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ABSTRACT

Introduction Despite the best intentions and intended beneficial outcomes, public health (PH) interventions can have adverse effects and other unintended consequences (AUCs). AUCs are rarely systematically examined when developing, evaluating or implementing PH interventions. We, therefore, used a multipronged, evidence-based approach to develop a framework to support researchers and decision-makers in anticipating and assessing AUCs of PH interventions.

Methods We employed the ‘best-fit’ synthesis approach, starting with an a priori framework and iteratively revising this based on systematically identified evidence. The a priori framework was designed using key elements of the WHO-INTEGRATE framework and the Behaviour Change Wheel, to root it in global health norms and values, established mechanisms of PH interventions and a complexity perspective. The a priori framework was advanced based on theoretical and conceptual publications and systematic reviews on the topic of AUCs in PH. Thematic analysis was used to revise the framework and identify new themes. To test the framework, it was coded against four systematic reviews of AUCs of PH interventions.

Results The Consequences of Public Health Interventions (CONSEQUENT) framework includes two components: the first focuses on AUCs and serves to categorise them; the second (supplementary) component highlights the mechanisms through which AUCs may arise. The first component comprises eight domains of consequences in addition to health outcomes. The framework offers structured definitions and examples for each of eight domains of CONSEQUENT, as well as potential mechanisms leading to these.

Conclusion The CONSEQUENT framework is intended to facilitate classification and conceptualisation of AUCs of PH interventions during their development or evaluation to support evidence-informed decision-making.

WHAT IS ALREADY KNOWN ON THIS TOPIC

⇒ Adverse and other unintended Consequences of Public Health Interventions (CONSEQUENT) exist and should be balanced against benefits in public health and health policy decision-making.
⇒ While there is an increasing interest among public health researchers in describing and identifying harms of public health interventions, the existing typologies and classifications have not been developed systematically and largely focus on health rather than broader societal consequences.

WHAT THIS STUDY ADDS

⇒ The CONSEQUENT framework was developed using a systematic, multicomponent approach integrating existing conceptual and empirical knowledge.
⇒ The framework is rooted in global health norms and values and embraces a complexity perspective highlighting a range of social, ecological and economic consequences in addition to health outcomes.
⇒ The framework offers structured definitions and examples for each of eight domains of CONSEQUENT, as well as potential mechanisms leading to these.

HOW THIS STUDY MIGHT AFFECT RESEARCH, PRACTICE OR POLICY

⇒ The CONSEQUENT framework can serve as a tool for researchers to assess and classify the adverse and other unintended CONSEQUENT and to explore underlying mechanisms. The framework may facilitate structured reflections on the adverse and other unintended consequences while developing, evaluating and implementing public health interventions.

INTRODUCTION

Promoting and improving the physical and mental health of populations is the central goal of public health (PH) interventions all over the globe. However, despite the best intentions, these interventions can have adverse effects, such as effects in the opposite direction of that intended or expected...
(paradoxical effects) or effects on unrelated outcomes (unintended externalities). For example, providing pre-exposure prophylaxis against HIV may lead to an increase in risky sexual behaviour and in sexually transmitted infections other than HIV. The drilling of groundwater wells, which successfully reduced diarrhoeal disease mortality due to polluted surface water, has exposed an estimated 40 million Bangladeshis to harmful concentrations of arsenic contained in the groundwater. It has also been shown how obesity-focused PH interventions have led to an increase in stigmatisation and social exclusion of those living with obesity.

To truly promote PH, it is essential not only to evaluate intended beneficial outcomes of PH interventions, but also to anticipate and assess their possible adverse and other unintended consequences (AUCs). Unlike the scrutiny used for evaluating adverse drug reactions—which still remain susceptible to underestimating harm—assessing the AUCs of PH interventions presents unique challenges: while adverse drug reactions primarily result directly from the drugs themselves and affect those taking them, PH interventions often function as ‘events in systems’, where effects of the intervention arise as a result of the interaction between the intervention and the social, economic or political context in which it is implemented. Individuals and populations not targeted by the intervention may even be those (most severely) affected by AUCs. While adverse drug reactions are mostly health related, PH interventions usually have social, economic, ecological or political ramifications (eg, large-scale usage of the insecticide dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT) in malaria prevention leading to adverse effects on the ecosystem). Furthermore, consideration of an unintended effect of an intervention as adverse, beneficial or neutral is not always clear, as it depends on the perspective of the observer, as well as underly sociocultural norms; both of these may change over time. For example, whether increased meat consumption is considered an adverse effect (beyond the effect of this on human health) is likely to depend on the perspective of the observer, as well as underlying sociocultural norms; both of these may change over time. For example, whether increased meat consumption is considered an adverse effect (beyond the effect of this on human health) is likely to depend on whether the evaluating person works in the meat industry or is an animal rights activist, whether the assessment takes place in Argentina or Nepal, and whether this is assessed the 1980s compared with the 2020s.

Anticipating and understanding AUCs should be a priority for those deciding on or implementing PH interventions—as there are moral, ethical, political and practical reasons for avoiding health and societal harms. However, these are often not thoroughly examined in PH research, practice and policy, especially AUCs not directly related to health. While unintended consequences of social action have been discussed in the broader scientific literature, they constitute a largely neglected topic in empirical PH research, except for specific areas, such as cancer screening or illicit drug use. In recent years, PH researchers have begun to identify and describe harms and to suggest typologies or classifications of harms. However, these have primarily focused on health rather than broader societal consequences and/or have not been developed in a systematic manner. Important questions remain on how to identify the unintended and potentially harmful effects of PH interventions, how best to evaluate them, and how to incorporate the consideration of harms into the process of evidence-informed decision-making. Being able to identify PH interventions and policies with substantive harmful effects and to subsequently adapt or disimplement these interventions is essential for programme implementers, service providers and policy-makers.

The primary objective of the research project was to develop a framework which supports PH researchers, practitioners and decision-makers in anticipating and assessing foreseeable AUCs of PH interventions (the consequences component of framework). The secondary objective was to map and conceptualise the mechanisms through which AUCs may arise (as a supplementary mechanisms component of framework).

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Overview of framework development process**

The framework development process is rooted in an understanding that interventions have both intended and unintended consequences, depending on whether these consequences are the outcomes the intervention is supposed to produce from the perspective of those conceptualising and implementing the intervention. A specification of further terms used in this manuscript can be found in online supplemental file 1.

We developed the final framework using the ‘best-fit’ framework synthesis approach. This approach involves generating an initial framework based on existing frameworks, conceptual models or theories, followed by coding evidence identified through systematic literature searches against the initial framework, and revising it in an iterative process considering further evidence. Within the ‘best-fit’ framework synthesis approach, this initial framework is referred to as an ‘a priori’ framework.

We used key elements from the WHO-INTEGRATE framework and the Behaviour Change Wheel (BCW) to create an a priori framework of AUCs and the possible mechanisms leading to these. We then advanced and refined the framework based on theoretical and conceptual papers describing frameworks or systems of AUCs of PH interventions and/or their mechanisms, as well as empirical research on the AUCs of PH interventions implemented in policy and practice. These papers were identified using systematic searches in health databases and reference searches (online supplemental files 2–4). Thematic analysis was used to identify new themes and topics and thereby to revise the framework. In the final step, the findings in systematic reviews of the AUCs of four specific PH interventions were coded against the empirically advanced framework components, which were conducted by or in cooperation with the members of the research team. This served to test the framework.
using examples from practice. The framework revisions across all steps were guided by discussions within the study team. The entire framework development process is visualised in figure 1. We used the Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research reporting guideline.43

Development of the a priori framework

For the categorisation of consequences, we used the criteria and subcriteria of the WHO-INTEGRATE framework version 1.0.35 44 45 The WHO-INTEGRATE framework is an Evidence-to-Decision (EtD) framework which was developed in a research project commissioned by the WHO, to support evidence-informed decision-making, in particular in the context of guideline development. It consists of six substantive criteria, balance of health benefits and harms, human rights and sociocultural acceptability, health equity, equality and non-discrimination, societal implications, financial and economic considerations, and feasibility and health system considerations, as well as the meta-criterion quality of evidence. We chose this EtD framework, as (1) it provides a reference frame that is firmly rooted in global health norms and values, as well as key PH ethics frameworks; (2) it is embedded in a complexity perspective, viewing PH interventions as events in (complex) systems8 9 46 and (3) it considers outcomes of PH interventions beyond health, including social, ecological and economic consequences.

For the categorisation of mechanisms, we used the BCW.38 The BCW is a framework for describing, designing and evaluating behaviour change interventions. At its core, the ‘COM-B system’ emphasises three factors - physical and psychological capability (C), social and physical opportunity (O), and automatic and reflective motivation (M) - affecting behaviour change (B). Surrounding these core factors are nine intervention functions (eg, enablement, incentivisation or coercion) and seven policy categories (eg, environmental/social planning, service provision or regulation). We chose BCW as (1) it is the most widely used approach for examining behaviour change and (2) it considers impacts at both individual and societal levels. We focused on the nine intervention functions in BCW and derived a priori mechanisms based on these, including restriction, education, persuasion, incentivisation, coercion, training, enablement, modelling and environmental restructuring.

Through brainstorming and discussions within the research team, these two frameworks were iteratively revised and advanced, resulting in the two components of the a priori framework (online supplemental files 5 and 6).

Identification of eligible publications for ‘best-fit’ framework synthesis

To retrieve the publications of relevance to advance the a priori framework, we conducted comprehensive literature searches in Medline (Ovid), Embase (Ovid) and the Cochrane library for systematic reviews up until November 2020. The search strategy was developed by expanding the search strategy of the 2014 scoping review by Allen-Scott et al31 and by following a guidance document by the Cochrane Adverse Effects Methods Group.47–49 In brief, the search strategy combined terms related to unintended consequences with those related to PH. The search strategy for Embase (Ovid) is provided as an example in online supplemental file 2. Additionally, we conducted forward and backward citation searches of all included studies. We conducted these searches in Scopus, Google Scholar and Microsoft Academic.

First, to incorporate existing concepts of AUCs of PH interventions, we examined theoretical or conceptual papers which categorised, explored or explained AUCs in-depth, grounded in or alluding to empirical findings. These included papers (1) providing typologies or taxonomies of AUCs of PH interventions, such

Figure 1 Framework development process. AUC, adverse and other unintended consequences; CONSEQUENT framework, Consequences of Public Health Interventions framework.
as those by Allen-Scott et al31 or Lorenc and Oliver,17 (2) describing, discussing or exploring mechanisms of how PH interventions may lead to unintended consequences, such as those by Allen-Scott et al31 and Bonell et al1 and (3) offering guidance for identifying unintended consequences of PH interventions, such as those by Bonell et al1 and Mittelmark.50

Second, to incorporate empirical insights to date, we retrieved and assessed systematic reviews with the primary objective to assess AUCs of PH interventions. Reviews with a primary focus on the effectiveness of interventions (ie, the intended beneficial effects of PH interventions) were excluded.

After removal of duplicate studies, the eligibility of studies was assessed independently by two researchers (JMS and RLB). Disagreements were resolved by discussion, and where necessary, by consulting with the full research team.

In selecting papers for inclusion, we adopted a broad approach to PH interventions. These encompass a variety of measures aimed at health promotion, disease prevention, health protection and overall improvements in population health and quality of life.51 We deliberately excluded studies focusing solely on the iatrogenic effects of medical preventive measures like vaccines, medications, medical procedures and screening or counselling services designed for individual patients. This exclusion covered medical primary prevention (eg, drug prophylaxis for malaria), as well as secondary (eg, prostate or breast cancer screenings) and tertiary preventive measures.

While studies examining the iatrogenic effects of individual-level prevention were excluded, we did include research evaluating the AUCs of population-level prevention programmes. For example, we incorporated studies that assessed the impact of vaccination programmes on broader health behaviour or vaccine acceptance,52 53 while omitting those focused solely on adverse reactions related to vaccines. Detailed inclusion and exclusion criteria are provided in online supplemental additional file 2.

First, the two components were revised and expanded based on the coding of the included theoretical and conceptual papers and the resulting new themes. The revisions were discussed in-depth within the research team, yielding conceptually advanced components. Next, the two components were further revised based on the coding of the systematic reviews of AUCs of PH interventions and discussions in the research team, yielding empirically advanced components.

Evaluating the empirically advanced framework through case studies

To assess the comprehensiveness of our empirically advanced framework, we applied it to four systematic reviews examining the unintended consequences of diverse PH interventions. These test case studies spanned various topics: setting-based drug prevention,42 prevention of SARS-CoV-2 transmission in schools,36 international travel-related control measures to control COVID-1910 and measures to reduce the consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages.41

We intentionally chose these case studies to represent a wide and heterogeneous array of PH interventions.54 Our selection criteria aimed to encompass different aspects, such as addressing communicable and non-communicable diseases; encompassing setting-based versus policy-level interventions; and covering interventions from providing information to creating incentives to restricting and eliminating choice—while still falling within the research team’s areas of expertise. The systematic reviews of the AUCs of these PH interventions had been conducted by or in cooperation with research team members. After a final review and discussion within the research team, the two-component framework was finalised as the adverse and other unintended Consequences of Public Health Interventions (CONSEQUENT) framework.

Patient and public involvement

The primary target group of the framework are PH and healthy policy decision makers. In a next step of the project, we aim to conduct workshops with members of the primary target group in order to disseminate the findings as well as to receive feedback on the framework itself as well as the practical application guidance. Based on this feedback, the framework and/or guidance will be revised accordingly.

RESULTS

After the removal of duplicates, the literature searches identified 2998 records. The full texts of 150 records were screened for eligibility, and 15 records met the criteria for inclusion as theoretical or conceptual publications.1 40 11 33 65–76 By screening the reference lists of the included records, as well as of the identified reviews, we included another three records.62–64 We also identified 15 systematic reviews11 33 65–76 reporting on AUCs of different PH interventions through the database searches. No
additional records yielding systematic reviews were identified through searches of the reference lists. Eventually, 18 unique records of theoretical or conceptual publications and 15 unique systematic reviews were included for thematic analysis and coding. The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow chart visualising this process is presented in online supplemental file 4.

The two-component CONSEQUENT framework is presented in figure 2.

The consequences component of the CONSEQUENT framework comprises eight first-order domains: (1) health, (2) health system, (3) human rights, (4) acceptability and adherence, (5) equality and equity, (6) social and institutional, (7) economic and resource-related and (8) ecological. Each first-order domain also comprises several specific second-order domains. For example, the first-order domain health includes consequences for physical health and health behaviour, as well as psychosocial health and well-being as second-order domains. Depending on the purpose and context of framework application, either the more generic first-order domains and/or the more granular second-order domains may be considered; second-order domains may also be adapted as needed (eg, differentiating the first order domain consequence health in COVID-19-related and non-COVID-19-related health consequences for the assessment of PH and social measures during the COVID-19 pandemic). Descriptions of first-order and second-order domains are provided in table 1, some examples are provided in table 2 and further examples—in online supplemental additional file 6.

The mechanisms component of the CONSEQUENT framework, which may be treated as a supplementary component, consists of eight mechanisms (figure 2). AUCs may arise through: (1) biophysiological mechanisms, (2) (re)action or behaviour change, (3) perception, experience and assessment, (4) available opportunities for (re)action, (5) environments and environmental exposures, (6) social norms and practices, (7) economic and market mechanisms and (8) the functioning of systems and system components. Each mechanism also includes a non-exhaustive list of more specific processes. For example, the mechanism of (re)action or behaviour change includes the following processes: affecting behavioural practice(s), evasive, resistant or counteractive (re)actions or practices, supplementing practices or products, human error or misuse, triggering automated behaviours and lack of action or (behaviour) change. In contrast to the second-order domains of consequences, these specific processes are not intended as standalone ‘submechanisms’, but rather illustrate how the mechanisms may operate and are likely to vary for different PH interventions. Descriptions of the mechanisms and specific processes are presented in table 3; further details and examples are provided in online supplemental additional file 7. The relationship between the final framework and the a priori and interim versions of the framework is depicted in online supplemental additional files 4 and 5.
### Table 1: Consequences in the CONSEQUENT framework: first-order domains, second-order domains, definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First order domain</th>
<th>Second order domain</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health system</td>
<td>Access to, utilisation of and quality of health services</td>
<td>This domain captures consequences regarding the availability, accessibility, acceptability and quality of local health services and institutions. This includes the underutilisation or overutilisation of health services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health system</td>
<td>Health system functioning</td>
<td>This domain addresses how the intervention interacts synergistically or adversely with other interventions in the same setting or population (eg, local health services) and broader aspects of the health system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights</td>
<td>Autonomy, self-determination and privacy</td>
<td>This domain covers consequences for all human rights and other fundamental rights, including the right to physical integrity, autonomy, self-determination or privacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights</td>
<td>Discrimination and stigmatisation</td>
<td>This domain captures consequences regarding the discrimination and stigmatisation of individuals or groups, as well as consequences which lead to a shift in the balance of power between individuals and groups. Both are likely to lead to additional health-related or socioeconomic consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability and adherence</td>
<td>Acceptability</td>
<td>This domain captures consequences regarding the acceptability of the intervention as well as the acceptability of other measures, goods or services in the target population and other affected populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability and adherence</td>
<td>Adherence and compliance</td>
<td>Describes the degree to which a population targeted by an intervention adheres to or refuses to comply with the intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality and equity</td>
<td>Health-related equality and equity</td>
<td>This domain covers the consequences regarding relative and absolute inequalities—whether assessed neutrally or judged with respect to their fairness—in health-related outcomes, as well as the relative capabilities of individuals to achieve health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality and equity</td>
<td>Social and economic equality and equity</td>
<td>This domain covers consequences regarding relative and absolute inequalities—both assessed neutrally or judged with respect to fairness—in social and economic outcomes, as well as regarding fairness in opportunities to achieve those outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and institutional</td>
<td>Civil life, sociocultural institutions and participation</td>
<td>This domain captures consequences on the availability and accessibility of sociocultural institutions, ability to engage in civil life and the opportunity for social participation. On a macrolevel, it refers to the availability and quality of social services, civil life and culture within a society. On a mesolevel, it refers to the ability of actors and institutions of civil society, social life and culture to provide these services. On a microlevel, this domain refers to the availability and accessibility of social or cultural institutions and services to individuals, as well as the individual's ability to take part in the social life of a society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and institutional</td>
<td>Social cohesion and social well-being</td>
<td>This domain captures consequences for the functioning of communities and the ability of individuals to be part of them. On a macrolevel or mesolevel, this includes social cohesion, solidarity or the risk of social and political division within communities, which can affect society as a whole (eg, the population of a nation state, macrolevel) or smaller communities (eg, families, cultural communities; mesolevel). On a microlevel, this includes the ability of individuals to be part of communities and experiences integration in them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and institutional</td>
<td>Education and development</td>
<td>This domain captures consequences for educational and developmental opportunities and attainment along the life course from a population (macro) and individual level (micro) perspective, as well as for the institutions contributing to this (mesolevel).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and institutional</td>
<td>Conditions of daily living</td>
<td>This domain captures consequences for the conditions of daily living. On the microlevel, this involves, for example, housing and working conditions, on mesolevel consequences for stakeholders and institutions providing or contributing to them, and on macrolevel this includes the consequences regarding the broader physical environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and institutional</td>
<td>Safety, security and crime</td>
<td>This domain captures consequences for the safety and security of populations and individuals (eg, regarding crime, accidents or natural disasters), as well as those stakeholders and institutions contributing to this (eg, police, fire brigade). Regarding crime, it captures the consequences for victims, perpetrators and society at large.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and institutional</td>
<td>Legal and political system</td>
<td>This domain describes consequences for the legal and political system (mesolevel), its institutions (mesolevel), as well as the relationships of individuals within these systems or institutions (microlevel).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and institutional</td>
<td>Social norms, values and practices</td>
<td>This domain covers consequences regarding social norms and values, as well as associated practices, including the social roles and role expectations of individuals in a given society or community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
Intended consequences may also lead to unintended consequences beyond the health system regarding financial costs, available financial resources and budgetary implications regarding the intervention itself, as well as individuals (microlevel), stakeholder groups or institutions affected by the intervention (mesolevel), or society at large (macrolevel). The financial consequences can lead to economic consequences (eg, bankruptcy of businesses).

AUCs may also arise through relatively simple or long and complex processes (this is displayed in online supplemental file 9, figure A1). AUCs may arise directly from the intervention (pathway A in online supplemental figure A1). For example, the taxation of sugar-sweetened beverages may lead to reduced revenue of vendors (the consequence) through an increase in prices and consequently a reduction in demand (the mechanisms). AUCs may also arise indirectly, when a mediator on the intended pathway leads to an unintended consequence (pathway B). For example, a PH campaign promoting physical activity may lead to an increase in road traffic injuries (consequence) due to uptake of cycling and increased exposure of cyclists to accident-prone environments (mechanism). Intended consequences may also lead to unintended consequences (pathway C). For example, skin cancer prevention programmes via a successful reduction of sun exposure (intended consequence) may further lead to vitamin D deficiencies and related health consequences (unintended consequence).

Furthermore, AUCs can arise through one mechanism (pathway A) or through a combination of multiple mechanisms interacting with each other (pathway D).

Finally, an unintended consequence may lead to additional ‘secondary’ unintended consequences: an unintended consequence may lead to further unintended consequences in a chain (pathway E). For example, a PH media campaign promoting healthy eating patterns may interact with and reinforce social norms and attitudes regarding obesity and obese individuals more broadly, ultimately leading to an increase in weight-based discrimination and adversely affecting the mental health of obese individuals (eg, depression). It may also lead to lower levels of physical activity among obese individuals due to behaviours that aim to avoid further stigmatisation.

The length and complexity of the causal pathways leading to AUCs depend on the perspective of the users conceptualising these: this entails the degree to which one ‘zooms in’ on a particular pathway. Consider the example of conceptualising the unintended consequences of a PH nutrition guideline to reduce the consumption of cholesterol. This may lead to an increase in the consumption of trans fats in margarine (change in health behaviour).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First order domain</th>
<th>Second order domain</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>Physical health and health behaviour</td>
<td>A taxation intervention to increase healthy eating behaviours may lead to an increase in alcohol consumption. 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychosocial health and well-being</td>
<td>A school-based obesity prevention intervention may lead to body dissatisfaction. 85 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health system</strong></td>
<td>Access to, utilisation of and quality of health services</td>
<td>An intervention to increase birth weight may lead to an increased utilisation of hospital maternity services and an increase in caesarean sections. 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health system functioning</td>
<td>Capacity for surgery has been reduced as requisiting theatre space and ventilators to provide additional critical care capacity for patients with COVID-19 in the context of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic reduced surgery capacity and led to delays in cancer surgery. 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human rights</strong></td>
<td>Autonomy, self-determination and privacy</td>
<td>Quarantine and lockdown of long-term care facilities to protect the elderly in a pandemic may lead to an infringement on freedom of movement, autonomy and self-determination among this population, as it was restricted to visit or leave the facility. 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discrimination and stigmatisation</td>
<td>A public health communication campaign aimed at increasing rates of HIV-testing in high-risk populations may lead to an increased stigmatisation of individuals or groups living with HIV/AIDS. 90 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acceptability and adherence</strong></td>
<td>Acceptability</td>
<td>A presumed consent legislation for organ donation may lead to a reduced willingness to become an organ donor. 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adherence and compliance</td>
<td>The implementation of rapid antigen tests to detect SARS-CoV-2 may reduce adherence to social distancing and hygiene practices. 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equality and equity</strong></td>
<td>Health-related equality and equity</td>
<td>A closure of businesses as an infection control measure during a pandemic may differentially affect the economic activities of white collar and blue-collar workers, thereby leading to differences in exposure to the virus in the workplace and during work-related mobility. 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social and economic equality and equity</td>
<td>The closure of schools during a pandemic may lead to worse educational outcomes for students from low-income households compared with students from high-income households. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social and institutional</strong></td>
<td>Civil life, sociocultural institutions and participation</td>
<td>A lockdown measure to control the spread of an infectious disease limits the ability of an individual to take advantage of food assistance programmes and other social services. 94 This furthermore prevents theatres and other cultural institutions from opening and may lead to their closing, reducing the overall availability of such cultural services. 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social cohesion and social well-being</td>
<td>The introduction of vaccination mandates and vaccine passports may lead to political polarisation, societal fragmentation and social movements (eg, antivaccine movements) and divisions within families over this issue. 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education and development</td>
<td>Closure of schools as an infection control measure during a pandemic can decrease the quality of the education itself and the educational outcomes for children and youth. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conditions of daily living</td>
<td>A traffic reduction measure to reduce outdoor air pollution may lead to a less harmful urban living environment for some population groups but increases commuting time for others. 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety, security and crime</td>
<td>Criminalising recreational drug use may lead to an increase in crime rates in society and to increased incarceration of individuals, but may also lead to a strengthening of the police and other institutions fighting crime. 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal and political system</td>
<td>Politicians or public health services providing changing or erroneous information regarding the severity of a pandemic or the effectiveness of protective measures may lead to an erosion of trust in governmental institutions. 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social norms, values and practices</td>
<td>A change in smoking legislation to reduce secondhand tobacco smoke may lead to changes in social norms regarding smoking behaviour in public. 99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
and because of pathophysiological mechanisms to a further increase of cardiovascular mortality. The pathway leading to an increase in cardiovascular mortality can be adequately depicted as a long-interlinked chain of biophysiological processes in the human body. While this conceptualisation can be helpful from a biomedical perspective, a detailed understanding of the exact chain of biophysiological mechanisms may not be useful for PH decision-makers developing or wanting to use the PH nutrition guideline. In line with a complexity perspective, a detailed understanding of the exact mechanisms leading to them. This can be the starting point for exploring and assessing unintended consequences in monitoring the implementation of PH interventions or in designing primary research to evaluate their effects, such a classification system can also reveal important gaps in designing primary research to evaluate their effects, monitoring the implementation of PH interventions or for exploring and assessing unintended consequences in anisms leading to them. This can be the starting point for exploring and assessing unintended consequences in monitoring the implementation of PH interventions or in designing primary research to evaluate their effects, such a classification system can also reveal important gaps in the literature. For example, a preliminary version of the framework was used in a systematic review of PH

### Application of the framework

The framework was developed with two uses in mind:

The first intended use of the framework is to help PH researchers, practitioners and decision-makers conceptualise AUCs. That is, it can be used as a supporting tool to reflect on and anticipate AUCs of PH interventions when developing, evaluating or implementing an intervention. In this context, we refer to anticipating as the use of the framework as a tool to support stakeholders in systematically reflecting on (potential) AUCs of PH interventions when developing, evaluating or implementing PH interventions. In this application, the consequences listed in the first component of the framework are intended to guide deliberations on the potential AUCs of implementing the intervention in a given context, while the mechanisms listed in the second component of the framework are intended to support the identification of consequences through thinking about the pathways through which those consequences may arise. A comprehensive consideration of AUCs is important to appropriately judge the balance between benefits and harms of PH interventions, and anticipation of AUCs will inform their evaluation, as well as implementation of potential cointerventions or countermeasures. The CONSEQUENT framework is intended to organise these procedures and ensure that all relevant AUCs and mechanisms are considered. However, balancing the identified unintended consequences against each other and against the intended benefits involves value judgements and is part of the decision-making process, which falls beyond the scope of this framework. There are specialised tools available to aid decision-makers in this process.

Box 1 offers an abbreviated guidance on how to apply the framework in this conceptual manner. The full guidance and an illustration of this application is provided in online supplemental file 10.

The second intended use of the framework is to provide researchers with a classification system of unintended consequences of PH interventions and the mechanisms leading to them. This can be the starting point for exploring and assessing unintended consequences in monitoring the implementation of PH interventions or in designing primary research to evaluate their effects, such a classification system can also reveal important gaps in the literature. For example, a preliminary version of the framework was used in a systematic review of PH

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First order domain</th>
<th>Second order domain</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic and resource related</td>
<td>Financial resources</td>
<td>A taxation intervention to promote healthy eating patterns may increase cost to consumers (with the poorest groups most severely affected), reduce the revenue of elected shops or restaurants and increase tax revenue for local governments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-financial resources</td>
<td>Providing households with access to piped drinking water reduces the time that women and children spend on water collection and frees time for other activities (eg, to generate income or go to school).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economy and economic activities</td>
<td>Lockdown regulations as an infection control measure may lead to shops and restaurants going bankrupt, individuals not being able to work and the national economy shrinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological</td>
<td>Energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td>Junk food and sugar-sweetened beverage taxes intended to improve population health may lead to changing consumption patterns, thereby also reducing greenhouse gas emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability, quality and use of air, land and water</td>
<td>Public health measures reducing red meat consumption could lead to reduced pollution of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems as well as local improvements in air quality through reducing industrial livestock farming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecosystems, animal welfare and biodiversity</td>
<td>Spraying an insecticide as a vector control measure in the prevention and control of malaria may lead to toxic effects in insect and other animal populations not targeted by the measures with resulting negative effects on local ecosystems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3  Mechanisms component of the CONSEQUENT framework: description and specific process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanisms</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Specific process through which the mechanism may operate (not exhaustive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through biophysiological mechanisms</td>
<td>Unintended consequences may arise through the measure initiating or affecting (ie, stimulating, limiting or modulating) biophysiological or pathophysiologic mechanisms or processes, such as malignant transformations or immune system reactions and processes (includes maladaptive immune responses such as allergic reactions). This furthermore includes consequences resulting through causing, triggering, increasing or reducing addictions or dependencies, stress responses, as well as other pathophysiological mechanisms and processes. For example, a skin cancer prevention measure, namely the reduction of the exposure to sunlight may decrease the physiological sun induced Vitamin D production. This can result in an increased risk for other types of cancer.</td>
<td>► Through (patho)physiological mechanisms. ► Through immune system reactions. ► Through addictions or dependencies. ► Through stress responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through (re)action or behaviour change</td>
<td>Unintended consequences may arise through the measure initiating or affecting (ie, causing, triggering, increasing, decreasing or otherwise modulating) behavioural practices or actions of individuals, populations or institutions. This includes the initiation or modification of behaviours or actions such as avoidance or counteractive behaviours or actions, behaviour change focused on supplementing for goods or services and automated human reaction. Furthermore, consequences may arise through (human) errors and misuses (with the measure affecting the possibility and likelihood thereof), as well as through lack of action or lack of behaviour change in the face of a trigger or changing circumstances. For example, peer intervention to decrease substance use increases alcohol or drug use by affecting consumption behaviours. This can result in consequences for physical or mental health.</td>
<td>► Through affecting behavioural practice(s). ► Through evasive, resistant or counteractive (re)action(s) or practices. ► Through supplementing practices or products. ► Through human error or misuse. ► Through triggering automated behaviours. ► Through a lack of action or (behaviour) change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through perception, experience and assessment</td>
<td>Unintended consequences may arise through the measure affecting or interacting with how individuals, populations, or institutions experience and perceive practices, environments, situations, disorders, themselves or other individuals, populations or institutions. Furthermore, this includes resulting changes in assessment, evaluation and judgement. This may include experiences or expectations of (non-financial) reward or gain or of harm, loss, punishment, judgement, injustice or infringing, as well as the emotional responses to these. This furthermore includes the experience or expectation of unmet needs, perceptions of risks or the experience or expectation of danger in (self-)labelling, stigmatisation and stereotyping. For example, an intervention to increase pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV-prevention affects the perception of the risks associated with unprotected sexual intercourse. This can result in an increase of risky sexual contacts and associated sexually transmitted disease.</td>
<td>► Through affecting experiences, perception or assessments. ► Through creating or fulfilling unmet needs ► Through emotional experiences. ► Through affecting the perception of risk. ► Through (self-)labelling, stigmatisation and stereotyping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through available opportunities for (re)action</td>
<td>The range of opportunities to act or react under existing or changing circumstances, which are perceived as available to individuals, populations or institutions, result from the interaction between the available and accessible resources, the characteristic of the setting (eg, rules and regulations), and characteristics or knowledge, skills and abilities of the individuals, populations or institutions. Thus, affecting one of these components can lead to an increase or decrease in the range of opportunities for (re)action perceived as available to the affected individual, population, or institutions and as a result can lead directly or indirectly (eg, through reactive behaviour change) to unintended consequences. Furthermore, can unintended consequences arise through changes in the situation or circumstances of individuals, populations or institutions when an adequate reaction to the change is (perceived as) not possible due to the lack of appropriate available opportunities. For example, infection control measures such as social distancing or curfews can constrain the option of meeting other individuals. This can lead to the experience of isolation and loneliness as a mental health consequence.</td>
<td>► Through rules and restrictions and their enforcement. ► Through (lack of) knowledge, skills and abilities. ► Trough (lack of) available and accessible resources, goods, or services. ► Through (self-)efficacy and empowerment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
interventions to prevent illicit drug use. The application of the framework showed that most publications examined in the review did not follow a structured approach for the assessment of AUCs or solely focused on health-related consequences. Furthermore, potential mechanisms were rarely described or explored. This indicated a gap in the literature on illicit drug use specifically related to the societal and ecological consequences of PH interventions for prevention.  

### Relationship with other frameworks of intervention harms

The proposed framework shares many features with other frameworks and classification systems of the harms of PH interventions.  

Allen-Scott et al. propose five underlying factors of AUCs of PH interventions, such as ‘ignoring root causes’, ‘limited and/or poor quality evidence’ and ‘lack of community engagement’. These underlying factors deviate from what we refer to as mechanisms in the CONSEQUENT framework. We consider the underlying factors proposed by Allen-Scott et al to operate on a more

### Table 3 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanisms</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Specific process through which the mechanism may operate (not exhaustive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through environments and environmental exposure</td>
<td>Unintended consequences may arise when the measure leads to changes of the (natural, physical or social) environment individuals, populations or institutions are already exposed to. Furthermore, unintended consequences may arise when individuals, populations or institutions are more or less exposed to environments and environmental risks as a result of the measure. Environmental exposure is defined broadly and includes factors such as exposure to air, atmosphere, chemicals, physical agents, microbiological pathogens, noise, vibration, radiation, temperature, etc. It furthermore includes the exposure to goods and services (eg, types and quality of food and water), to accidents or to violence. For example, providing a financial incentive for physical active mobility to the workplace leads to an increase of individuals cycling to work. Due to an increased exposure to an accident-prone physical activity environment, this can result in an increase in road traffic accidents.</td>
<td>➤ Through changing characteristics of environments. ➤ Through changing exposure to environments. ➤ Through (affecting) quality and characteristics of goods and services. ➤ Through accidents and violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through social norms and practices</td>
<td>Unintended consequences may arise through the measure affecting or interacting with social norms, practices or relationships. This includes the formation of new and the reformation of existing social norms, roles and identities, as well as social practices arising from them (eg, discriminatory practices or institutions). Furthermore, this includes the measures leading to unintended consequences through affecting social networks and relationships. For example, an anti-smoking campaign to reduce public tobacco smoking can promote changes in social norms and practices. This can result in smokers being perceived as deviant and face social judgement and exclusion.</td>
<td>➤ Through social roles, norms and practices. ➤ Through social networks and relationships. ➤ Through discriminatory practices or institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through economic and market mechanisms</td>
<td>Unintended consequences may arise through the measure affecting (ie, creating or restricting) or interacting with economic mechanisms and processes. This includes incentives or disincentives as well as price and market mechanisms resulting from the balance between the balance and supply of goods and services. For example, a public health programme which provides a bounty for a killed cobra to reduce the risk of snake bites, may lead to an increase due to the population incentivised to engage in the breeding of cobras (these are so-called perverse incentives).</td>
<td>➤ Through incentives or disincentives. ➤ Through demand, supply and their balance in markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through the functioning of systems and system components</td>
<td>Unintended consequences may arise through the measure affecting or interacting with the functioning of systems (eg, health system), including single subsystems of bigger systems (eg, primary schools within the educational systems; or insect populations within an ecological system). In this context, systems can refer to social, economic, political, organisational or ecological systems. This includes the resilience, resistance, or sustainability of systems, the creation of synergies or antagonistic effects across systems, as well as the functioning of systems and its components. For example, a syringe exchange programme can serve as a delivery platform for other interventions or services (eg, vaccination services). This can result in an increased utilisation of other interventions or healthcare services.</td>
<td>➤ Through the functioning of system and system components. ➤ Through affecting resilience, resistance or sustainability of systems. ➤ Through creating synergies or antagonistic effects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Box 1  Abbreviated guidance on the conceptual use of the Consequences of Public Health Interventions (CONSEQUENT) framework

Step 1: Develop an initial logic model: Begin by crafting a logic model or a complex system map to illustrate how the intended intervention will operate within its implementation context.114
Step 2: Extend the model using the CONSEQUENT framework: Enhance your preliminary logic model using the CONSEQUENT framework in two key areas:
  ⇒ 2a. Identify the consequences: Use the framework’s list of potential unintended consequences.
  ⇒ 2b. Examine the mechanisms: Use the framework’s list of mechanisms to reflect on processes that might be triggered by the intervention, along with their potential consequences.
Step 3: Map affected populations: Conduct a mapping exercise to identify specific (sub)populations that could be uniquely affected by the intervention. Revise the extended logic model accordingly.
Step 4: Review the literature: Review publications on similar interventions, identified via systematic or non-systematic literature searches, to discern causal pathways and potential adverse unintended consequences. Update the logic model based on these insights.
Step 5: Engage stakeholders: Engage with affected stakeholder groups to incorporate unique insights into the specific contexts and operational dynamics of the intervention. This should also include the viewpoints of those who oppose the intervention.30

Although the steps are outlined in a linear fashion, we recommend an iterative approach, revisiting and refining different steps to enhance the final logic model.

As a standalone mechanism. This decision was made, as equity and inequality can arise through different mechanisms in different populations (eg, an increase in health inequality (the consequence) can arise through different populations acting within the constraints of different df (ie, opportunities).

Strengths and limitations of the framework development process

A significant strength of the CONSEQUENT framework is the systematic, multipronged and iterative development of the framework. The framework has a strong and explicit normative foundation as it was modelled based on the WHO-INTEGRATE framework,35 and incorporates key insights from behavioural sciences.36 It was advanced using theoretical/conceptual, as well as empirical literature on AUCs of PH interventions derived from systematic literature searches; new insights were integrated using a mix of inductive and deductive approaches of qualitative inquiry.

However, the project also has a few limitations. First, the literature searches regarding theoretical/conceptual papers and systematic reviews focusing on AUCs of PH interventions were likely not comprehensive. We conducted searches (primarily) in health-related databases, it is, therefore, likely that we missed insights on a broader range of consequences arising from PH interventions assessed and published by other disciplines (eg, economics literature, environmental sciences literature). Second, the identified empirical literature itself is likely not comprehensive regarding all unintended consequences that may have occurred; for example, unintended ecological consequences were rarely addressed. Third, while we achieved content saturation in the coding process (ie, themes were covered by multiple publications and those coded at a later stage did not provide new consequences or mechanisms), further publications may suggest additional consequences and mechanisms. For example, consideration of more publications on the AUCs of economic or market-based PH interventions derived from economic research may lead to additional insights. Fourth, we focused on the literature of AUCs of PH interventions. In some cases, the distinction between economic or social policy measures and PH interventions was challenging. We aimed to overcome this issue through extensive discussions in the team and a clear definition of inclusion and exclusion criteria. For example, we are aware of the extensive literature on unintended consequences of social action from outside the field of PH. Therefore, expanding the framework based on this body of literature may provide additional insights. Finally, our database searches for theoretical and conceptual papers were conducted in the early phase of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. The pandemic has since increased awareness about AUCs of PH interventions, leading to various publications on the topic.13 33 35 78–82 However, to the best of our knowledge, none of these publications would necessitate a change in the structure of our framework.
Indeed, one such publication, co-led by coauthors of the CONSEQUENT framework, uses the CONSEQUENT first order domains in a conceptual framework of PH and social measures during health emergencies.83

We; therefore, suggest that further application and testing should take place by applying it to a more diverse set of PH interventions. Based on this, a systematic collation of the experiences may lead to a further advancement of the CONSEQUENT framework, extending it into areas that are currently insufficiently covered and/or adding further granularity, such as for the second-order domains of consequences or for specific mechanisms.

CONCLUSION

The CONSEQUENT framework is a two-component framework to anticipate and assess the AUCs of PH interventions, reflecting on both outcomes (ie, consequences), as well as the processes leading to these outcomes (ie, mechanisms). The framework may help PH researchers, practitioners and decision-makers in anticipating AUCs when developing, evaluating or implementing PH intervention. Furthermore, the framework can be used by researchers to assess AUCs of PH interventions, for example, to reveal gaps in the literature. Application and user-testing of the framework for practical utility may also inform further adaptations.
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