reports. Those with access to regular information on health
32 inequalities would be more likely to see the underpinning structural causes and be
33 willing to act upon them. Furthermore, Prague and Cluj-Napoca expressed not being
34 aware of the existence of inequalities in their cities possibly because they were not as
35 familiar with the **concept. There** are relevant studies on health inequalities in the Czech
36 Republic[40,41] and in Romania.[42] Nevertheless, the overarching INEQ-Cities
37 project[29] will provide the cities included in the project with further data on health
38 inequalities at the small area level. Data on health indicators and inequalities is
39 important for various reasons: to understand how causal pathways are established and
40 to design effective policies and interventions.[4,11] While elsewhere it was concluded
41 that researchers do not provide policymakers with befitting and timely information

1
2
3 [15,22,43] constantly requiring more evidence runs the risk of delaying having to face
4 the problem and making decisions.[44] Nevertheless, additional evidence on the social
5 determinants of health, and particularly on effective interventions and policies is
6 important.
7
8
9

10
11 The majority of the informants understood that reducing health inequalities was a
12 priority for their city government. However, only the city governments of Amsterdam,
13 Barcelona, Helsinki, London, Madrid, Rotterdam, Lisbon and Stockholm had health
14 plans, and within these only London has a specific plan for reducing health inequalities,
15 as has also been described elsewhere.[13] Our findings partly reflect the different
16 stages of awareness and action undertaken in the cities as it describes a spectrum of
17 different approaches towards inequalities adopted by countries throughout Europe. We
18 understand that a strong political will is inherent to tackling health inequalities along
19 with supplying policymakers with information on the social determinants and how the
20 gradient operates.[33]
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 Many of the participants described participation between sectors at some level, even
28 though not all cities showed the same involvement. A study carried out also within the
29 INEQ-Cities project analysing policy documents of some of the cities included in this
30 study showed similar results.[13] Another study[23] observed that the structure of
31 political responsibilities in the Canadian context offered important constraints for inter-
32 sectoral collaboration. Encouraging the continuation of collaborative strategies may
33 have a substantial impact on reducing health inequalities, previous research has shown
34 that inter-sectoral collaboration between the health and other sectors is essential to
35 achieving health outcomes in a more effective way than from the health sector
36 alone.[45] Fewer cities described participatory processes and collaborating with social
37 actors. Including other stakeholders in policy-making processes is an important step to
38 city governance and empowerment, both decisive in reducing health inequalities more
39 effectively.[34,46] However, there are many different barriers which policymakers
40 encounter when trying to establish collaborative relationships such as an overall lack of
41 awareness of health inequalities among those who work in the city government,
42 difficulties to coordinate with other authorities, a lack of mandate, and limited
43 resources.[16,8]
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Along with the barriers mentioned above, lack of awareness on health inequalities and
55 bureaucratic restraints were the main barriers to reduce health inequalities as quoted
56 by the interviewees and have been categorised elsewhere as ideological and
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 institutional.[23] Institutional limitations are related to values attitudes and opinions; one
4 possible explanation why this approach has been underlined is that informants seemed
5 to focus mostly on lifestyles and healthy behaviours instead of structural determinants
6 as the causes of health inequalities. Furthermore, the second group of barriers
7 referring to rigid bureaucracy and funding might also be reinforced by the ideological
8 barriers and exacerbated by the social and financial crisis and subsequent austerity
9 measures.

14 **Limitations and strengths**

15
16 It should be also taken into account that in some cases, the politicians interviewed
17 gave political discourses and it was a difficult task to make them follow the topics.
18 Participants were selected through an opportunity sampling, they might not be the most
19 representative informants in their fields; other respondents might have wider
20 knowledge on the subject or they possibly participated due to their willingness,
21 accessibility as well as interest in the area of health inequalities and therefore may be
22 more sensitive to the issue. The interviews were carried out by different interviewers
23 from each city in their native language so that participants could express themselves
24 more freely. The results of politicians and officers have been presented together as we
25 found no differences in their discourses. Nevertheless, the informants included in this
26 study were selected following the pre-established criteria so both elected and non-
27 elected informants were highly positioned in their municipal government's structure and
28 had decision making competences. The data was collected 3-4 years ago so parties
29 governing in the cities may have changed and the elected officials may not be working
30 in decision making positions at the present moment. However, describing these beliefs
31 provides very valuable information on the governance of cities given the key role of
32 policymakers.

33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

As a relevant strength of the study, the interviewees included many examples of their everyday experiences and realities providing rich and detailed information. They expressed their own beliefs and describing them provides very valuable information on the governance of cities given the key role of policymakers. Moreover, carrying out the interview, an activity seldom performed previously, probably drew politicians to review the issue, update their knowledge and learn about the INEQ-Cities project (INEQ-Cities 2012). The findings of the present study to some extent mirrors the findings of the analysis of health policy documents in the same cities, and illustrates the different stages at which cities are concerning work on health inequalities.[13] This exploratory

1
2
3 study, possibly one of the first of its kind in comparing policymaker's knowledge and
4 beliefs across several cities of Europe, will hopefully be a stepping stone for further
5 studies and also has the important advantage of having information from quite a large
6 number of cities.
7
8
9

10 11 **Conclusions and recommendations**

12 The majority of the interviewed policymakers gave an account of interventions focusing
13 on the immediate determinants and aimed at modifying lifestyles and behaviours in the
14 more disadvantaged classes. Some described inter-sectoral action explicitly and for
15 most cities reducing health inequalities was a priority and policymakers had access to
16 periodic information.
17
18
19

20
21 Future collaboration between the research centres from Cluj-Napoca and Prague and
22 their local governments could possibly foster more awareness about health inequalities
23 and their causes and the importance of addressing them. Providing decision makers
24 from the municipal governments with information on policies aimed at addressing
25 upstream determinants alongside health indicators should be encouraged further to
26 promote knowledge on their role in addressing health inequalities.
27
28
29

30
31 More funding should be put towards academic research on effective universal policies,
32 evaluation of their impact and training policymakers and officers on health inequalities
33 in city governments. Further advocacy must be carried out to place health inequalities
34 and their implications in the municipal government's agenda and in city health plans.
35
36
37
38
39

40 41 **Acknowledgements**

42 We would like to thank the informants who participated in the interviews and the
43 interviewers who carried them out and all the partners involved in the INEQ-Cities
44 project. This article has been partially funded by the project: INEQ-Cities,
45 "Socioeconomic inequalities in mortality: evidence and policies of cities of Europe";
46 project funded by the Executive Agency for Health and Consumers-DG Sanco
47 (Commission of the European Union), project n°2008 12 13 and CIBERESP
48 Epidemiología y Salud Pública.
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 56 **Conflicts of interests**

57 The authors declare not to have any conflicts of interest.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Data sharing statement

No additional data are available.

For peer review only

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2013-004454 on 28 May 2014. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on June 13, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l'Enseignement Supérieur (ABES).
Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

References

1. Kilroy A. Intra-urban spatial inequalities: cities as 'urban regions'. World development report. MIT and UNDP. 2009;1-27.
2. UN-HABITAT/WHO. Hidden cities: unmasking and overcoming health inequities in urban settings. 2010; Available at: http://www.hiddencities.org/downloads/WHO_UN-HABITAT_Hidden_Cities_Web.pdf. Accessed 12 of November 2013.
3. Commission on Social Determinants of Health, WHO. Closing the gap in a Generation. Health equity through action on the social determinants of health. Available at: http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2008/WHO_IER_CSDH_08.1_eng.pdf. Accessed 8 of February 2014.
4. World Health Organization (WHO). Centre for Health Development. Our cities, our health, our future. Acting on social determinants for health equity in urban settings. Report to the WHO Commission on Social Determinants of Health from the Knowledge Network on Urban Settings. 2008; Available at: http://www.who.int/social_determinants/resources/knus_final_report_052008.pdf. Accessed 14 of August 2013.
5. Collins PA. Do great local minds think alike? Comparing perceptions of the social determinants of health between non-profit and governmental actors in two Canadian cities. Health Educ Res 2012;27:371-84.
6. Collins PA, Hayes MV. Examining the capacities of municipal governments to reduce health inequities: a survey of municipal actors' perceptions in Metro Vancouver. Can J Public Health 2013;104:304-10.
7. Borrell C, Pons-Vigues M, Morrison J, Diez E. Factors and processes influencing health inequalities in urban areas. J Epidemiol Community Health 2013;67:389-91.
8. Lavis JN.. Ideas, Policy Learning and Policy Change: The determinants-of-Health Synthesis in Canada and the United Kingdom 1998.
9. Lavis JN. Ideas at the margin or marginalized ideas? Nonmedical determinants of health in Canada. Health Aff (Millwood) 2002;21:107-12.
10. Liverpool WHO Collaborating Centre for Policy Research on Social Determinants of Health. How can the health equity impact of universal policies be evaluated? Insights into approaches and next steps. Editors: Milton B, Moonan M, Taylor-Robinson David, Whitehead M Copenhagen, 2011.
11. Borrell C, Bartoll X, García-Altés A, Pasarín M I, Piñeiro M, Villalbí J.R y and the Barcelona Health Report group. A quarter of a century of health reports in Barcelona: A commitment to transparency and a tool for action. Rev Esp Salud Publica;85:449-58.
12. Whitehead M. Diffusion of ideas on social inequalities in health: a European perspective. Milbank Q 1998;76:469-92.
13. Borrell C, Morrison J, Burstrom B, Pons-Vigues M, Hoffmann R, Gandarillas A, et al. Comparison of health policy documents of European cities: are they oriented to reduce inequalities in health? J Public Health Policy 2013;34:100-20.
14. Collins PA, Hayes MV. The role of urban municipal governments in reducing health inequities: A meta-narrative mapping analysis. Int J Equity Health 2010;9:13.

- 1
2
3 15. Lavis JN, Posada FB, Haines A, Osei E. Use of research to inform public policymaking. *Lancet* 2004;364:1615-21.
4
5
6 16. Lavis JN. Research, public policymaking, and knowledge-translation processes: Canadian
7 efforts to build bridges. *J Contin Educ Health Prof* 2006;26:37-45.
8
9 17. Davidson R, Mitchell R, Hunt K. Location, location, location: the role of experience of
10 disadvantage in lay perceptions of area inequalities in health. *Health Place* 2008;2:167-81.
11
12 18. Macintyre S, McKay L, Ellaway A. Lay concepts of the relative importance of different
13 influences on health; are there major socio-demographic variations? *Health Educ Res*
14 2006;21:731-39.
15
16 19. Macintyre S. Evidence in the development of health policy. *Public Health* 2012 3;126:217-
17 19.
18
19 20. Popay J, Bennett S, Thomas C, Williams G, Gatrell A, Bostock L. Beyond 'beer, fags, egg
20 and chips'? Exploring lay understandings of social inequalities in health. *Sociol Health Illn*
21 2003;25:1-23.
22
23 21. Lavis JN, Ross SE, Stoddart GL, Hohenadel JM, McLeod CB, Evans RG. Do Canadian civil
24 servants care about the health of populations? *Am J Public Health* 2003;93:658-63.
25
26 22. Petticrew M, Whitehead M, Macintyre SJ, Graham H, Egan M. Evidence for public health
27 policy on inequalities: 1: The reality according to policymakers. *J Epidemiol Community Health*
28 2004;58:811-16.
29
30 23. Collins PA, Abelson J, Eyles JD. Knowledge into action? understanding ideological barriers
31 to addressing health inequalities at the local level. *Health Policy* 2007;80:158-71.
32
33 24. Sofaer S. Qualitative research methods. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2002;14:329-36.
34
35 25. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research
36 (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality*
37 *in Health Care* 2007;19:349-57.
38
39 26. Shortell SM. The emergence of qualitative methods in health services research. *Health Serv*
40 *Res* 1999;34:1083-90.
41
42 27. Reeves S, Albert M, Kuper A, Hodges BD. Why use theories in qualitative research? *Br Med*
43 *J* 2008;337:49.
44
45 28. Maxwell JA. Qualitative research design. An interactive approach. Qualitative research
46 design. An interactive approach. Second ed. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE; 2005.
47
48 29. INEQ-CITIES Socio-economic inequalities in mortality: evidence and policies in cities of
49 Europe. INEQ-CITIES Atlas. Available at: <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/ineqcities/atlas>. Accessed 10th
50 of October, 2013.
51
52 30. ATLAS.ti. Atlas. ti Qualitative data analysis software. 2010-2011 Scientific Software
53 Development GmbH.
54
55 31. Mays N, Pope C. Qualitative research in health care - Assessing quality in qualitative
56 research. *Br Med J* 2000;320:50-2.
57
58 32. Vlahov D, Freudenberg N, Proietti F, Ompad D, Quinn A, Nandi V, Galea S. Urban as a
59 determinant of health. *J Urban Health* 2007;84:16-26.
60

- 1
2
3 33. Marmot M, Commission Social Determinants Hlt. Achieving health equity: from root causes
4 to fair outcomes. Lancet 2007;370:1153-63.
5
6 34. The Commission to Reduce Social Inequalities in Health in Spain. A proposal of policies and
7 interventions to reduce social inequalities in health in Spain. Commission to Reduce Social
8 Inequalities in Health in Spain. Gac Sanit 2012;26:182-89.
9
10 35. WHO. Review of social determinants and the health divide in the WHO European Region.
11 2013.
12
13 36. Lorenc T, Petticrew M, Welch V, Tugwell P. What types of interventions generate
14 inequalities? Evidence from systematic reviews. J Epidemiol Community Health 2013;67:190-
15 93.
16
17 37. Whitehead M DG. What can be done about inequalities in health? Lancet 1991;338:1059-
18 63.
19
20 38. Rose G. Sick individuals and sick populations. Int J Epidemiol 1985;14:32-38.
21
22 39. Whitehead M DG. Whitehead M, Dahlgren G. Concepts and principles for tackling social
23 inequities in health. Levelling up (part 1). Denmark 2006.
24
25 40. Dzurova D, Spilkova J, Pikhart H. Social inequalities in alcohol consumption in the Czech
26 Republic: a multilevel analysis. Health Place 2010;16:590-97.
27
28 41. Pikhart H, Drbohlav D, Dzurova D. The self-reported health of legal and illegal/irregular
29 immigrants in the Czech Republic. Int J Public Health 2010;55:401-11.
30
31 42. Florescu L, Balanica G, Vremera T, Matei M. Cross-sectional study to evaluate risk factors
32 in infant malnutrition. Rev Med Chir Soc Med Nat Iasi 2011;115:699-704.
33
34 43. Petticrew M, Roberts H. Systematic reviews--do they 'work' in informing decision-making
35 around health inequalities? Health Econ Policy Law 2008;3:197-211.
36
37 44. Whitehead M. Diffusion of Ideas on Social Inequalities in Health: A European Perspective.
38 Milbank Q 1998;76:469-92.
39
40 45. Solar O Irwin A. A conceptual framework for action on the social determinants of health.
41 Discussion paper for the Commission on Social Determinants of Health. 2007.
42
43 46. Bambra C. Going beyond The three worlds of welfare capitalism: regime theory and public
44 health research. J Epidemiol Community Health 2007;61:1098-102.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. City profile indicators¹

City	Year of the indicator	Population aged 0 – 14 %	Population aged 65 and older %	Population aged 16 - 64 in the labour market %	Unemployment %	Immigrant population %
Amsterdam	2001	16.1	11.3	72.0	13.3	48.3
Barcelona	2005	12.3	20.8	57.2	8.7	21.5
Brussels	2001	18.3	15.4	64.9	18.2	26.3
Helsinki	2004	14.5	13.8	78.9	9.1	7.3
Lisbon	2001	14.9	15.4	73.3	7.6	5.7
London	2001	20.2	12.0	67.6	5.2	24.9
Madrid	2005	12.8	18.7	74.1	8.2	14.1
Paris	2007	14.4	14.1	75.5	11.3	20
Prague	2006	12.3	15.6	74.8	3.5	7.6
Rotterdam	2001	17.2	14.3	69	9	45
Stockholm	2005	18	14.1	76	5.3	24.3
Turin	2005	11.4	23.4	67.8	11.4	5.6

1. The information was provided by each city and proceeds from different information sources

Table 2. Description of the 19 informants*

Identification	City (Country)	Status	Profile	Party
1	Amsterdam (Netherlands)	Officer	Health	NA
2	Barcelona (Spain)	Politician	Health	Eco-socialism
3	Barcelona (Spain)	Politician	Non-Health	Eco-socialism
4	Brussels (Belgium)	Officer	Health	NA
5	Cluj-Napoca (Romania)	Officer	Health	NA
6	Helsinki (Finland)	Officer	Health	NA
7	Lisbon (Portugal)	Politician	Non-Health	Social democracy
8*	London (United Kingdom)	Officer	Health	NA
9*	London (United Kingdom)	Officer	Health	NA
10	Madrid (Spain)	Officer	Health	NA
11	Madrid (Spain)	Officer	Health	NA
12	Paris (France)	Officer	Health	NA
13	Prague (Czech Republic)	Officer	Health	NA
14	Prague (Czech Republic)	Officer	Health	NA
15	Rotterdam (Netherlands)	Officer	Non-Health	NA
16	Stockholm (Sweden)	Politician	Health	Christian democratic
17	Stockholm (Sweden)	Politician	Health	Social democracy
18	Turin (Italy)	Politician	Non-Health	Social democracy
19	Turin (Italy)	Politician	Non-Health	Social democracy

^ NA= Not applicable

* Both informants 8 and 9 from London were interviewed together. The information was generated through 18 in-depth interviews

Table 3. Summary of cities' discourses

City	Knowledge on HI ¹ and their causes	Reducing HI as a priority for the city government	Information on health inequalities	Knowledge on policies and programs	Intersectoral collaboration/ participation of social agents	Barriers	Opportunities
Amsterdam	Economic, genetic, environmental, ethnic factors	It is a priority, through changing economic and political factors	Health survey, city memo, collaboration with academics	The city has a Health Plan	There is specific collaboration with other sectors	Funding and the administrative organisation	Health topics are placed in the agenda of organisations
Barcelona	Capitalist economic system, different life expectancy between neighbourhoods structural poverty, traditional and emerging inequalities	HI is a priority but mostly for the health sector and at the local level	Annual city health report and health policy evaluation. Social observatory	Urban regeneration policies. Non-health policies with health outcomes, Health in the neighbourhoods strategy to reduce HI	Not a formal intersectorality, council organisation still compartmentalised. 18 plans with community action, civil society	Financial restraints, factual powers	Proximity to the community and intersectorality
Brussels	Gradient in health, socio-economic position, lack of redistribution mechanisms, segregation, personal traits, access to health care	Reducing HI is an absolute priority	Death certificates, census, national health survey, more data is needed on children	No specific policies aimed at health inequalities	Collaboration is transversal with 3 political structures. Social agents are advisory bodies and also participate in action plans	The liberal course of EU ² . Geographic proximity of actors	Migrant population contribute to healthy lifestyles
Cluj-Napoca	Health inequalities are not an issue	Reducing HI is not a priority, health is a right for all people	The city has the population health statistics	There are preventive measures for the whole population	There is close cooperation with municipalities	Funding and administrative restraints are a barrier	
Helsinki	Sex, education, unemployment, living conditions, social relations, exclusion of young people and ways of life	Strategy of city council 2009-2012. Resources directed at reducing HI	There is some information because it is a strategy of the city	Healthy Helsinki project to reduce HI. Non-smoking and responsible alcohol consumption programmes	There is not enough intersectorality. Steering committees include various social agents. Intersectorality might be slow	Difficulty to obtain funding. Administrative structures	Funding and good cooperation create opportunities
Lisbon	Socioeconomic, demographic, income and age inequalities. Housing conditions	Reducing HI is not explicitly a priority, but it should be. We have the Municipal master plan	There is no information or assessment	Policies and plan targeted at aging	Intersectorality is inherent in tackling health inequalities	Cultural, economic and legislative obstacles	Initiatives with multiple dimensions

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

London	Social determinants in a global context. Lack of evidence base of strategies. Policies directed at most deprived instead of all population	The informants did not answer explicitly that reducing HI was a priority	There is not a must on information. Data is pieced together	Primary care interventions, employment programmes, partnership approach, no knowledge on EU funds	There is intersectoral work with local partnerships not only health services	Little capacity to influence the upstream determinants of inequalities	Promoting local integration and pool resources
Madrid	Socio-economic inequalities, housing, lifestyles, education, income, cultural behaviours. Inequalities at the district level, access to healthcare services	A priority to be dealt with by health care systems	Yes, through research and the annual report	Plan Vallecas to change behaviours. Law for health, programme for the homeless with tuberculosis, for sexual trade workers, for women of Roma ethnicity, children at risk	Plan Vallecas which is multidisciplinary, community and participatory. The aim is to work transversally but it is difficult. Neighbours' associations and participation at the micro level	Relations with other institutions, budget delimitation, lack of awareness of the population, little information on the impact of programmes	To integrate the actions on the groups affected by health inequalities
Paris	Access to health care	Health is not responsibility of the city government or a priority	Epidemiological information and on local health issues for specific municipalities	City policy: measures at the city level, preventive measures, public Health programmes in the neighbourhoods	City health workshops	The consideration of health in the context of urban policy	
Prague	Social status, poverty, chosen lifestyle, voluntarily socially excluded	Health inequalities are not a priority	National plan of social politics but no periodic support	Health 21, strategic plan of Prague	Complex a to work with different sectors, social agents make themselves heard	Legislative and coordination issues, financial barriers	NGO's ³ are very close to the socially excluded
Rotterdam	Socioeconomic differences	Yes, with a broad view on health. Health is a precondition for the life of the city	Health is included in a general biannual survey	Directed at unhealthy behaviour of low SES, air quality and traffic, health plan	Work, participation, education. "Healthy in the city": city health plan. "From complaint to strength", depression and diabetes. Many joint projects but no collaboration with social actors	Long timeframe in cooperating with other networks. Different levels in institutions have trouble communicating	Benefits of cooperation
Stockholm	Structural differences: housing segregation, education level, age group, income, migration criminal acts/safety and living conditions. Health inequalities in Stockholm are very large	Based on health care services. Legislation is there but the educated are the ones who benefit. Accessibility to health care is the highest priority	Public health survey produced every four years, review of health care services, Karolinska Institute Public Health Academy reports	Wide range of choice of health providers, addressed at behavioural and cultural determinants, resources for prevention are too small	Action plan for health, Hard for actors to cooperate voluntary organisations which strengthen the community but nonexistent in participatory process	Lack of competence, knowledge and methods to change behaviours	Resources, Evidenced based health prevention, Engaged people working in health centres

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Turin	Housing conditions, overcrowding, economic and employment crisis, deterioration of social conditions	The city has a direct and privileged approach to dealing with inequality but there are conflicts of interest	No use of effectiveness indicators for evaluation and modification of policies	Policies not addressed at specific groups, traffic calming and public transport development, security, social housing, local welfare strategies	Sentinel events arise interest but there is a conflict of interests in the political administration	Structural policies tend to be slow	Social cooperatives for housing by improving existing assets
-------	--	--	--	---	---	-------------------------------------	--

- 1. HI: Health Inequalities
- 2. EU: European Union
- 3. NGOs Non-Governmental Organisations

For peer review only

Box 1. Interview topic guide

Topics
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Can you explain your point of view on health inequalities in [name of city]?</i>• <i>Which do you consider are the causes of these health inequalities?</i>• <i>Is tackling health inequalities a priority in [name of city] or your local area?</i>• <i>Do you have periodic information on health inequalities and policies designed to reduce them?</i>• <i>Are there policies aimed at reducing health inequalities in [name of city]? Could you name and describe them?</i>• <i>Do these policies cover different areas?</i>• <i>Were these policies designed with the participation of different social agents?</i>• <i>Sometimes some opportunities arise which may enable the implementation of interventions or policies. Please, can you provide any experience or thoughts about this?</i>• <i>Which barriers do you face when reducing health inequalities?</i>• <i>Do you know of policies funded with European structural funds?</i>

BMJ Open

Health inequalities in European cities: Perceptions and beliefs among local policymakers

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2013-004454.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	15-Apr-2014
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Morrison, Joana; University College London, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health; CIBERESP, Pons-Vigués, Mariona; Institut Universitari d'Investigació en Atenció Primària Jordi Gol (IDIAP Jordi Gol), ; Universitat de Girona, Becares, Laia; University of Manchester, Burström, Bo; Karolinska Institutet, Department of Public Health Sciences, Division of Social Medicine Gandarillas, Ana; Subdirección General de Promoción de la Salud y Prevención. Consejería de Sanidad. Comunidad de Madrid (Subdirectorato-General for Health Promotion and Prevention. Madrid Regional Health Authority), Domínguez-Berjón, Felicitas; Subdirección General de Promoción de la Salud y Prevención. Consejería de Sanidad. Comunidad de Madrid (Subdirectorato-General for Health Promotion and Prevention. Madrid Regional Health Authority), Díez, Elia; Agència de Salut Pública de Barcelona, ; Agència de Salut Pública de Barcelona Costa, Giuseppe; University of Turin, Department of Clinical and Biological Science Ruíz, Milagros; University College London, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health Pikhart, Hynek; University College London, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health Marinacci, Chiara; Epidemiology Department, Local Health Unit TO3, ; Ministry of Health, Italy, Hoffmann, Rasmus; Erasmus Medical Centre, Santana, Paula; Centro de Estudos de Geógrafa e Ordenamento do Território (CEGOT), Departamento de Geografia, Universidade de Coimbra, Borrell, Carme; Agència de Salut Pública de Barcelona; CIBERESP,</p>
Primary Subject Heading:	Health policy
Secondary Subject Heading:	Qualitative research, Public health, Epidemiology
Keywords:	Health inequalities, Public policies, Municipal government, Policymaker, Knowledge, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Health inequalities in European cities: Perceptions and beliefs among local policymakers

Authors:

Joana Morrison, Mariona Pons-Vigués, Laia Bécares, Bo Bürstrom, Ana Gandarillas, Felicitas Domínguez-Berjón, Èlia Diez, Giuseppe Costa, Milagros Ruiz, Hynek Pikhart, Chiara Marinacci, Rasmus Hoffmann, Paula Santana, Carme Borrell, and partners from the INEQ-CITIES Project

Affiliations

- University College London, London, UK
- Agència de Salut Pública de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain
- CIBER de Epidemiología y Salud Pública (CIBERESP), Spain
- Institut Universitari d'Investigació en Atenció Primària Jordi Gol (IDIAP Jordi Gol), Barcelona, Spain
- Universitat de Girona, Girona, Spain
- University of Manchester, Manchester, UK
- Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden
- Subdirección General de Promoción de la Salud y Prevención. Consejería de Sanidad. Comunidad de Madrid (Subdirectorate-General for Health Promotion and Prevention. Madrid Regional Health Authority), Spain.
- Erasmus Medical Centre,
- Institut d'Investigació Biomèdica de Sant Pau (IIB Sant Pau), Barcelona, Spain
- Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain
- Centro de Estudos de Geógrafa e Ordenamento do Território (CEGOT), Departamento de Geografia, Universidade de Coimbra, Coimbra

Corresponding author

Joana Morrison

University College London

Dept. of Epidemiology and Public Health

1-19 Torrington Place, London WC1E 6BT

T: +44 (0)20 7679 1711

j.morrison@ucl.ac.uk

Keywords Health inequalities, public policies, municipal government, policymaker, knowledge, qualitative research, urban health

Word count: 4238

Abstract

Objective To describe the knowledge and beliefs of public policymakers on social inequalities in health and policies to reduce them in cities from different parts of Europe during 2010 and 2011.

Design Phenomenological qualitative study.

Setting Thirteen European cities.

Participants Nineteen elected politicians and officers with a directive status from thirteen European cities.

Main outcome Policymaker's knowledge and beliefs.

Results Three emerging discourses were identified among the interviewees, depending on the city of the interviewee. Health inequalities were perceived by most policy makers as differences in life expectancy between population with economic, social and geographical differences. Reducing health inequalities was a priority for the majority of cities which use surveys as sources of information to analyse these. Bureaucracy, funding and population beliefs were the main barriers.

Conclusions The majority of the interviewed policymakers gave an account of interventions focusing on the immediate determinants and aimed at modifying lifestyles and behaviours in the more disadvantaged classes. More funding should be put towards academic research on effective universal policies, evaluation of their impact and training policymakers and officers on health inequalities in city governments.

Limitations

- Respondents possibly participated due to their willingness, accessibility as well as interest in the area of health inequalities and therefore may be more sensitive to the issue.
- The data was collected 3-4 years ago so parties governing in the cities may have changed.
- In some cities, either officers or politicians were interviewed; it might have been more desirable to have one of each for every city.
- As the interviewees were selected by INEQ-Cities partners from each city, these were chosen by opportunity sampling.

Strengths

- The interviewees included many examples of their everyday experiences and realities providing rich and detailed information.
- Carrying out the interview, an activity seldom performed previously among policymakers, possibly drew them to review the issue, update their knowledge and learn about the INEQ-Cities project and its results on health inequalities in their cities.
- Since this is an exploratory study, possibly one of the first of its kind in comparing policymaker's knowledge and beliefs across several cities of Europe, it will hopefully be a stepping stone for further qualitative research on the topic.
- This study has the important advantage of having collected information from quite a large number of cities throughout Europe.

Introduction

Health inequalities in urban environments are complex[1,2] affect the entire population throughout the health gradient[3] and require a multi-sectoral approach to address multiple social and economic determinants.[4] To that effect, although city governments' competences and authorities vary, they are endowed with jurisdiction to develop strategic plans and policies, provide services and deliver interventions which may address health inequalities.[5-7]

Within governments, policymakers are responsible for decision and policy-making in the form of laws, guidelines, and regulations[8] and their knowledge, beliefs and perceptions are relevant in the implementation of these. It is important to know whether the concept of the social determinants of health inequalities is imbedded in their discourse[9,10] in addition to the information on health issues provided to them as reports or surveys. These topics, explored in this study, may determine the course of the policy-making process.[11,12] Furthermore, their perceptions regarding the responsibilities and priorities of city governments and the city government's strategic plans possibly influence the policies in place.[13,14] These issues along with how policymakers make use of their knowledge will influence decision making and affect how health inequalities are addressed by city governments.[8,15,16]

The majority of studies exploring the knowledge and beliefs of health inequalities have explored lay perceptions[17-20] and the few studies describing expert beliefs focused on researchers and policymakers working in regional and national governments.[9,21,22] To our knowledge, there are only a small number of studies focusing on policymakers in the city government[5,6,14,23] and this is among the first qualitative studies to compare the perceptions of policymakers in different European cities. The use of rigorous qualitative research methods has been on the rise in health services and health policy research[24] to explore the experiences of participants and the meanings they attribute to them, to contribute new knowledge and to provide new perspectives.[25] It is consistent with developments in the social and policy sciences at large and has been described to reflect the need for more in-depth understanding of naturalistic settings the importance of understanding context and the complexity of implementing social change.[26] Selecting policymakers from different European cities provided a description of the different socio-political realities and contexts according to the participant's daily experiences to provider a richer and wider view on reducing health inequalities at the municipal level throughout the continent. Notwithstanding their

1
2
3 diversity, the participant cities share important commonalities as European
4 democracies and urban settings, allowing to explore the study object from a new view.
5 Previous studies[13] in the project have analysed written policy documents in these
6 cities. The objective of this study is to further increase the understanding of how
7 policies are realised, through the perception and beliefs of public policy makers in
8 thirteen European cities during 2010 and 2011.
9
10
11
12
13

14 **Methods**

15 **Methodological development**

16 We carried out a descriptive and exploratory qualitative research study from a
17 phenomenological perspective[27] as it sought to capture policymakers' unique
18 accounts of reality in order to capture a breadth of discourses on health
19 inequalities[28]. Data was collected from thirteen cities (Amsterdam, Barcelona,
20 Brussels, Cluj-Napoca, Helsinki, Lisbon, London, Madrid, Paris, Prague, Rotterdam,
21 Stockholm and Turin; see Table 1 for information on the cities' profiles) from eleven
22 different European countries participating in the project; Socio-economic inequalities in
23 mortality: evidence and policies in cities of Europe 2009-2012 (INEQ-Cities)[29] during
24 the years 2010 and 2011.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Participants and sampling technique**

34 The study population consisted of nineteen public policymakers, selected through
35 opportunity sampling[28], see Table 2, working in the aforementioned cities'
36 governments during the research period. A sample of elected politicians which included
37 councillors and or aldermen and high ranked, non-elected, officers was selected.
38 Policymakers were chosen from the health sector as well as other non-health sectors
39 to provide a wider range of discourses. Interviews were performed by INEQ-Cities'
40 partners, who interviewed a maximum of two participants, in their respective cities.
41 Furthermore, subjects were chosen only if they held a decision making position.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Data collection and generation techniques**

50 Seventeen semi-structured individual interviews and one semi-structured interview
51 where two informants participated were carried out from November 2010 to June 2011
52 using an open-ended question topic guide (Box 1). The interviews provided information
53 on the participant's knowledge and beliefs of health inequalities and policies to address
54 these, as well as the role of the municipal government. The interview topic guide was
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 developed following the requirements listed in INEQ-cities' description of work and was
4 further discussed with other project partners. Three pilot interviews were performed in
5 Barcelona to test the topic guides and final versions of the guide were distributed to the
6 project partners in the abovementioned cities who then conducted the interviews. The
7 sessions were carried out in each city's native language and lasted between 45
8 minutes and an hour, where clarification of the topics was needed, some interviewers
9 made city-specific questions. The interviewers belonged to partner groups from the
10 INEQ-Cities project. A data collection manual designed by the authors of this study was
11 sent to each partner and interviewer, providing guidelines on how to perform the
12 interview to ensure that these were carried out in a standardised way. To our
13 knowledge the only participant who did not wish to participate was from the city of
14 Kosice and was therefore not included in the study. Interviews were translated to
15 English by each partner and several sent the transcripts and summaries to the
16 informants for approval. The summaries and the transcripts were sent to the authors
17 carrying out the analysis in English.

28 **Processing and analysis of information**

29 All transcripts and summaries were analysed centrally on the basis of a thematic
30 interpretive content analysis[27] by 2 researchers (JM and MP). Interviews were read
31 numerous times until researchers reached pre-analytical intuitions on each of the
32 interviewee's discourses and texts were then coded using predefined and emergent
33 categories. The text was divided following these categories before performing an
34 analysis of the written content and finally the content was articulated into results. Two
35 research members carried out the analysis process independently with the support of
36 Atlas.Ti software,[30] and compared the main findings with the original data. The
37 working manuscript was sent to informants through each project partner for
38 approval.[31]

46 **Ethical considerations**

47 Informed consent was obtained through verbal means and the information was
48 anonymised and confidential. No participants received a salary or reward as
49 participation was completely voluntary and the study received formal ethical approval
50 by a research ethics committee (Hospital del Mar de Barcelona Research Ethics
51 Committee).

57 **Results**

1
2
3 Three emerging discourses were identified among the interviewees, as follows,
4 depending on the city of the interviewee: London's informants focused on structural
5 determinants as the main causes of health inequalities and described universal policies
6 aimed at these, Prague and Cluj-Napoca's interviewees were not as familiar with the
7 concept of the social health inequalities. Informants from other cities had a mixed
8 approach, although they referred to the wider determinants as the causes of health
9 inequalities, they also suggested downstream interventions to address these. It was not
10 possible, however, to distinguish differences in discourses between officers and
11 politicians or health and non-health informants. Table 3 shows a summary of the
12 responses giving by each city's participants. Presented below, the results have been
13 arranged in six sections following the major topics explored in the interviews. The
14 informant's identification (ID) can be seen in Table 2.

21 **Knowledge on health inequalities and their causes**

22
23
24 Two broad discourses were found within the informant's perceptions and knowledge of
25 health inequalities. The first discourse corresponds to the majority of informants who
26 were aware of such inequalities and described them as differences in health. These
27 were expressed, for example, as differences in life expectancy.

28
29
30
31 ***We have large differences in health: people live five years longer in areas such as***
32 ***Kungsholmen (inner city area of Stockholm municipality) compared to areas such as***
33 ***Järva fältet***" Stockholm health politician, ID 16

34
35
36 They also explained that health inequalities existed among the population according to
37 their levels of education or income, gender, age and the neighbourhood in which they
38 lived.

39
40
41 ***"There are factors which relate to education, employment or unemployment, living***
42 ***conditions, income, social relations and ways of life. Also the social exclusion of young***
43 ***people generates inequalities in health.***" Helsinki health officer, ID 6.

44
45
46
47 In addition, the interviewee from Lisbon pointed out that inequalities were increasing as
48 did the informant from Brussels who understood them as a gradient.

49
50
51 The second discourse corresponded to informants from Cluj-Napoca and Prague did
52 not have a clear concept on social health inequalities, as described in the quote below.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

“In this city we cannot talk about this concept. It is estimated that there are no legal criteria to make any differences between individuals in terms of access and use of medical care.” Cluj-Napoca health officer, ID 5.

Concerning the causes of inequalities, the majority of the interviewees, identified a strong relationship between economic position, educational level and health. Furthermore, low income was perceived as the main cause of unhealthy lifestyle behaviours and reduced access to health care which lead to health inequalities. Other social determinants were also highlighted, such as gender, age group, type of household and residential segregation. The current economic crisis and reduced public expenditure were considered to exacerbate the problem and reduce the capacity of action of the local system.

In contrast, interviewees from Prague and Cluj-Napoca considered that health inequalities were chiefly a result of individual responsibility.

Reducing health inequalities as a priority for the city government

Most interviewees reported that reducing health inequalities was an objective of the city government included in either strategic plans or in specific laws. However interviewees from Prague and Cluj-Napoca did not consider it to be a priority of their municipal governments, whereas Lisbon informant's considered it was not a priority even though they thought it should be.

“Tackling inequalities in health should be a priority in the Lisbon Metropolitan Area and is not, directly, a hotly debated topic.” Lisbon non-health politician, ID 7

The interviewees of Paris and Brussels explained that their city governments did not have jurisdiction over health matters as these are the responsibility of the regional authorities.

“In France, health is not a responsibility of the cities, although historically it was the cities that were in charge of sanitary aspects.” Paris health officer, ID 12.

That's not easy to answer, as not all the areas are governed on the level of the communities or on the city level.” Belgium, health officer, ID 4.

Information on health inequalities

1
2
3 To monitor health inequalities, the majority of the informants mentioned relying on
4 health surveys which were published periodically in their cities and mortality statistics
5 from their statistics authority.
6
7

8
9 ***“To track differences in health, a health survey is conducted every four years.”***
10 Amsterdam health officer, ID 1.
11

12
13 London’s interviewees described the need to integrate the different sources of
14 information into one to make access to information easier. Informants from Lisbon and
15 Prague declared not having information or assessment of health inequalities.
16 Furthermore, the interviewee from Cluj-Napoca explained that periodic data of health
17 inequalities was not available as this concept was not applicable.
18
19
20
21

22 23 **Knowledge on policies and programs implemented**

24
25 When asked about their knowledge of policies that address health inequalities,
26 policymakers described actions aimed at deprived populations and at modifying
27 attitudes and unhealthy behaviours, such as smoking and poor diets. They emphasised
28 the importance of preventive measures and health promotion and education. Policies to
29 improve access to health care services were also quoted as an important means to
30 reduce health inequalities by most interviewees. However, the informants from London
31 highlighted the need to address health inequalities throughout the general population
32 rather than focusing on the most deprived sectors and developing long-term policies
33 aimed at the social determinants, not only proximal factors, such as physical activity
34 and fruit intake. Moreover, the informant from Turin highlighted local interventions
35 aimed at addressing unemployment and the interviewee from Madrid described
36 tackling health inequalities at the local level.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 ***“We have to work on the processes...I’m talking from the micro level, which is where I***
46 ***have more experience, but I think that’s where the solution lies, in the micro level.”***
47 Madrid health politician, ID 10.
48
49

50
51 The informants from Prague, however, did not mention any policies implemented by
52 their city government and referred to national health plans as a reference for health-
53 related issues.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Inter-sectoral collaboration and participation of social agents in policymaking

Interviewees from Madrid, London, Rotterdam and Lisbon referred to strategic plans which fostered inter-sectoral collaboration between different administrations, citizens' and non-profit associations and established local partnerships. Barcelona and Turin, in turn, described inter-sectoral collaboration established only between two sectors, for example between health and welfare or health and education. While Lisbon cited examples of housing policies for groups at risk of exclusion, some informants suggested that inter-sectoral collaboration slowed down the policymaking process and perceived that having different sectors collaborate proved to be difficult.

“Yes. Action on inequalities in health is synonymous with disciplinary cross-cutting. In this sense, this theme is incorporated in several areas such as education, social service, environmental and cultural policies, among others, addressed in the municipal master plan.” Lisbon, non-health politician, ID 7.

With respect to community organisations participating in the policymaking process, the majority of the informants thought their city governments collaborated with these, however informants from Rotterdam, Turin and Stockholm considered it was very limited.

“The social networks exist but they need public support. There is no doubt that there should be more shared responsibility among private sector and public services or welfare systems.” Turin non-health politician, ID 18.

Barriers and opportunities encountered

One of the principal barriers described was the lack of awareness on changing unhealthy lifestyles among the population. Informants from Stockholm and Lisbon considered the obstacles addressing health inequalities to be essentially related to imbedded cultural beliefs which made adopting healthier lifestyles difficult. Bureaucratic restraints and resistance from other levels of the administration along with miscommunication with the private sector as well as budget restrictions were described as important barriers by the majority of interviewees. London's interviewee explained

1
2
3 that implementing financial policies from within a city government was complicated in
4 the context of globalisation.
5
6

7 ***“We come across them all the time and a very important one is the financial issue. Every***
8 ***year we have less money and the crisis only makes it worse.”*** *Barcelona health politician,*
9 *ID 2.*
10

11
12 Informants also referred to opportunities which enabled policy implementation. For
13 example, the interviewees from Barcelona and Rotterdam made reference to working
14 at the community level or with different sectors which led to learning opportunities.
15 Community groups were seen as especially important in liaising with hard to reach
16 groups. The interviewee from Brussels suggested that the migrant population promoted
17 healthy lifestyle behaviours, as some of their customs had healthy components.
18
19

20
21 ***“There are definitely opportunities. Other services have problems as well and see the***
22 ***benefits of cooperation with groups who work with migrant population.”*** *Brussels health*
23 *officer ID 4.*
24
25

26 27 28 29 30 **Discussion**

31 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to explore policymakers'
32 perceptions on health inequalities and policies to reduce these throughout various
33 European cities from diverse geographical areas and with different socio-economic and
34 political contexts. Three discourses were identified depending on the city of the
35 interviewee: 1) London's approach focused on upstream determinants and policies; 2)
36 Cluj-Napoca and Prague's where informants were less acquainted with social health
37 inequalities and 3) the rest of the cities' informants who perceived health inequalities as
38 differences in life expectancy among the population defined by their economic, social
39 and geographical background. Regarding the causes of health inequalities, these were
40 seen as being caused by low-income levels, unhealthy lifestyle behaviours and barriers
41 in accessing health care. Most of the informants agreed that reducing these inequalities
42 was a priority of their local governments and referred to periodic surveys as information
43 sources to monitor them. Nearly all policies and interventions were targeted at
44 modifying health behaviours and some relied upon inter-sectoral collaboration.
45 Furthermore, bureaucracy, funding and the population's attitudes and beliefs towards
46 healthy lifestyles were considered important barriers.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The majority of informants described upstream determinants such as socio-economic
4 and structural factors as the causes of health inequalities but nevertheless focused on
5 describing downstream policies and programmes. This could be due to the fact that the
6 informants work in city governments and even though they are aware of the main
7 causes of health inequalities, their daily routines involve work with downstream policies
8 and programmes. In this regard, some city councils may have limited authority over
9 upstream determinants[4,32] or over health when it is under the authority of higher
10 levels of government; such was the case of Paris and Brussels. In this sense,
11 policymakers seemed to refer to what was within their mandate, so even if they
12 understood structural determinants were important in addressing health inequalities,
13 the activities they described were focused within their own jurisdiction. Downstream,
14 interventions targeted at disadvantaged populations such as some of the ones
15 described by the interviewees, which do not aim at reducing inequalities throughout the
16 whole gradient, may end up being diluted into multiple small downstream initiatives and
17 are less effective in reducing health inequalities.[33,34] This also carries the risk of
18 health inequalities becoming the responsibility of each individual, which is already an
19 existing trend,[35] and downplaying the responsibilities and competences of the city
20 government which will constitute a barrier for the local city governments in tackling
21 inequalities. Moreover it has been widely argued that if interventions are not delivered
22 carefully, they are likely to increase inequalities as those who are most in need, might
23 not benefit from the intervention.[36] However, as described elsewhere,[5] the majority
24 of research on health inequalities relates to downstream determinants and focuses on
25 individual lifestyle factors,[37] so little information is provided to policymakers on the
26 wider determinants and the underlying causes of the causes of health inequalities.[38]

27
28
29 Furthermore, with the exception of Brussels' and London's interviewees, the concept of
30 the socioeconomic gradient in health was not present among respondents; their
31 understanding of reducing health inequalities connoted reducing the differences
32 between the most deprived groups and the rest of the city's population. Therefore, their
33 discourses did not seem to acknowledge that inequalities affect the entire population
34 and not only the most disadvantaged populations.[39]

35
36
37 Except for Lisbon and the Central-eastern European cities, most of the informants
38 mentioned having access to information on health inequalities through periodical
39 surveys or health reports. Those with access to regular information on health
40 inequalities would be more likely to see the underpinning structural causes and be
41 willing to act upon them. Furthermore, Prague and Cluj-Napoca expressed not being
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 aware of the existence of inequalities in their cities possibly because they were not as
4 familiar with the concept. There are relevant studies on health inequalities in the Czech
5 Republic[40,41] and in Romania.[42] Nevertheless, the overarching INEQ-Cities
6 project[29] will provide the cities included in the project with further data on health
7 inequalities at the small area level. Data on health indicators and inequalities is
8 important for various reasons: to understand how causal pathways are established and
9 to design effective policies and interventions.[4,11] While elsewhere it was concluded
10 that researchers do not provide policymakers with befitting and timely information
11 [15,22,43] constantly requiring more evidence runs the risk of delaying having to face
12 the problem and making decisions.[44] Nevertheless, additional evidence on the social
13 determinants of health, and particularly on effective interventions and policies is
14 important.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 The majority of the informants understood that reducing health inequalities was a
24 priority for their city government. However, only the city governments of Amsterdam,
25 Barcelona, Helsinki, London, Madrid, Rotterdam, Lisbon and Stockholm had health
26 plans, and within these only London has a specific plan for reducing health inequalities,
27 as has also been described elsewhere.[13] Our findings partly reflect the different
28 stages of awareness and action undertaken in the cities as it describes a spectrum of
29 different approaches towards inequalities adopted by countries throughout Europe. We
30 understand that a strong political will is inherent to tackling health inequalities along
31 with supplying policymakers with information on the social determinants and how the
32 gradient operates.[33]

33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Many of the participants described participation between sectors at some level, even though not all cities showed the same involvement. A study carried out also within the INEQ-Cities project analysing policy documents of some of the cities included in this study showed similar results.[13] Another study[23] observed that the structure of political responsibilities in the Canadian context offered important constraints for inter-sectoral collaboration. Encouraging the continuation of collaborative strategies may have a substantial impact on reducing health inequalities, previous research has shown that inter-sectoral collaboration between the health and other sectors is essential to achieving health outcomes in a more effective way than from the health sector alone.[45] Fewer cities described participatory processes and collaborating with social actors. Including other stakeholders in policy-making processes is an important step to city governance and empowerment, both decisive in reducing health inequalities more effectively.[34,46] However, there are many different barriers which policymakers

1
2
3 encounter when trying to establish collaborative relationships such as an overall lack of
4 awareness of health inequalities among those who work in the city government,
5 difficulties to coordinate with other authorities, a lack of mandate, and limited
6 resources.[16,8]
7
8

9
10 Along with the barriers mentioned above, lack of awareness on health inequalities and
11 bureaucratic restraints were the main barriers to reduce health inequalities as quoted
12 by the interviewees and have been categorised elsewhere as ideological and
13 institutional.[23] Institutional limitations are related to values attitudes and opinions; one
14 possible explanation why this approach has been underlined is that informants seemed
15 to focus mostly on lifestyles and healthy behaviours instead of structural determinants
16 as the causes of health inequalities. Furthermore, the second group of barriers
17 referring to rigid bureaucracy and funding might also be reinforced by the ideological
18 barriers and exacerbated by the social and financial crisis and subsequent austerity
19 measures.
20
21
22
23
24

25 26 27 **Limitations and strengths**

28 It should be also taken into account that in some cases, the politicians interviewed
29 gave political discourses and it was a difficult task to make them follow the topics.
30 Participants were selected through an opportunity sampling, they might not be the most
31 representative informants in their fields; other respondents might have wider
32 knowledge on the subject or they possibly participated due to their willingness,
33 accessibility as well as interest in the area of health inequalities and therefore may be
34 more sensitive to the issue. The interviews were carried out by different interviewers
35 from each city in their native language so that participants could express themselves
36 more freely. The results of politicians and officers have been presented together as we
37 found no differences in their discourses. Nevertheless, the informants included in this
38 study were selected following the pre-established criteria so both elected and non-
39 elected informants were highly positioned in their municipal government's structure and
40 had decision making competences. The data was collected 3-4 years ago so parties
41 governing in the cities may have changed and the elected officials may not be working
42 in decision making positions at the present moment. However, describing these beliefs
43 provides very valuable information on the governance of cities given the key role of
44 policymakers.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55
56 As a relevant strength of the study, the interviewees included many examples of their
57 everyday experiences and realities providing rich and detailed information. They
58
59
60

1
2
3 expressed their own beliefs and describing them provides very valuable information on
4 the governance of cities given the key role of policymakers. Moreover, carrying out the
5 interview, an activity seldom performed previously, probably drew politicians to review
6 the issue, update their knowledge and learn about the INEQ-Cities project (INEQ-Cities
7 2012). The findings of the present study to some extent mirrors the findings of the
8 analysis of health policy documents in the same cities, and illustrates the different
9 stages at which cities are concerning work on health inequalities.[13] This exploratory
10 study, possibly one of the first of its kind in comparing policymaker's knowledge and
11 beliefs across several cities of Europe, will hopefully be a stepping stone for further
12 studies and also has the important advantage of having information from quite a large
13 number of cities.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **Conclusions and recommendations**

22 The majority of the interviewed policymakers gave an account of interventions focusing
23 on the immediate determinants and aimed at modifying lifestyles and behaviours in the
24 more disadvantaged classes. Some described inter-sectoral action explicitly and for
25 most cities reducing health inequalities was a priority and policymakers had access to
26 periodic information.
27
28
29
30
31

32 Future collaboration between the research centres from Cluj-Napoca and Prague and
33 their local governments could possibly foster more awareness about health inequalities
34 and their causes and the importance of addressing them. Providing decision makers
35 from the municipal governments with information on policies aimed at addressing
36 upstream determinants alongside health indicators should be encouraged further to
37 promote knowledge on their role in addressing health inequalities.
38
39
40
41
42

43 More funding should be put towards academic research on effective universal policies,
44 evaluation of their impact and training policymakers and officers on health inequalities
45 in city governments. Further advocacy must be carried out to place health inequalities
46 and their implications in the municipal government's agenda and in city health plans.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the informants who participated in the interviews and the interviewers who carried them out and all the partners involved in the INEQ-Cities project. This article has been partially funded by the project: INEQ-Cities, "Socioeconomic inequalities in mortality: evidence and policies of cities of Europe"; project funded by the Executive Agency for Health and Consumers-DG Sanco (Commission of the European Union), project n°2008 12 13 and CIBERESP Epidemiología y Salud Pública.

Contributorship Statement

All authors made substantial contributions to conception and design of the study and interviews. They carried out the interviews in their own cities and translated these and provided a summary or transcription. Once the data was analysed by the coordinating centre, the authors interpreted the results and provided critical feedback as well as sending the results to informants and providing the coordinating centre with comments or suggestions made by them. Authors also participated in drafting the article and reviewed it critically several times, making substantial comments and suggestions regarding form, analysis and concepts. Authors also reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript and provided their approval for publication.

Conflicts of interests

The authors declare not to have any conflicts of interest.

Data sharing statement

No additional data are available.

References

1. Kilroy A. Intra-urban spatial inequalities: cities as 'urban regions'. World development report. MIT and UNDP. 2009;1-27.
2. UN-HABITAT/WHO. Hidden cities: unmasking and overcoming health inequities in urban settings. 2010; Available at: http://www.hiddencities.org/downloads/WHO_UN-HABITAT_Hidden_Cities_Web.pdf. Accessed 12 of November 2013.
3. Commission on Social Determinants of Health, WHO. Closing the gap in a Generation. Health equity through action on the social determinants of health. Available at: http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2008/WHO_IER_CSDH_08.1_eng.pdf. Accessed 8 of February 2014.
4. World Health Organization (WHO). Centre for Health Development. Our cities, our health, our future. Acting on social determinants for health equity in urban settings. Report to the WHO Commission on Social Determinants of Health from the Knowledge Network on Urban Settings. 2008; Available at: http://www.who.int/social_determinants/resources/knus_final_report_052008.pdf. Accessed 14 of August 2013.
5. Collins PA. Do great local minds think alike? Comparing perceptions of the social determinants of health between non-profit and governmental actors in two Canadian cities. Health Educ Res 2012;27:371-84.
6. Collins PA, Hayes MV. Examining the capacities of municipal governments to reduce health inequities: a survey of municipal actors' perceptions in Metro Vancouver. Can J Public Health 2013;104:304-10.
7. Borrell C, Pons-Vigues M, Morrison J, et al. Factors and processes influencing health inequalities in urban areas. J Epidemiol Community Health 2013;67:389-91.
8. Lavis JN.. Ideas, Policy Learning and Policy Change: The determinants-of-Health Synthesis in Canada and the United Kingdom 1998.
9. Lavis JN. Ideas at the margin or marginalized ideas? Nonmedical determinants of health in Canada. Health Aff (Millwood) 2002;21:107-12.
10. Liverpool WHO Collaborating Centre for Policy Research on Social Determinants of Health. How can the health equity impact of universal policies be evaluated? Insights into approaches and next steps. Editors: Milton B, Moonan M, Taylor-Robinson David, Whitehead M Copenhagen, 2011.
11. Borrell C, Bartoll X, García-Altés A, et al. R y and the Barcelona Health Report group. A quarter of a century of health reports in Barcelona: A commitment to transparency and a tool for action. Rev Esp Salud Publica;85:449-58.
12. Whitehead M. Diffusion of ideas on social inequalities in health: a European perspective. Milbank Q 1998;76:469-92.
13. Borrell C, Morrison J, Burstrom B, et al. Comparison of health policy documents of European cities: are they oriented to reduce inequalities in health? J Public Health Policy 2013;34:100-20.
14. Collins PA, Hayes MV. The role of urban municipal governments in reducing health inequities: A meta-narrative mapping analysis. Int J Equity Health 2010;9:13.

15. Lavis JN, Posada FB, Haines A, et al. Use of research to inform public policymaking. *Lancet* 2004;364:1615-21.
16. Lavis JN. Research, public policymaking, and knowledge-translation processes: Canadian efforts to build bridges. *J Contin Educ Health Prof* 2006;26:37-45.
17. Davidson R, Mitchell R, Hunt K. Location, location, location: the role of experience of disadvantage in lay perceptions of area inequalities in health. *Health Place* 2008;2:167-81.
18. Macintyre S, McKay L, Ellaway A. Lay concepts of the relative importance of different influences on health; are there major socio-demographic variations? *Health Educ Res* 2006;21:731-39.
19. Macintyre S. Evidence in the development of health policy. *Public Health* 2012 3;126:217-19.
20. Popay J, Bennett S, Thomas C, et al. Beyond 'beer, fags, egg and chips'? Exploring lay understandings of social inequalities in health. *Sociol Health Illn* 2003;25:1-23.
21. Lavis JN, Ross SE, Stoddart GL, Hohenadel JM, McLeod CB, Evans RG. Do Canadian civil servants care about the health of populations? *Am J Public Health* 2003;93:658-63.
22. Petticrew M, Whitehead M, Macintyre SJ, et al. Evidence for public health policy on inequalities: 1: The reality according to policymakers. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2004;58:811-16.
23. Collins PA, Abelson J, Eyles JD. Knowledge into action? understanding ideological barriers to addressing health inequalities at the local level. *Health Policy* 2007;80:158-71.
24. Sofaer S. Qualitative research methods. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2002;14:329-36.
25. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care* 2007;19:349-57.
26. Shortell SM. The emergence of qualitative methods in health services research. *Health Serv Res* 1999;34:1083-90.
27. Reeves S, Albert M, Kuper A, et al Why use theories in qualitative research? *Br Med J* 2008;337:49.
28. Maxwell JA. Qualitative research design. An interactive approach. Qualitative research design. An interactive approach. Second ed. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE; 2005.
29. INEQ-CITIES Socio-economic inequalities in mortality: evidence and policies in cities of Europe. INEQ-CITIES Atlas. Available at: <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/ineqcities/atlas>. Accessed 10th of October, 2013.
30. ATLAS.ti. Atlas. ti Qualitative data analysis software. 2010-2011 Scientific Software Development GmbH.
31. Mays N, Pope C. Qualitative research in health care - Assessing quality in qualitative research. *Br Med J* 2000;320:50-2.
32. Vlahov D, Freudenberg N, Proietti F, et al. Urban as a determinant of health. *J Urban Health* 2007;84:16-26.

- 1
2
3 33. Marmot M, Commission Social Determinants Hlt. Achieving health equity: from root causes
4 to fair outcomes. *Lancet* 2007;370:1153-63.
5
6 34. The Commission to Reduce Social Inequalities in Health in Spain. A proposal of policies and
7 interventions to reduce social inequalities in health in Spain. *Commission to Reduce Social*
8 *Inequalities in Health in Spain*. *Gac Sanit* 2012;26:182-89.
9
10 35. WHO. Review of social determinants and the health divide in the WHO European Region.
11 2013.
12
13 36. Lorenc T, Petticrew M, Welch V, et al. What types of interventions generate inequalities?
14 Evidence from systematic reviews. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2013;67:190-93.
15
16 37. Whitehead M DG. What can be done about inequalities in health? *Lancet* 1991;338:1059-
17 63.
18
19 38. Rose G. Sick individuals and sick populations. *Int J Epidemiol* 1985;14:32-38.
20
21 39. Whitehead M DG. Whitehead M, Dahlgren G. Concepts and principles for tackling social
22 inequities in health. *Levelling up (part 1)*. Denmark 2006.
23
24 40. Dzurova D, Spilkova J, Pikhart H. Social inequalities in alcohol consumption in the Czech
25 Republic: a multilevel analysis. *Health Place* 2010;16:590-97.
26
27 41. Pikhart H, Drbohlav D, Dzurova D. The self-reported health of legal and illegal/irregular
28 immigrants in the Czech Republic. *Int J Public Health* 2010;55:401-11.
29
30 42. Florescu L, Balanica G, Vremera T, et al. Cross-sectional study to evaluate risk factors in
31 infant malnutrition. *Rev Med Chir Soc Med Nat Iasi* 2011;115:699-704.
32
33 43. Petticrew M, Roberts H. Systematic reviews--do they 'work' in informing decision-making
34 around health inequalities? *Health Econ Policy Law* 2008;3:197-211.
35
36 44. Whitehead M. Diffusion of Ideas on Social Inequalities in Health: A European Perspective.
37 *Milbank Q* 1998;76:469-92.
38
39 45. Solar O Irwin A. A conceptual framework for action on the social determinants of health.
40 Discussion paper for the Commission on Social Determinants of Health. 2007.
41
42 46. Bambra C. Going beyond The three worlds of welfare capitalism: regime theory and public
43 health research. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2007;61:1098-102.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. City profile indicators¹

City	Year of the indicator	Population aged 0 – 14 %	Population aged 65 and older %	Population aged 16 - 64 in the labour market %	Unemployment %	Immigrant population %
Amsterdam	2001	16.1	11.3	72.0	13.3	48.3
Barcelona	2005	12.3	20.8	57.2	8.7	21.5
Brussels	2001	18.3	15.4	64.9	18.2	26.3
Helsinki	2004	14.5	13.8	78.9	9.1	7.3
Lisbon	2001	14.9	15.4	73.3	7.6	5.7
London	2001	20.2	12.0	67.6	5.2	24.9
Madrid	2005	12.8	18.7	74.1	8.2	14.1
Paris	2007	14.4	14.1	75.5	11.3	20
Prague	2006	12.3	15.6	74.8	3.5	7.6
Rotterdam	2001	17.2	14.3	69	9	45
Stockholm	2005	18	14.1	76	5.3	24.3
Turin	2005	11.4	23.4	67.8	11.4	5.6

1. The information was provided by each city and proceeds from different information sources

Table 2. Description of the 19 informants*

Identification	City (Country)	Status	Profile	Party
1	Amsterdam (Netherlands)	Officer	Health	NA
2	Barcelona (Spain)	Politician	Health	Eco-socialism
3	Barcelona (Spain)	Politician	Non-Health	Eco-socialism
4	Brussels (Belgium)	Officer	Health	NA
5	Cluj-Napoca (Romania)	Officer	Health	NA
6	Helsinki (Finland)	Officer	Health	NA
7	Lisbon (Portugal)	Politician	Non-Health	Social democracy
8*	London (United Kingdom)	Officer	Health	NA
9*	London (United Kingdom)	Officer	Health	NA
10	Madrid (Spain)	Officer	Health	NA
11	Madrid (Spain)	Officer	Health	NA
12	Paris (France)	Officer	Health	NA
13	Prague (Czech Republic)	Officer	Health	NA
14	Prague (Czech Republic)	Officer	Health	NA
15	Rotterdam (Netherlands)	Officer	Non-Health	NA
16	Stockholm (Sweden)	Politician	Health	Christian democratic
17	Stockholm (Sweden)	Politician	Health	Social democracy
18	Turin (Italy)	Politician	Non-Health	Social democracy
19	Turin (Italy)	Politician	Non-Health	Social democracy

^ NA= Not applicable

* Both informants 8 and 9 from London were interviewed together. The information was generated through 18 in-depth interviews

Table 3. Summary of cities' discourses

City	Knowledge on HI ¹ and their causes	Reducing HI as a priority for the city government	Information on health inequalities	Knowledge on policies and programs	Intersectoral collaboration/ participation of social agents	Barriers	Opportunities
Amsterdam	Economic, genetic, environmental, ethnic factors	It is a priority, through changing economic and political factors	Health survey, city memo, collaboration with academics	The city has a Health Plan	There is specific collaboration with other sectors	Funding and the administrative organisation	Health topics are placed in the agenda of organisations
Barcelona	Capitalist economic system, different life expectancy between neighbourhoods structural poverty, traditional and emerging inequalities	HI is a priority but mostly for the health sector and at the local level	Annual city health report and health policy evaluation. Social observatory	Urban regeneration policies. Non-health policies with health outcomes, Health in the neighbourhoods strategy to reduce HI	Not a formal intersectorality, council organisation still compartmentalised. 18 plans with community action, civil society	Financial restraints, factual powers	Proximity to the community and intersectorality
Brussels	Gradient in health, socio-economic position, lack of redistribution mechanisms, segregation, personal traits, access to health care	Reducing HI is an absolute priority	Death certificates, census, national health survey, more data is needed on children	No specific policies aimed at health inequalities	Collaboration is transversal with 3 political structures. Social agents are advisory bodies and also participate in action plans	The liberal course of EU ² . Geographic proximity of actors	Migrant population contribute to healthy lifestyles
Cluj-Napoca	Health inequalities are not an issue	Reducing HI is not a priority, health is a right for all people	The city has the population health statistics	There are preventive measures for the whole population	There is close cooperation with municipalities	Funding and administrative restraints are a barrier	
Helsinki	Sex, education, unemployment, living conditions, social relations, exclusion of young people and ways of life	Strategy of city council 2009-2012. Resources directed at reducing HI	There is some information because it is a strategy of the city	Healthy Helsinki project to reduce HI. Non-smoking and responsible alcohol consumption programmes	There is not enough intersectorality. Steering committees include various social agents. Intersectorality might be slow	Difficulty to obtain funding. Administrative structures	Funding and good cooperation create opportunities
Lisbon	Socioeconomic, demographic, income and age inequalities. Housing conditions	Reducing HI is not explicitly a priority, but it should be. We have the Municipal master plan	There is no information or assessment	Policies and plan targeted at aging	Intersectorality is inherent in tackling health inequalities	Cultural, economic and legislative obstacles	Initiatives with multiple dimensions

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

London	Social determinants in a global context. Lack of evidence base of strategies. Policies directed at most deprived instead of all population	The informants did not answer explicitly that reducing HI was a priority	There is not a must on information. Data is pieced together	Primary care interventions, employment programmes, partnership approach, no knowledge on EU funds	There is intersectoral work with local partnerships not only health services	Little capacity to influence the upstream determinants of inequalities	Promoting local integration and pool resources
Madrid	Socio-economic inequalities, housing, lifestyles, education, income, cultural behaviours. Inequalities at the district level, access to healthcare services	A priority to be dealt with by health care systems	Yes, through research and the annual report	Plan Vallecas to change behaviours. Law for health, programme for the homeless with tuberculosis, for sexual trade workers, for women of Roma ethnicity, children at risk	Plan Vallecas which is multidisciplinary, community and participatory. The aim is to work transversally but it is difficult. Neighbours' associations and participation at the micro level	Relations with other institutions, budget delimitation, lack of awareness of the population, little information on the impact of programmes	To integrate the actions on the groups affected by health inequalities
Paris	Access to health care	Health is not responsibility of the city government or a priority	Epidemiological information and on local health issues for specific municipalities	City policy: measures at the city level, preventive measures, public Health programmes in the neighbourhoods	City health workshops	The consideration of health in the context of urban policy	
Prague	Social status, poverty, chosen lifestyle, voluntarily socially excluded	Health inequalities are not a priority	National plan of social politics but no periodic support	Health 21, strategic plan of Prague	Complex a to work with different sectors, social agents make themselves heard	Legislative and coordination issues, financial barriers	NGO's ³ are very close to the socially excluded
Rotterdam	Socioeconomic differences	Yes, with a broad view on health. Health is a precondition for the life of the city	Health is included in a general biannual survey	Directed at unhealthy behaviour of low SES, air quality and traffic, health plan	Work, participation, education. "Healthy in the city": city health plan. "From complaint to strength", depression and diabetes. Many joint projects but no collaboration with social actors	Long timeframe in cooperating with other networks. Different levels in institutions have trouble communicating	Benefits of cooperation
Stockholm	Structural differences: housing segregation, education level, age group, income, migration criminal acts/safety and living conditions. Health inequalities in Stockholm are very large	Based on health care services. Legislation is there but the educated are the ones who benefit. Accessibility to health care is the highest priority	Public health survey produced every four years, review of health care services, Karolinska Institute Public Health Academy reports	Wide range of choice of health providers, addressed at behavioural and cultural determinants, resources for prevention are too small	Action plan for health, Hard for actors to cooperate voluntary organisations which strengthen the community but nonexistent in participatory process	Lack of competence, knowledge and methods to change behaviours	Resources, Evidenced based health prevention, Engaged people working in health centres

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

For peer review only

Turin	Housing conditions, overcrowding, economic and employment crisis, deterioration of social conditions	The city has a direct and privileged approach to dealing with inequality but there are conflicts of interest	No use of effectiveness indicators for evaluation and modification of policies	Policies not addressed at specific groups, traffic calming and public transport development, security, social housing, local welfare strategies	Sentinel events arise interest but there is a conflict of interests in the political administration	Structural policies tend to be slow	Social cooperatives for housing by improving existing assets
-------	--	--	--	---	---	-------------------------------------	--

- 1. HI: Health Inequalities
- 2. EU: European Union
- 3. NGOs Non-Governmental Organisations

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Box 1. Interview topic guide

Box 1. Interview topic guide

Topics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Can you explain your point of view on health inequalities in [name of city]?</i> • <i>Which do you consider are the causes of these health inequalities?</i> • <i>Is tackling health inequalities a priority in [name of city] or your local area?</i> • <i>Do you have periodic information on health inequalities and policies designed to reduce them?</i> • <i>Are there policies aimed at reducing health inequalities in [name of city]? Could you name and describe them?</i> • <i>Do these policies cover different areas?</i> • <i>Were these policies designed with the participation of different social agents?</i> • <i>Sometimes some opportunities arise which may enable the implementation of interventions or policies. Please, can you provide any experience or thoughts about this?</i> • <i>Which barriers do you face when reducing health inequalities?</i> • <i>Do you know of policies funded with European structural funds?</i>

view only

Health inequalities in European cities: Perceptions and beliefs among local policymakers

Authors:

Joana Morrison, Mariona Pons-Vigués, Laia Bécares, Bo Bürstrom, Ana Gandarillas, Felicitas Domínguez-Berjón, Èlia Diez, Giuseppe Costa, Milagros Ruiz, Hynek Pikhart, Chiara Marinacci, Rasmus Hoffmann, Paula Santana, Carme Borrell, and partners from the INEQ-CITIES Project

Affiliations

- University College London, London, UK
- Agència de Salut Pública de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain
- CIBER de Epidemiología y Salud Pública (CIBERESP), Spain
- Institut Universitari d'Investigació en Atenció Primària Jordi Gol (IDIAP Jordi Gol), Barcelona, Spain
- Universitat de Girona, Girona, Spain
- University of Manchester, Manchester, UK
- Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden
- Subdirección General de Promoción de la Salud y Prevención. Consejería de Sanidad. Comunidad de Madrid (Subdirectorato-General for Health Promotion and Prevention. Madrid Regional Health Authority), Spain.
- Erasmus Medical Centre,
- Institut d'Investigació Biomèdica de Sant Pau (IIB Sant Pau), Barcelona, Spain
- Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain
- Centro de Estudos de Geógrafa e Ordenamento do Território (CEGOT), Departamento de Geografia, Universidade de Coimbra, Coimbra

Corresponding author

Joana Morrison

University College London

Dept. of Epidemiology and Public Health

1-19 Torrington Place, London WC1E 6BT

T: +44 (0)20 7679 1711

j.morrison@ucl.ac.uk

Keywords Health inequalities, public policies, municipal government, policymaker, knowledge, qualitative research, urban health

Word count: 4212

Abstract

Objective To describe the knowledge and beliefs of public policymakers on social inequalities in health and policies to reduce them in cities from different parts of Europe during 2010 and 2011.

Design Phenomenological qualitative study.

Setting Thirteen European cities.

Participants Nineteen elected politicians and officers with a directive status from thirteen European cities.

Main outcome Policymaker's knowledge and beliefs.

Results Three emerging discourses were identified among the interviewees, depending on the city of the interviewee. Health inequalities were perceived by most policy makers as differences in life expectancy between population with economic, social and geographical differences. Reducing health inequalities was a priority for the majority of cities which use surveys as sources of information to analyse these. Bureaucracy, funding and population beliefs were the main barriers.

Conclusions The majority of the interviewed policymakers gave an account of interventions focusing on the immediate determinants and aimed at modifying lifestyles and behaviours in the more disadvantaged classes. More funding should be put towards academic research on effective universal policies, evaluation of their impact and training policymakers and officers on health inequalities in city governments.

Limitations

- Respondents possibly participated due to their willingness, accessibility as well as interest in the area of health inequalities and therefore may be more sensitive to the issue.
- The data was collected 3-4 years ago so parties governing in the cities may have changed.
- In some cities, either officers or politicians were interviewed; it might have been more desirable to have one of each for every city.
- As the interviewees were selected by INEQ-Cities partners from each city, these were chosen by opportunity sampling.

Strengths

- The interviewees included many examples of their everyday experiences and realities providing rich and detailed information.
- Carrying out the interview, an activity seldom performed previously among policymakers, possibly drew them to review the issue, update their knowledge and learn about the INEQ-Cities project and its results on health inequalities in their cities.
- Since this is an exploratory study, possibly one of the first of its kind in comparing policymaker's knowledge and beliefs across several cities of Europe, it will hopefully be a stepping stone for further qualitative research on the topic.
- This study has the important advantage of having collected information from quite a large number of cities throughout Europe.

Introduction

Health inequalities in urban environments are complex[1,2] affect the entire population throughout the health gradient[3] and require a multi-sectoral approach to address multiple social and economic determinants.[4] To that effect, although city governments' competences and authorities vary, they are endowed with jurisdiction to develop strategic plans and policies, provide services and deliver interventions which may address health inequalities.[5-7]

Within governments, policymakers are responsible for decision and policy-making in the form of laws, guidelines, and regulations[8] and their knowledge, beliefs and perceptions are relevant in the implementation of these. It is important to know whether the concept of the social determinants of health inequalities is imbedded in their discourse[9,10] in addition to the information on health issues provided to them as reports or surveys. **These topics, explored in this study,** may determine the course of the policy-making process.[11,12] Furthermore, their perceptions regarding the responsibilities and priorities of city governments and the city government's strategic plans possibly influence the policies in place.[13,14] These issues along with how policymakers make use of their knowledge will influence decision making and affect how health inequalities are addressed by city governments.[8,15,16]

The majority of studies exploring the knowledge and beliefs of health inequalities have explored lay perceptions[17-20] and the few studies describing expert beliefs focused on researchers and policymakers working in regional and national governments.[9,21,22] To our knowledge, there are only a small number of studies focusing on policymakers in the city government[5,6,14,23] **and this is among the first** qualitative studies to compare the perceptions of policymakers in different European cities. **The use of rigorous qualitative research methods has been on the rise in health services and health policy research[24] to explore the experiences of participants and the meanings they attribute to them, to contribute new knowledge and to provide new perspectives.[25] It is consistent with developments in the social and policy sciences at large and has been described to reflect the need for more in-depth understanding of naturalistic settings the importance of understanding context and the complexity of implementing social change.[26] Selecting policymakers from different European cities provided a description of the different socio-political realities and contexts according to the participant's daily experiences to provider a richer and wider view on reducing health inequalities at the municipal level throughout the continent. Notwithstanding their**

1
2
3 diversity, the participant cities share important commonalities as European
4 democracies and urban settings, allowing to explore the study object from a new view.
5 Previous studies[13] in the project have analysed written policy documents in these
6 cities. The objective of this study is to further increase the understanding of how
7 policies are realised, through the perception and beliefs of public policy makers
8 in
9 thirteen European cities during 2010 and 2011.
10
11
12
13

14 **Methods**

15 **Methodological development**

16 We carried out a descriptive and exploratory qualitative research study from a
17 phenomenological perspective[27] as it sought to capture policymakers' unique
18 accounts of reality in order to capture a breadth of discourses on health
19 inequalities[28]. Data was collected from thirteen cities (Amsterdam, Barcelona,
20 Brussels, Cluj-Napoca, Helsinki, Lisbon, London, Madrid, Paris, Prague, Rotterdam,
21 Stockholm and Turin; see Table 1 for information on the cities' profiles) from eleven
22 different European countries participating in the project; Socio-economic inequalities in
23 mortality: evidence and policies in cities of Europe 2009-2012 (INEQ-Cities)[29] during
24 the years 2010 and 2011.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **Participants and sampling technique**

34 The study population consisted of nineteen public policymakers, selected through
35 opportunity sampling[28], see Table 2, working in the aforementioned cities'
36 governments during the research period. A sample of elected politicians which included
37 councillors and or aldermen and high ranked, non-elected, officers was selected.
38 Policymakers were chosen from the health sector as well as other non-health sectors
39 to provide a wider range of discourses. Interviews were performed by INEQ-Cities'
40 partners, who interviewed a maximum of two participants, in their respective cities.
41 Furthermore, subjects were chosen only if they held a decision making position.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Data collection and generation techniques**

50 Seventeen semi-structured individual interviews and one semi-structured interview
51 where two informants participated were carried out from November 2010 to June 2011
52 using an open-ended question topic guide (Box 1). The interviews provided information
53 on the participant's knowledge and beliefs of health inequalities and policies to address
54 these, as well as the role of the municipal government. The interview topic guide was
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 developed following the requirements listed in INEQ-cities' description of work and was
4 further discussed with other project partners. Three pilot interviews were performed in
5 Barcelona to test the topic guides and final versions of the guide were distributed to the
6 project partners in the abovementioned cities who then conducted the interviews. The
7 sessions were carried out in each city's native language and lasted between 45
8 minutes and an hour, where clarification of the topics was needed, some interviewers
9 made city-specific questions. The interviewers belonged to partner groups from the
10 INEQ-Cities project. A data collection manual designed by the authors of this study was
11 sent to each partner and interviewer, providing guidelines on how to perform the
12 interview to ensure that these were carried out in a standardised way. Interviews were
13 translated to English by each partner and several sent the transcripts and summaries
14 to the informants for approval. The summaries and the transcripts were sent to the
15 authors carrying out the analysis in English.

22 23 24 **Processing and analysis of information**

25 All transcripts and summaries were analysed centrally on the basis of a thematic
26 interpretive content analysis[27] by 2 researchers (JM and MP). Interviews were read
27 numerous times until researchers reached pre-analytical intuitions on each of the
28 interviewee's discourses and texts were then coded using predefined and emergent
29 categories. The text was divided following these categories before performing an
30 analysis of the written content and finally the content was articulated into results. Two
31 research members carried out the analysis process independently with the support of
32 Atlas.Ti software,[30] and compared the main findings with the original data. The
33 working manuscript was sent to informants through each project partner for
34 approval.[31]

35 36 37 **Ethical considerations**

38 Informed consent was obtained through verbal means and the information was
39 anonymised and confidential. No participants received a salary or reward as
40 participation was completely voluntary and the study received formal ethical approval
41 by a research ethics committee (Hospital del Mar de Barcelona Research Ethics
42 Committee).

43 44 45 **Results**

46 Three emerging discourses were identified among the interviewees, as follows,
47 depending on the city of the interviewee: London's informants focused on structural
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

determinants as the main causes of health inequalities and described universal policies aimed at these, Prague and Cluj-Napoca's interviewees were not as familiar with the concept of the social health inequalities. Informants from other cities had a mixed approach, although they referred to the wider determinants as the causes of health inequalities, they also suggested downstream interventions to address these. It was not possible, however, to distinguish differences in discourses between officers and politicians or health and non-health informants. Table 3 shows a summary of the responses giving by each city's participants. Presented below, the results have been arranged in six sections following the major topics explored in the interviews. The informant's identification (ID) can be seen in Table 2.

Knowledge on health inequalities and their causes

Two broad discourses were found within the informant's perceptions and knowledge of health inequalities. The first discourse corresponds to the majority of informants who were aware of such inequalities and described them as differences in health. These were expressed, for example, as differences in life expectancy.

We have large differences in health: people live five years longer in areas such as Kungsholmen (inner city area of Stockholm municipality) compared to areas such as Järva fältet” Stockholm health politician, ID 16

They also explained that health inequalities existed among the population according to their levels of education or income, gender, age and the neighbourhood in which they lived.

“There are factors which relate to education, employment or unemployment, living conditions, income, social relations and ways of life. Also the social exclusion of young people generates inequalities in health.” Helsinki health officer, ID 6.

In addition, the interviewee from Lisbon pointed out that inequalities were increasing as did the informant from Brussels who understood them as a gradient.

The second discourse corresponded to informants from Cluj-Napoca and Prague did not have a clear concept on social health inequalities, as described in the quote below.

“In this city we cannot talk about this concept. It is estimated that there are no legal criteria to make any differences between individuals in terms of access and use of medical care.” Cluj-Napoca health officer, ID 5.

1
2
3 Concerning the causes of inequalities, the majority of the interviewees, identified a
4 strong relationship between economic position, educational level and health.
5 Furthermore, low income was perceived as the main cause of unhealthy lifestyle
6 behaviours and reduced access to health care which lead to health inequalities. Other
7 social determinants were also highlighted, such as gender, age group, type of
8 household and residential segregation. The current economic crisis and reduced public
9 expenditure were considered to exacerbate the problem and reduce the capacity of
10 action of the local system.
11
12

13
14
15
16
17 In contrast, interviewees from Prague and Cluj-Napoca considered that health
18 inequalities were chiefly a result of individual responsibility.
19

20 21 **Reducing health inequalities as a priority for the city government**

22 Most interviewees reported that reducing health inequalities was an objective of the city
23 government included in either strategic plans or in specific laws. However interviewees
24 from Prague and Cluj-Napoca did not consider it to be a priority of their municipal
25 governments, whereas Lisbon informant's considered it was not a priority even though
26 they thought it should be.
27
28
29
30

31
32 *"Tackling inequalities in health should be a priority in the Lisbon Metropolitan Area and*
33 *is not, directly, a hotly debated topic."* Lisbon non-health politician, ID 7
34

35
36 The interviewees of Paris and Brussels explained that their city governments did not
37 have jurisdiction over health matters as these are the responsibility of the regional
38 authorities.
39

40
41 *"In France, health is not a responsibility of the cities, although historically it was the*
42 *cities that were in charge of sanitary aspects."* Paris health officer, ID 12.
43
44

45
46 *That's not easy to answer, as not all the areas are governed on the level of the*
47 *communities or on the city level."* Belgium, health officer, ID 4.
48

49 **Information on health inequalities**

50 To monitor health inequalities, the majority of the informants mentioned relying on
51 health surveys which were published periodically in their cities and mortality statistics
52 from their statistics authority.
53
54

55
56 *"To track differences in health, a health survey is conducted every four years."*
57 Amsterdam health officer, ID 1.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

London's interviewees described the need to integrate the different sources of information into one to make access to information easier. Informants from Lisbon and Prague declared not having information or assessment of health inequalities. Furthermore, the interviewee from Cluj-Napoca explained that periodic data of health inequalities was not available as this concept was not applicable.

Knowledge on policies and programs implemented

When asked about their knowledge of policies that address health inequalities, policymakers described actions aimed at deprived populations and at modifying attitudes and unhealthy behaviours, such as smoking and poor diets. They emphasised the importance of preventive measures and health promotion and education. Policies to improve access to health care services were also quoted as an important means to reduce health inequalities by most interviewees. However, the informants from London highlighted the need to address health inequalities throughout the general population rather than focusing on the most deprived sectors and developing long-term policies aimed at the social determinants, not only proximal factors, such as physical activity and fruit intake. Moreover, the informant from Turin highlighted local interventions aimed at addressing unemployment and the interviewee from Madrid described tackling health inequalities at the local level.

"We have to work on the processes...I'm talking from the micro level, which is where I have more experience, but I think that's where the solution lies, in the micro level."

Madrid health politician, ID 10.

The informants from Prague, however, did not mention any policies implemented by their city government and referred to national health plans as a reference for health-related issues.

Inter-sectoral collaboration and participation of social agents in policymaking

Interviewees from Madrid, London, Rotterdam and Lisbon referred to strategic plans which fostered inter-sectoral collaboration between different administrations, citizens' and non-profit associations and established local partnerships. Barcelona and Turin, in

1
2
3 turn, described inter-sectoral collaboration established only between two sectors, for
4 example between health and welfare or health and education. While Lisbon cited
5 examples of housing policies for groups at risk of exclusion, some informants
6 suggested that inter-sectoral collaboration slowed down the policymaking process and
7 perceived that having different sectors collaborate proved to be difficult.
8
9

10
11
12 ***“Yes. Action on inequalities in health is synonymous with disciplinary cross-cutting. In***
13 ***this sense, this theme is incorporated in several areas such as education, social service,***
14 ***environmental and cultural policies, among others, addressed in the municipal master***
15 ***plan.”*** Lisbon, non-health politician, ID 7.
16
17

18
19
20 With respect to community organisations participating in the policymaking process, the
21 majority of the informants thought their city governments collaborated with these,
22 however informants from Rotterdam, Turin and Stockholm considered it was very
23 limited.
24
25

26
27
28 ***“The social networks exist but they need public support. There is no doubt that there***
29 ***should be more shared responsibility among private sector and public services or***
30 ***welfare systems.”*** Turin non-health politician, ID 18.
31
32

33 34 35 **Barriers and opportunities encountered**

36 One of the principal barriers described was the lack of awareness on changing
37 **unhealthy** lifestyles among the population. Informants from Stockholm and Lisbon
38 considered the obstacles addressing health inequalities to be essentially related to
39 **imbedded cultural beliefs which made adopting healthier lifestyles difficult.** Bureaucratic
40 restraints and resistance from other levels of the administration along with
41 miscommunication with the private sector as well as budget restrictions were described
42 as important barriers by the majority of interviewees. London's **interviewee** explained
43 that implementing financial policies from within a city government was complicated in
44 the context of globalisation.
45
46
47
48
49

50
51
52 ***“We come across them all the time and a very important one is the financial issue. Every***
53 ***year we have less money and the crisis only makes it worse.”*** Barcelona health politician,
54 ID 2.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Informants also referred to opportunities which enabled policy implementation. For
4 example, the interviewees from Barcelona and Rotterdam made reference to working
5 at the community level or with different sectors which led to learning opportunities.
6 Community groups were seen as especially important in liaising with hard to reach
7 groups. The interviewee from Brussels suggested that the migrant population promoted
8 **healthy** lifestyle behaviours, as some of their customs had healthy components.
9

10
11
12
13
14 *“There are definitely opportunities. Other services have problems as well and see the*
15 *benefits of cooperation with groups who work with migrant population.” Brussels health*
16 *officer ID 4.*
17

18 19 Discussion

20 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to explore policymakers’
21 perceptions on health inequalities and policies to reduce these throughout various
22 European cities from diverse geographical areas and with different socio-economic and
23 political contexts. **Three discourses were identified depending on the city of the**
24 **interviewee: 1) London’s approach focused on upstream determinants and policies; 2)**
25 **Cluj-Napoca and Prague’s where informants were less acquainted with social health**
26 **inequalities and 3) the rest of the cities’ informants who** perceived health inequalities as
27 differences in life expectancy among the population defined by their economic, social
28 and geographical background. Regarding the causes of health inequalities, these were
29 seen as being caused by low-income levels, unhealthy lifestyle behaviours and barriers
30 in accessing health care. Most of the informants agreed that reducing these inequalities
31 was a priority of their local governments and referred to periodic surveys as information
32 sources to monitor them. Nearly all policies and interventions were targeted at
33 modifying health behaviours and **some** relied upon inter-sectoral collaboration.
34 Furthermore, bureaucracy, funding and the population’s attitudes and beliefs towards
35 healthy lifestyles were considered important barriers.
36
37

38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 **The majority of informants** described upstream determinants such as socio-economic
48 and structural factors as the causes of health inequalities but nevertheless focused on
49 describing downstream policies and programmes. This could be due to the fact that the
50 informants work in city governments and even though they are aware of the main
51 causes of health inequalities, their daily routines involve work with downstream policies
52 and programmes. In this regard, some city councils **may have limited** authority over
53 upstream determinants[4,32] or over health when it is under the authority of higher
54 levels of government; such was the case of Paris and Brussels. In this sense,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 policymakers seemed to refer to what was within their mandate, so even if they
4 understood structural determinants were important in addressing health inequalities,
5 the activities they described were focused within their own jurisdiction. **Downstream,**
6 **interventions targeted at disadvantaged populations such as some of the ones**
7 **described by the interviewees,** which do not aim at reducing inequalities throughout the
8 whole gradient, may end up being diluted into multiple small downstream initiatives and
9 are less effective in reducing health inequalities.[33,34] This also carries the risk of
10 health inequalities becoming the responsibility of each individual, which is already an
11 existing trend,[35] and downplaying the responsibilities and competences of the city
12 government which will constitute a barrier for the local city governments in tackling
13 inequalities. Moreover it has been widely argued that if interventions are not delivered
14 carefully, they are likely to increase inequalities as those who are most in need, might
15 not benefit from the intervention.[36] However, as described elsewhere,[5] the majority
16 of research on health inequalities relates to downstream determinants and focuses on
17 individual lifestyle factors,[37] so little **information** is provided to policymakers on the
18 wider determinants and the underlying causes of the causes of health inequalities.[38]

19
20
21 Furthermore, with the exception of Brussels' and London's interviewees, the concept of
22 the socioeconomic gradient in health was not present among respondents; their
23 understanding of reducing health inequalities connoted reducing the differences
24 between the most deprived groups and the rest of the city's population. Therefore, their
25 discourses did not seem to acknowledge that inequalities affect the entire population
26 and not only the most disadvantaged populations.[39]

27
28
29 Except for Lisbon and the Central-eastern European cities, most of the informants
30 mentioned having access to information on health inequalities through periodical
31 surveys or health reports. Those with access to regular information on health
32 inequalities would be more likely to see the underpinning structural causes and be
33 willing to act upon them. Furthermore, Prague and Cluj-Napoca expressed not being
34 aware of the existence of inequalities in their cities possibly because they were not as
35 familiar with the **concept. There** are relevant studies on health inequalities in the Czech
36 Republic[40,41] and in Romania.[42] Nevertheless, the overarching INEQ-Cities
37 project[29] will provide the cities included in the project with further data on health
38 inequalities at the small area level. Data on health indicators and inequalities is
39 important for various reasons: to understand how causal pathways are established and
40 to design effective policies and interventions.[4,11] While elsewhere it was concluded
41 that researchers do not provide policymakers with befitting and timely information

1
2
3 [15,22,43] constantly requiring more evidence runs the risk of delaying having to face
4 the problem and making decisions.[44] Nevertheless, additional evidence on the social
5 determinants of health, and particularly on effective interventions and policies is
6 important.
7
8
9

10
11 The majority of the informants understood that reducing health inequalities was a
12 priority for their city government. However, only the city governments of Amsterdam,
13 Barcelona, Helsinki, London, Madrid, Rotterdam, Lisbon and Stockholm had health
14 plans, and within these only London has a specific plan for reducing health inequalities,
15 as has also been described elsewhere.[13] Our findings partly reflect the different
16 stages of awareness and action undertaken in the cities as it describes a spectrum of
17 different approaches towards inequalities adopted by countries throughout Europe. We
18 understand that a strong political will is inherent to tackling health inequalities along
19 with supplying policymakers with information on the social determinants and how the
20 gradient operates.[33]
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 Many of the participants described participation between sectors at some level, even
28 though not all cities showed the same involvement. A study carried out also within the
29 INEQ-Cities project analysing policy documents of some of the cities included in this
30 study showed similar results.[13] Another study[23] observed that the structure of
31 political responsibilities in the Canadian context offered important constraints for inter-
32 sectoral collaboration. Encouraging the continuation of collaborative strategies may
33 have a substantial impact on reducing health inequalities, previous research has shown
34 that inter-sectoral collaboration between the health and other sectors is essential to
35 achieving health outcomes in a more effective way than from the health sector
36 alone.[45] Fewer cities described participatory processes and collaborating with social
37 actors. Including other stakeholders in policy-making processes is an important step to
38 city governance and empowerment, both decisive in reducing health inequalities more
39 effectively.[34,46] However, there are many different barriers which policymakers
40 encounter when trying to establish collaborative relationships such as an overall lack of
41 awareness of health inequalities among those who work in the city government,
42 difficulties to coordinate with other authorities, a lack of mandate, and limited
43 resources.[16,8]
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Along with the barriers mentioned above, lack of awareness on health inequalities and
55 bureaucratic restraints were the main barriers to reduce health inequalities as quoted
56 by the interviewees and have been categorised elsewhere as ideological and
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 institutional.[23] Institutional limitations are related to values attitudes and opinions; one
4 possible explanation why this approach has been underlined is that informants seemed
5 to focus mostly on lifestyles and healthy behaviours instead of structural determinants
6 as the causes of health inequalities. Furthermore, the second group of barriers
7 referring to rigid bureaucracy and funding might also be reinforced by the ideological
8 barriers and exacerbated by the social and financial crisis and subsequent austerity
9 measures.

14 **Limitations and strengths**

15
16 It should be also taken into account that in some cases, the politicians interviewed
17 gave political discourses and it was a difficult task to make them follow the topics.
18 Participants were selected through an opportunity sampling, they might not be the most
19 representative informants in their fields; other respondents might have wider
20 knowledge on the subject or they possibly participated due to their willingness,
21 accessibility as well as interest in the area of health inequalities and therefore may be
22 more sensitive to the issue. The interviews were carried out by different interviewers
23 from each city in their native language so that participants could express themselves
24 more freely. The results of politicians and officers have been presented together as we
25 found no differences in their discourses. Nevertheless, the informants included in this
26 study were selected following the pre-established criteria so both elected and non-
27 elected informants were highly positioned in their municipal government's structure and
28 had decision making competences. The data was collected 3-4 years ago so parties
29 governing in the cities may have changed and the elected officials may not be working
30 in decision making positions at the present moment. However, describing these beliefs
31 provides very valuable information on the governance of cities given the key role of
32 policymakers.

33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

As a relevant strength of the study, the interviewees included many examples of their everyday experiences and realities providing rich and detailed information. They expressed their own beliefs and describing them provides very valuable information on the governance of cities given the key role of policymakers. Moreover, carrying out the interview, an activity seldom performed previously, probably drew politicians to review the issue, update their knowledge and learn about the INEQ-Cities project (INEQ-Cities 2012). The findings of the present study to some extent mirrors the findings of the analysis of health policy documents in the same cities, and illustrates the different stages at which cities are concerning work on health inequalities.[13] This exploratory

1
2
3 study, possibly one of the first of its kind in comparing policymaker's knowledge and
4 beliefs across several cities of Europe, will hopefully be a stepping stone for further
5 studies and also has the important advantage of having information from quite a large
6 number of cities.
7
8

9 10 11 **Conclusions and recommendations**

12 The majority of the interviewed policymakers gave an account of interventions focusing
13 on the immediate determinants and aimed at modifying lifestyles and behaviours in the
14 more disadvantaged classes. Some described inter-sectoral action explicitly and for
15 most cities reducing health inequalities was a priority and policymakers had access to
16 periodic information.
17

18
19
20
21
22 Future collaboration between the research centres from Cluj-Napoca and Prague and
23 their local governments could possibly foster more awareness about health inequalities
24 and their causes and the importance of addressing them. Providing decision makers
25 from the municipal governments with information on policies aimed at addressing
26 upstream determinants alongside health indicators should be encouraged further to
27 promote knowledge on their role in addressing health inequalities.
28
29

30
31
32 More funding should be put towards academic research on effective universal policies,
33 evaluation of their impact and training policymakers and officers on health inequalities
34 in city governments. Further advocacy must be carried out to place health inequalities
35 and their implications in the municipal government's agenda and in city health plans.
36
37

38 39 40 41 **Acknowledgements**

42 We would like to thank the informants who participated in the interviews and the
43 interviewers who carried them out and all the partners involved in the INEQ-Cities
44 project. This article has been partially funded by the project: INEQ-Cities,
45 "Socioeconomic inequalities in mortality: evidence and policies of cities of Europe";
46 project funded by the Executive Agency for Health and Consumers-DG Sanco
47 (Commission of the European Union), project n°2008 12 13 and CIBERESP
48 Epidemiología y Salud Pública.
49
50
51
52
53

54 55 56 **Conflicts of interests**

57 The authors declare not to have any conflicts of interest.
58
59
60

Data sharing statement

No additional data are available.

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. Kilroy A. Intra-urban spatial inequalities: cities as 'urban regions'. World development report. MIT and UNDP. 2009;1-27.
2. UN-HABITAT/WHO. Hidden cities: unmasking and overcoming health inequities in urban settings. 2010; Available at: http://www.hiddencities.org/downloads/WHO_UN-HABITAT_Hidden_Cities_Web.pdf. Accessed 12 of November 2013.
3. Commission on Social Determinants of Health, WHO. Closing the gap in a Generation. Health equity through action on the social determinants of health. Available at: http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2008/WHO_IER_CSDH_08.1_eng.pdf. Accessed 8 of February 2014.
4. World Health Organization (WHO). Centre for Health Development. Our cities, our health, our future. Acting on social determinants for health equity in urban settings. Report to the WHO Commission on Social Determinants of Health from the Knowledge Network on Urban Settings. 2008; Available at: http://www.who.int/social_determinants/resources/knus_final_report_052008.pdf. Accessed 14 of August 2013.
5. Collins PA. Do great local minds think alike? Comparing perceptions of the social determinants of health between non-profit and governmental actors in two Canadian cities. Health Educ Res 2012;27:371-84.
6. Collins PA, Hayes MV. Examining the capacities of municipal governments to reduce health inequities: a survey of municipal actors' perceptions in Metro Vancouver. Can J Public Health 2013;104:304-10.
7. Borrell C, Pons-Vigues M, Morrison J, Diez E. Factors and processes influencing health inequalities in urban areas. J Epidemiol Community Health 2013;67:389-91.
8. Lavis JN.. Ideas, Policy Learning and Policy Change: The determinants-of-Health Synthesis in Canada and the United Kingdom 1998.
9. Lavis JN. Ideas at the margin or marginalized ideas? Nonmedical determinants of health in Canada. Health Aff (Millwood) 2002;21:107-12.
10. Liverpool WHO Collaborating Centre for Policy Research on Social Determinants of Health. How can the health equity impact of universal policies be evaluated? Insights into approaches and next steps. Editors: Milton B, Moonan M, Taylor-Robinson David, Whitehead M Copenhagen, 2011.
11. Borrell C, Bartoll X, García-Altés A, Pasarín M I, Piñeiro M, Villalbí J.R y and the Barcelona Health Report group. A quarter of a century of health reports in Barcelona: A commitment to transparency and a tool for action. Rev Esp Salud Publica;85:449-58.
12. Whitehead M. Diffusion of ideas on social inequalities in health: a European perspective. Milbank Q 1998;76:469-92.
13. Borrell C, Morrison J, Burstrom B, Pons-Vigues M, Hoffmann R, Gandarillas A, et al. Comparison of health policy documents of European cities: are they oriented to reduce inequalities in health? J Public Health Policy 2013;34:100-20.
14. Collins PA, Hayes MV. The role of urban municipal governments in reducing health inequities: A meta-narrative mapping analysis. Int J Equity Health 2010;9:13.

- 1
2
3 15. Lavis JN, Posada FB, Haines A, Osei E. Use of research to inform public policymaking. *Lancet* 2004;364:1615-21.
- 4
5
6 16. Lavis JN. Research, public policymaking, and knowledge-translation processes: Canadian
7 efforts to build bridges. *J Contin Educ Health Prof* 2006;26:37-45.
- 8
9 17. Davidson R, Mitchell R, Hunt K. Location, location, location: the role of experience of
10 disadvantage in lay perceptions of area inequalities in health. *Health Place* 2008;2:167-81.
- 11
12 18. Macintyre S, McKay L, Ellaway A. Lay concepts of the relative importance of different
13 influences on health; are there major socio-demographic variations? *Health Educ Res*
14 2006;21:731-39.
- 15
16 19. Macintyre S. Evidence in the development of health policy. *Public Health* 2012 3;126:217-
17 19.
- 18
19 20. Popay J, Bennett S, Thomas C, Williams G, Gatrell A, Bostock L. Beyond 'beer, fags, egg
20 and chips'? Exploring lay understandings of social inequalities in health. *Sociol Health Illn*
21 2003;25:1-23.
- 22
23 21. Lavis JN, Ross SE, Stoddart GL, Hohenadel JM, McLeod CB, Evans RG. Do Canadian civil
24 servants care about the health of populations? *Am J Public Health* 2003;93:658-63.
- 25
26 22. Petticrew M, Whitehead M, Macintyre SJ, Graham H, Egan M. Evidence for public health
27 policy on inequalities: 1: The reality according to policymakers. *J Epidemiol Community Health*
28 2004;58:811-16.
- 29
30 23. Collins PA, Abelson J, Eyles JD. Knowledge into action? understanding ideological barriers
31 to addressing health inequalities at the local level. *Health Policy* 2007;80:158-71.
- 32
33 24. Sofaer S. Qualitative research methods. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2002;14:329-36.
- 34
35 25. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research
36 (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality*
37 *in Health Care* 2007;19:349-57.
- 38
39 26. Shortell SM. The emergence of qualitative methods in health services research. *Health Serv*
40 *Res* 1999;34:1083-90.
- 41
42 27. Reeves S, Albert M, Kuper A, Hodges BD. Why use theories in qualitative research? *Br Med*
43 *J* 2008;337:49.
- 44
45 28. Maxwell JA. Qualitative research design. An interactive approach. Qualitative research
46 design. An interactive approach. Second ed. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE; 2005.
- 47
48 29. INEQ-CITIES Socio-economic inequalities in mortality: evidence and policies in cities of
49 Europe. INEQ-CITIES Atlas. Available at: <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/ineqcities/atlas>. Accessed 10th
50 of October, 2013.
- 51
52 30. ATLAS.ti. Atlas. ti Qualitative data analysis software. 2010-2011 Scientific Software
53 Development GmbH.
- 54
55 31. Mays N, Pope C. Qualitative research in health care - Assessing quality in qualitative
56 research. *Br Med J* 2000;320:50-2.
- 57
58 32. Vlahov D, Freudenberg N, Proietti F, Ompad D, Quinn A, Nandi V, Galea S. Urban as a
59 determinant of health. *J Urban Health* 2007;84:16-26.
- 60

- 1
2
3 33. Marmot M, Commission Social Determinants Hlt. Achieving health equity: from root causes
4 to fair outcomes. *Lancet* 2007;370:1153-63.
5
6 34. The Commission to Reduce Social Inequalities in Health in Spain. A proposal of policies and
7 interventions to reduce social inequalities in health in Spain. *Commission to Reduce Social*
8 *Inequalities in Health in Spain*. *Gac Sanit* 2012;26:182-89.
9
10 35. WHO. Review of social determinants and the health divide in the WHO European Region.
11 2013.
12
13 36. Lorenc T, Petticrew M, Welch V, Tugwell P. What types of interventions generate
14 inequalities? Evidence from systematic reviews. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2013;67:190-
15 93.
16
17 37. Whitehead M DG. What can be done about inequalities in health? *Lancet* 1991;338:1059-
18 63.
19
20 38. Rose G. Sick individuals and sick populations. *Int J Epidemiol* 1985;14:32-38.
21
22 39. Whitehead M DG. Whitehead M, Dahlgren G. Concepts and principles for tackling social
23 inequities in health. *Levelling up (part 1)*. Denmark 2006.
24
25 40. Dzurova D, Spilkova J, Pikhart H. Social inequalities in alcohol consumption in the Czech
26 Republic: a multilevel analysis. *Health Place* 2010;16:590-97.
27
28 41. Pikhart H, Drbohlav D, Dzurova D. The self-reported health of legal and illegal/irregular
29 immigrants in the Czech Republic. *Int J Public Health* 2010;55:401-11.
30
31 42. Florescu L, Balanica G, Vremera T, Matei M. Cross-sectional study to evaluate risk factors
32 in infant malnutrition. *Rev Med Chir Soc Med Nat Iasi* 2011;115:699-704.
33
34 43. Petticrew M, Roberts H. Systematic reviews--do they 'work' in informing decision-making
35 around health inequalities? *Health Econ Policy Law* 2008;3:197-211.
36
37 44. Whitehead M. Diffusion of Ideas on Social Inequalities in Health: A European Perspective.
38 *Milbank Q* 1998;76:469-92.
39
40 45. Solar O Irwin A. A conceptual framework for action on the social determinants of health.
41 Discussion paper for the Commission on Social Determinants of Health. 2007.
42
43 46. Bambra C. Going beyond The three worlds of welfare capitalism: regime theory and public
44 health research. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2007;61:1098-102.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. City profile indicators¹

City	Year of the indicator	Population aged 0 – 14 %	Population aged 65 and older %	Population aged 16 - 64 in the labour market %	Unemployment %	Immigrant population %
Amsterdam	2001	16.1	11.3	72.0	13.3	48.3
Barcelona	2005	12.3	20.8	57.2	8.7	21.5
Brussels	2001	18.3	15.4	64.9	18.2	26.3
Helsinki	2004	14.5	13.8	78.9	9.1	7.3
Lisbon	2001	14.9	15.4	73.3	7.6	5.7
London	2001	20.2	12.0	67.6	5.2	24.9
Madrid	2005	12.8	18.7	74.1	8.2	14.1
Paris	2007	14.4	14.1	75.5	11.3	20
Prague	2006	12.3	15.6	74.8	3.5	7.6
Rotterdam	2001	17.2	14.3	69	9	45
Stockholm	2005	18	14.1	76	5.3	24.3
Turin	2005	11.4	23.4	67.8	11.4	5.6

1. The information was provided by each city and proceeds from different information sources

Table 2. Description of the 19 informants*

Identification	City (Country)	Status	Profile	Party
1	Amsterdam (Netherlands)	Officer	Health	NA
2	Barcelona (Spain)	Politician	Health	Eco-socialism
3	Barcelona (Spain)	Politician	Non-Health	Eco-socialism
4	Brussels (Belgium)	Officer	Health	NA
5	Cluj-Napoca (Romania)	Officer	Health	NA
6	Helsinki (Finland)	Officer	Health	NA
7	Lisbon (Portugal)	Politician	Non-Health	Social democracy
8*	London (United Kingdom)	Officer	Health	NA
9*	London (United Kingdom)	Officer	Health	NA
10	Madrid (Spain)	Officer	Health	NA
11	Madrid (Spain)	Officer	Health	NA
12	Paris (France)	Officer	Health	NA
13	Prague (Czech Republic)	Officer	Health	NA
14	Prague (Czech Republic)	Officer	Health	NA
15	Rotterdam (Netherlands)	Officer	Non-Health	NA
16	Stockholm (Sweden)	Politician	Health	Christian democratic
17	Stockholm (Sweden)	Politician	Health	Social democracy
18	Turin (Italy)	Politician	Non-Health	Social democracy
19	Turin (Italy)	Politician	Non-Health	Social democracy

^ NA= Not applicable

* Both informants 8 and 9 from London were interviewed together. The information was generated through 18 in-depth interviews

Table 3. Summary of cities' discourses

City	Knowledge on HI ¹ and their causes	Reducing HI as a priority for the city government	Information on health inequalities	Knowledge on policies and programs	Intersectoral collaboration/ participation of social agents	Barriers	Opportunities
Amsterdam	Economic, genetic, environmental, ethnic factors	It is a priority, through changing economic and political factors	Health survey, city memo, collaboration with academics	The city has a Health Plan	There is specific collaboration with other sectors	Funding and the administrative organisation	Health topics are placed in the agenda of organisations
Barcelona	Capitalist economic system, different life expectancy between neighbourhoods structural poverty, traditional and emerging inequalities	HI is a priority but mostly for the health sector and at the local level	Annual city health report and health policy evaluation. Social observatory	Urban regeneration policies. Non-health policies with health outcomes, Health in the neighbourhoods strategy to reduce HI	Not a formal intersectorality, council organisation still compartmentalised. 18 plans with community action, civil society	Financial restraints, factual powers	Proximity to the community and intersectorality
Brussels	Gradient in health, socio-economic position, lack of redistribution mechanisms, segregation, personal traits, access to health care	Reducing HI is an absolute priority	Death certificates, census, national health survey, more data is needed on children	No specific policies aimed at health inequalities	Collaboration is transversal with 3 political structures. Social agents are advisory bodies and also participate in action plans	The liberal course of EU ² . Geographic proximity of actors	Migrant population contribute to healthy lifestyles
Cluj-Napoca	Health inequalities are not an issue	Reducing HI is not a priority, health is a right for all people	The city has the population health statistics	There are preventive measures for the whole population	There is close cooperation with municipalities	Funding and administrative restraints are a barrier	
Helsinki	Sex, education, unemployment, living conditions, social relations, exclusion of young people and ways of life	Strategy of city council 2009-2012. Resources directed at reducing HI	There is some information because it is a strategy of the city	Healthy Helsinki project to reduce HI. Non-smoking and responsible alcohol consumption programmes	There is not enough intersectorality. Steering committees include various social agents. Intersectorality might be slow	Difficulty to obtain funding. Administrative structures	Funding and good cooperation create opportunities
Lisbon	Socioeconomic, demographic, income and age inequalities. Housing conditions	Reducing HI is not explicitly a priority, but it should be. We have the Municipal master plan	There is no information or assessment	Policies and plan targeted at aging	Intersectorality is inherent in tackling health inequalities	Cultural, economic and legislative obstacles	Initiatives with multiple dimensions

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

London	Social determinants in a global context. Lack of evidence base of strategies. Policies directed at most deprived instead of all population	The informants did not answer explicitly that reducing HI was a priority	There is not a must on information. Data is pieced together	Primary care interventions, employment programmes, partnership approach, no knowledge on EU funds	There is intersectoral work with local partnerships not only health services	Little capacity to influence the upstream determinants of inequalities	Promoting local integration and pool resources
Madrid	Socio-economic inequalities, housing, lifestyles, education, income, cultural behaviours. Inequalities at the district level, access to healthcare services	A priority to be dealt with by health care systems	Yes, through research and the annual report	Plan Vallecas to change behaviours. Law for health, programme for the homeless with tuberculosis, for sexual trade workers, for women of Roma ethnicity, children at risk	Plan Vallecas which is multidisciplinary, community and participatory. The aim is to work transversally but it is difficult. Neighbours' associations and participation at the micro level	Relations with other institutions, budget delimitation, lack of awareness of the population, little information on the impact of programmes	To integrate the actions on the groups affected by health inequalities
Paris	Access to health care	Health is not responsibility of the city government or a priority	Epidemiological information and on local health issues for specific municipalities	City policy: measures at the city level, preventive measures, public Health programmes in the neighbourhoods	City health workshops	The consideration of health in the context of urban policy	
Prague	Social status, poverty, chosen lifestyle, voluntarily socially excluded	Health inequalities are not a priority	National plan of social politics but no periodic support	Health 21, strategic plan of Prague	Complex a to work with different sectors, social agents make themselves heard	Legislative and coordination issues, financial barriers	NGO's ³ are very close to the socially excluded
Rotterdam	Socioeconomic differences	Yes, with a broad view on health. Health is a precondition for the life of the city	Health is included in a general biannual survey	Directed at unhealthy behaviour of low SES, air quality and traffic, health plan	Work, participation, education. "Healthy in the city": city health plan. "From complaint to strength", depression and diabetes. Many joint projects but no collaboration with social actors	Long timeframe in cooperating with other networks. Different levels in institutions have trouble communicating	Benefits of cooperation
Stockholm	Structural differences: housing segregation, education level, age group, income, migration criminal acts/safety and living conditions. Health inequalities in Stockholm are very large	Based on health care services. Legislation is there but the educated are the ones who benefit. Accessibility to health care is the highest priority	Public health survey produced every four years, review of health care services, Karolinska Institute Public Health Academy reports	Wide range of choice of health providers, addressed at behavioural and cultural determinants, resources for prevention are too small	Action plan for health, Hard for actors to cooperate voluntary organisations which strengthen the community but nonexistent in participatory process	Lack of competence, knowledge and methods to change behaviours	Resources, Evidenced based health prevention, Engaged people working in health centres

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

For peer review only

Turin	Housing conditions, overcrowding, economic and employment crisis, deterioration of social conditions	The city has a direct and privileged approach to dealing with inequality but there are conflicts of interest	No use of effectiveness indicators for evaluation and modification of policies	Policies not addressed at specific groups, traffic calming and public transport development, security, social housing, local welfare strategies	Sentinel events arise interest but there is a conflict of interests in the political administration	Structural policies tend to be slow	Social cooperatives for housing by improving existing assets
-------	--	--	--	---	---	-------------------------------------	--

- 1. HI: Health Inequalities
- 2. EU: European Union
- 3. NGOs Non-Governmental Organisations