

## Understanding the formulation of non-communicable disease policies in Nepal: A qualitative study

Item Type	Article
Authors	Vaidya, Anju;Simkhada, Padam;van Teijlingen, Edwin;Lee, Andrew C. K.
Citation	Vaidya, A., Simkhada, P., van Teijlingen, E., & Lee, A. C. K. (2026). Understanding the formulation of non-communicable disease policies in Nepal: a qualitative study. Health Policy and Planning, vol(issue), czag048. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czag048">https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czag048</a>
DOI	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czag048">10.1093/heapol/czag048</a>
Publisher	Oxford University Press
Journal	Health Policy and Planning
Download date	2026-05-17 12:41:41
Item License	<a href="https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/">https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/</a>
Link to Item	<a href="https://chesterrep.openrepository.com/handle/10034/629977">https://chesterrep.openrepository.com/handle/10034/629977</a>

1 **Title:** Understanding the formulation of non-communicable disease policies in Nepal: A  
2 qualitative study

3 **Corresponding author:**

4 Anju Vaidya

5 School of Human and Health Sciences, University of Huddersfield, Queensgate, HD1 3DH,  
6 England, United Kingdom

7 Email address: Anju.vaidya@hud.ac.uk

8 ORCID ID: 0000-0001-8524-4335

9 **Each author's affiliation and qualification**

10 i. Anju Vaidya, (MBBS, MSc, PhD) - University of Huddersfield, UK

11 ii. Padam Simkhada (MSc, PhD) - University of Chester, UK

12 iii. Edwin van Teijlingen (MA, PhD) - Bournemouth University, UK

13 iv. Andrew CK Lee (MBCbB, MD, MPH) - University of Sheffield, UK

14 **Keywords:**

15 advocacy, evidence-based policy, policy process, non-communicable diseases, political  
16 prioritization

17 **Reflexivity Statement:**

18 The original data was collected by one person as part of a PhD project, and as such it  
19 needed to be their own work and was limited by time and resources. Three of the authors  
20 have over 20 years' experience of working in Nepal, and two authors were born in Nepal, and  
21 one is Nepali. Authors come from a range of backgrounds in public health and have worked  
22 in many regions of the world. There is a gender balance in the authors, with the primary  
23 author being a female and three other authors being male. There were also far more males  
24 than females available for interview, and extra efforts were made to interview as many  
25 women as possible who were involved. However, only one female participant was  
26 interviewed. We think this reflects the paternalism of institutional structures and society in  
27 Nepal, which favours men being in positions of organizational power.

28

1 **Reason for all named authors from HICs**

2 Although there are no authors currently living in Nepal, the first author (AV) is a Nepalese  
3 PhD student conducting the research reported in this paper in Nepal whilst being registered  
4 at a UK university. PS is a Nepalese academic currently employed at a UK university, AL is a  
5 Malaysian academic currently employed at a UK university, and EvT is a Dutch academic  
6 employed at a UK university.

7 **Word count of the full article:** 5425

8

9 **Ethical Approval:**

10 Ethical approval for this research was obtained from School Research Ethics and Integrity  
11 Committee (Reference: SREIC/2021/070) and Nepal Health Research Council (508/2021)

12 **Funding:**

13 University of Huddersfield paid partial flight costs for primary author, otherwise they are  
14 self-funded.

15 **Author contributions:** AV conceptualized the project with some input from PS and AL, and  
16 AV carried out data collection and its analysis. PS, EvT and AL supported with analysis,  
17 interpretation and drafting of the manuscript. All authors contributed to, and approved, the  
18 final manuscript.

19 **Acknowledgement:** We thank the authors of the drafts for sharing expertise with us. We  
20 would like to acknowledge all the interview participants for their time and for sharing their  
21 experiences with us. We would also like to thank Professor Paul Bissel and Dr. Susan Jones  
22 for their input in the early stages of the project.

23 **Conflicts of interest:** None

24

25

26

## 1 **Abstract**

2  
3 Few policies have focused specifically on the growing burden of Non-Communicable  
4 Diseases (NCD) in Low- and Middle-Income Countries (LMIC). Health policy  
5 formulation plays a vital role in the allocation of resources to implement effective  
6 interventions and reforms; hence, a nuanced understanding of the health policy  
7 formulation process is essential. However, there is limited evidence about the process  
8 through which NCD policies were formulated in Nepal. This study used Kingdon's  
9 multiple streams framework to explore how NCDs were recognized and  
10 prioritized, how policy alternatives were decided, how policy windows were opened,  
11 and which contextual factors influenced the policy formulation process.

12 A qualitative case study approach was applied to gain a comprehensive  
13 understanding of the formulation of major NCD-related policies in Nepal. Semi-  
14 structured interviews were conducted with 12 key stakeholders, and policy  
15 documents were analyzed using framework analysis.

16 The NCDs were gradually recognized and prioritized through the convergence of global  
17 and local evidence, sustained advocacy, and international commitments. Policymakers  
18 encountered several challenges, such as competing health priorities, the chronic  
19 nature of NCDs, donor preferences for communicable diseases, financial constraints,  
20 and multisectoral complexities of NCDs. The Package of Essential Non-  
21 communicable diseases (PEN) interventions were adopted as a policy alternative,  
22 informed by global evidence, World Health Organization (WHO) recommendations, and  
23 lessons from other countries.

24 While coordinated efforts by stakeholders brought the problem, policy and politics

1 streams together, the role of policy entrepreneurs was found to be less relevant in  
2 Nepal's context. The findings highlight the need to consider external influences while  
3 conducting similar studies in LMICs. Further research is needed on strategies to  
4 address persistent structural and financial challenges in NCD policy formulation.

5  
6 Key Messages:  
7

- 8 • Global and local evidence on non-communicable diseases, persistent advocacy,  
9 and international commitments opened the window of opportunity, resulting in  
10 political prioritization and formulation of NCD policies in Nepal.
- 11 • Kingdon's Multiple Streams Framework offers insights into the complex and  
12 multifaceted aspects of the NCD policy formulation process.
- 13 • External factors such as persistent advocacy and support from the WHO and  
14 international commitments to NCDs significantly contributed to the successful  
15 formulation of relevant policy in Nepal. This suggests the importance of  
16 assessing external influences in LMIC policy processes.
- 17 • Empirical evidence generated in Nepal offers transferable lessons for  
18 understanding NCD policy formulation in other LMICs.

## 1 Introduction

2  
3 The epidemic of Non-Communicable Diseases (NCDs) is a global public health issue.  
4 Many countries have experienced a shift from communicable diseases to NCDs, while  
5 others face a dual disease burden (Roth et al., 2018). The latest global estimate (2021)  
6 is that 43 million deaths occurred due to NCDs, some 75% of all global deaths. Most  
7 NCD-related global deaths were due to Cardiovascular disease (CVD), cancer,  
8 Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD), and diabetes mellitus (Li et al., 2025;  
9 World Health Organization 2025). NCDs have a disproportionate impact globally with  
10 80% of premature deaths occurring in LMICs (World Health Organization 2025). In  
11 addition to premature deaths, the rising NCD prevalence contributes to increased  
12 poverty and poses a threat to national economies (Department of Health Services  
13 2023).

14 Like many other LMICs, the burgeoning trend of NCDs holds true in Nepal where  
15 71.1% of all deaths were due to NCDs in 2019, rising from 51% in 2010 (Department of  
16 Health Services 2023; Nepal Health Research Council et al., 2021). The deaths in  
17 Nepal were mainly due to four major NCDs: CVD, COPD, cancers, and diabetes  
18 mellitus, accounting for 24%, 16%, 11% and 4% respectively (Nepal Health Research  
19 Council et al., 2021). The growing NCD burden is closely linked to increasingly  
20 prevalent behavioural risk factors, including smoking, alcohol use, unhealthy diets, and  
21 physical inactivity, accounting for 17%, 7%, 97%, and 8% respectively (Dhimal et al.,  
22 2019; Gyawali et al., 2020). The rise in NCDs is associated with a decreased quality of  
23 life, catastrophic health expenses, and loss of productivity (Government of Nepal  
24 2014), and places additional pressure on an already challenged health system

1 (Sharma et al., 2019).

2 In response, the Government of Nepal (GoN) has made several policy initiatives to  
3 address NCDs. Nepal became a signatory to the 2011 United Nations (UN) Political  
4 Declaration on the Prevention and Control of NCDs. Subsequently, the National Health  
5 Policy was revised in 2014 which explicitly recognized NCDs as a significant public  
6 health concern (Ministry of Health and Population 2014). This led to the development  
7 of the Multisectoral Action Plan for Prevention and Control of NCDs (2014-2020) as a  
8 major policy initiative introduced by the GoN to guide the implementation of NCD-  
9 related activities via a multisectoral approach (Government of Nepal 2014). The latter  
10 received technical support from the WHO and financial support of WHO and Russia  
11 (Government of Nepal 2014). The Package of Essential Non-communicable diseases  
12 (PEN) interventions were adopted in 2015, followed by endorsement of the PEN protocol  
13 in 2016. The PEN programme features four simplified clinical protocols (Table 1)  
14 designed specifically for primary health care settings, enabling healthcare workers to  
15 effectively identify individuals at risk, manage diagnosed individuals, and promote  
16 behavioural change (Department of Health Services 2023, 2025; World Health  
17 Organization 2013b; World Health Organization et al., 2019a). The PEN interventions  
18 were implemented in 77 districts in Nepal (Department of Health Services 2024,  
19 2025). Subsequent revision of the National Health Policy in 2019 further emphasized  
20 multisectoral coordination and integrated health system approaches (Ministry of Health  
21 and Population 2019). In 2022, the action plan was revised as the Multisectoral Action  
22 Plan for prevention and control of NCDs (2021-2025). This policy was yet to be  
23 endorsed during the data collection period, and therefore, its policy formulation process

1 is not explored here. An overview of the NCD policies is presented in Table 1.

2

3 (insert Table 1 here)

4 Despite several policy developments, little is known about how NCD policies were  
5 formulated. Understanding the policy formulation process, such as who the key actors  
6 were, how problems were prioritized, and what factors facilitated or constrained the  
7 processes, is essential for strengthening future policy responses (Unwin et al., 2017).

8 A review of the literature found only one paper from Nepal exploring the policy  
9 formulation process, particularly of CVDs (Pradhan et al., 2021). Given Nepal's unique  
10 political and administrative context, decentralized government structure, constrained  
11 health financing, competing health priorities and reliance on external funding, it is  
12 unclear how policy-making mechanisms operate in practice.

13 This study addresses this gap by examining the NCD policies formulation process in  
14 Nepal and explored how NCDs were recognized and prioritized, how policy alternatives  
15 were selected, how political factors shaped decision-making and which factors  
16 facilitated or hindered the policy formulation process. Using a qualitative case study  
17 design, the study provides insights into the dynamics of NCD policies formulation in  
18 Nepal and contributes to broader understanding of policy formulation processes in  
19 LMIC contexts.

## 20 **Theoretical framework**

21  
22 This article draws on Kingdon's Multiple Streams Framework (MSF) to examine the  
23 policy formulation processes. It focuses on how the three streams (problem, policy and

1 politics) are brought together often by policy entrepreneurs during the window of  
2 opportunity to formulate the policy. The problem stream describes how health problems  
3 are recognized and prioritized by the policy actors through indicators, focusing events,  
4 and feedback from existing programmes, and routinely monitored activities  
5 (Kingdon 1984). The policy stream describes the process through which potential  
6 solutions and strategies to solve pressing problems are discussed and finalized  
7 among policymakers (Kingdon 1984). The politics stream illustrates how the political  
8 environment, including political actors and their preferences, institutional context,  
9 national and international influences shape s the decision-making process (Jones  
10 2015). The framework describes how the coupling of these three independent streams  
11 takes place and opens the window of opportunity for issues to get into the policy agenda  
12 and how policy is formulated (Kingdon 2011). Although the framework was originally  
13 developed for the United States of America (USA), it has been increasingly used in LMIC  
14 settings to understand the health policy processes. Strengths and limitations of the  
15 framework are described in Supplementary file 1.

## 16 **Methodology**

17 A qualitative case-study design explored the process of NCD policy formulation in  
18 Nepal, including enabling and constraining factors contributing to the policy process.  
19 The case-study design helped to understand the complex phenomenon of NCD policy  
20 formulation process in its natural context by using multiple approaches (Yin 2014).  
21 Triangulation of data using multiple sources enhanced the study's trustworthiness.  
22 Data were collected using three approaches: literature review, document review, and  
23 semi-structured key informant interviews. The literature review was conducted

1 systematically of two databases (PubMed and CINAHL) for publications between 2011  
2 and 2022, using inclusion and exclusion criteria (Supplementary file 2). The search  
3 was supplemented by hand-searching reference lists of the retrieved articles, as well  
4 as searches of Google Scholar and the WHO Institutional Repository for Information  
5 Sharing (IRIS). The document review was used as a complementary source of  
6 evidence to gather further relevant information. Official documents related to NCD  
7 policies and policy process activities, including government reports, policy plans and  
8 strategies, and regulatory documents (Table 2) were reviewed to contextualize the  
9 policy process.

10 (Insert Table 2 here).

11 Semi-structured key informant interviews were then conducted. The interview guide  
12 was developed based on literature review, research objectives, discussions with  
13 research team members, informal discussions with experts, and framed using key  
14 concepts of the Kingdom's MSF.

15 As NCD policy documents did not name the policy actors involved in the policy  
16 formulation, therefore, policy actors were purposively selected for interview. The  
17 information officer of the Ministry of Health and Population (MoHP) was contacted to  
18 gather information about the stakeholders involved in the policy formulation process.  
19 Furthermore, individuals working in the NCD area were searched on Google and  
20 contacted. They were asked about their involvement in the process, and those  
21 who participated in the process were purposively selected. Snowball sampling was  
22 also employed (Noy 2008) to recruit other relevant participants from the network of  
23 policy actors. This network of policy actors was the focus of the study, which was one

1 of the reasons for selecting these sampling techniques (Clark et al., 2021). Of 17  
2 individuals contacted, 12 were recruited to study, one declined to participate, and four  
3 were not involved in the policy process.

4 Semi-structured interviews were conducted in 2021, lasting 30-60 minutes. As the  
5 policy formulation process involves different stages (e.g. problem and policy option  
6 identification, consultation, advocacy, and decision-making), the involvement of  
7 participants involved in these stages was taken into consideration when selecting  
8 participants.

9 Key informants were provided information sheets and consent was obtained prior to  
10 the interviews. An iterative approach was followed, and reflections from each  
11 interview were incorporated into subsequent interviews, e.g. some participants  
12 mentioned the important role of WHO's advocacy and adoption of the PEN programme  
13 as a policy option. This was further explored with subsequent participants to obtain  
14 further understanding of the advocacy process. This approach not only facilitated a  
15 deeper understanding of the process but also enabled validation of the findings. Data  
16 were collected until theoretical saturation was reached, i.e. no new information  
17 emerged from further interviews (Padgett 2017). We also adopted the concept of  
18 *information power* to determine the sample size of this study (Malterud et al., 2016)  
19 (Supplementary file 3). We acknowledge that there is a growing question regarding  
20 genuineness, bias, and completeness about the collected data, along with the  
21 difference found between what people say and what they do (Hammersley 2008;  
22 Padgett 2017). To enhance trustworthiness, interview data were integrated, compared,  
23 and contrasted with data from other sources (Yin 2014). Interviews were audio-

1 recorded, except for one, where handwritten notes were taken, and transcribed  
2 verbatim.

3 Framework analysis was applied which included five key steps: (i) data  
4 familiarization; (ii) framework identification; (iii) indexing of data; (iv) organization of  
5 indexed data into a format; (v) mapping and interpreting data to find key patterns and  
6 abstractions (Supplementary file 4). NVivo 14 (QSR International) was used for data  
7 management and analysis.

8 **Results**

9  
10 The findings are presented based on key components of Kingdon's MSF (problem  
11 stream, policy stream, politics stream, policy entrepreneurs, policy windows). The study  
12 also presents information on the involvement of various actors in the policy formulation  
13 process (Table 3).

14  
15 **Actors**

16  
17 Although the actors are not identified as one of the key components of Kingdon's MSF,  
18 each of the three streams is driven by their actions and interactions. Providing  
19 information about which actors were involved (or excluded) and how they were  
20 selected helps to reveal underlying power dynamics, institutional constraints, and  
21 network influences, shaping the policy process (Oltmer and Lohr 2025). Including this  
22 component, therefore, allows for a more comprehensive and nuanced application of  
23 the framework.

24  
25

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

**Stakeholder engagement**

A diverse range of stakeholders participated in the NCD policy formulation, including representatives from the MoHP, other ministries, non-government organizations, international organizations, professional societies, academics, researchers, and clinicians, including currently working and retired officials (Table 3).

(Insert Table 3 here)

Most participants highlighted that the MoHP played a central coordinating role, guiding consultations and consolidating input from various sectors. However, a few participants perceived stakeholder selection and engagement process as informal and influenced by personal and political relationships rather than systematic expertise-based selection. One participant reflected:

*“If the Health Minister or the Health Secretary knows me, he will call me for consultation regarding NCD issues and policies.”* - (Civil Society Representative)

This resulted in limited engagement of key stakeholders such as Non-Government Organizations (NGOs), researchers working in the NCD area, people living with NCDs, and frontline implementers. The exclusion of these actors was perceived to have constrained the inclusiveness and diversity of perspectives in the policy process.

Participants (Researchers and Clinician) further mentioned that policymakers viewed clinical professionals as primary subject experts and prioritized their involvement in the

1 policy process, while those engaged in academic or NCD-related empirical research  
2 were often overlooked for consultation.

3 Despite recognition of the multisectoral nature of NCDs, participants (MoHP  
4 Representatives and international organization representative) reported challenges in  
5 multisectoral coordination during the policy formulation process. Engagement of non-  
6 health ministries in the policy formulation process was constrained by competing  
7 priorities, limited awareness about the multisectoral nature of NCDs, and perceptions  
8 that NCDs were solely health responsibility and did not fall within the scope of other  
9 ministries. These findings highlight persistent institutional and perceptual barriers to  
10 shared accountability and effective cross-sectoral collaboration in the policy  
11 formulation process.

### 12 **Problem stream: Recognition and prioritization of NCDs**

13  
14 Some participants (INGO Representative, Researcher, Health Activist) noted that NCD  
15 recognition emerged gradually, initially through tobacco control efforts, particularly the  
16 formulation of tobacco control policies in 2010 (Tobacco Control Laws 2014).

17 However, only tobacco control issues gained political prioritization initially while other  
18 NCDs received little attention. A few clinicians reported that although they recognized  
19 increasing NCD-related deaths through their experience, the issue could not gain  
20 political attention initially due to a lack of local evidence.

### 21 22 ***Role of indicators***

23 Over time, participants (Clinician, Civil Society Representative, and Researchers)  
24 highlighted that global and local evidence, particularly the Global Burden of Disease

1 study and national STEPS survey, were crucial in demonstrating the increasing NCD  
2 burden and attracting political attention. Evidence generated by government  
3 institutions was perceived as credible indicators and influenced policymakers'  
4 perceptions because of their close relationship with the MoHP (Aryal et al., 2015).

5 Barriers to research uptake by policymakers (Clinician and Researcher), included  
6 limited efforts by researchers to share evidence with policymakers in an  
7 understandable manner and the irrelevant timing of evidence dissemination.

8 *“We, as researchers, were not able to present policy research in an understandable*  
9 *manner to the policymakers. There was a lack of ability to push this issue forward*  
10 *among researchers ...The focus of the researcher is on how he can conduct the research,*  
11 *collect data, and perform analysis. Similarly, we need to know what the time points are for*  
12 *the uptake of that evidence. For example, suppose I am a policymaker. You come and tell*  
13 *me about your study findings. I will say that it is good. But how am I going to use these*  
14 *findings? So timing is also particularly important.”- (Researcher)*

### 15 **Advocacy and issue framing**

16 Participants (Researchers, MoHP Representative, WHO Representative and Public  
17 Health Professional) mentioned that persistent advocacy by national and international  
18 stakeholders, including the WHO and the NCD Alliance, further contributed to problem  
19 recognition. However, advocacy activities were reported to be often individualized,  
20 sporadic, lacked a structured plan, and patient voices were largely absent.

21 Participants (Researcher and Civil Society Representative) mentioned that NCDs were  
22  
23

1 initially framed as a health issue requiring hospital-based approaches. Over time, with  
2 increasing realization of the need to prevent NCDs, the framing shifted to lifestyle,  
3 emphasizing public awareness, education, and promotion of adopting healthy  
4 behaviours (Government of Nepal 2014; Ministry of Health and Population 2019).

5 *“People’s responsibility to keep themselves healthy and healthy lifestyle shall be*  
6 *promoted through health awareness programmes.”* (Ministry of Health and Population  
7 2019, p.27)

### 8 **Challenges to NCD prioritization**

9  
10 Participants (Researchers) noted several factors impeding NCD prioritization. The  
11 government’s attention to existing health issues, such as communicable diseases,  
12 maternal and child health, and commitment to Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)  
13 constituted a key challenge to getting NCDs on the policy agenda.

14  
15 *“At that time, the target of the government and non-government organization was on the*  
16 *MDGs. There were no NCDs in the MDGs. So, convincing policymakers about the situation*  
17 *of NCDs was incredibly challenging.”*- (Researcher)

18 The chronic nature of NCDs requiring long-term interventions was cited by some  
19 (Researcher and Public Health Professional) as another reason for NCD’s low priority.

20 *“When people become ill immediately and die in a short interval, it grabs the attention of*  
21 *the government, politicians, and policymakers. In case of NCDs, as the person becomes*  
22 *old, the prevalence of NCDs increases, and it requires management for long durations.”* -

23 (Public Health Professional)

1  
2 Participants (Clinician, Researcher and Public Health Professional) highlighted the  
3 influence of funding on NCD prioritization, with donor support skewed towards  
4 communicable diseases. Because of Nepal's high dependency on external funding,  
5 donor priorities often shaped the policy agenda, leaving NCD with a lower priority during  
6 the policy formulation process.

7 Despite these challenges, participants (Clinician and INGO Representative) reported  
8 that collective and sustained advocacy by a wide range of stakeholders, including the  
9 MoHP, senior bureaucrats, WHO, clinicians, and researchers working in the NCD area  
10 contributed to NCD prioritization.

#### 14 **Policy stream: Selection of policy alternatives**

15  
16 PEN interventions were adopted as a strategy to prevent and control NCDs  
17 (Government of Nepal 2014). Most participants highlighted the significant influence of  
18 the WHO in shaping policy decisions to adopt PEN. The findings demonstrate the  
19 WHO's role in advocating for the PEN programme through synthesizing and sharing  
20 evidence of successful implementations in other countries. Through continuous  
21 engagement, WHO highlighted the cost-effectiveness and feasibility of the PEN  
22 programme within Nepal's resource-constrained context and facilitated informed decision-  
23 making. The institutional relationship and trust between the WHO and MoHP also  
24 influenced this decision.

1 Half of the participants noted that the formulation process for policy documents, e.g.,  
2 MSAP (2014-2020), was guided by global guidelines such as the Global NCD Action  
3 Plan, which was later contextualized to Nepal (Government of Nepal 2014; World  
4 Health Organization 2013a).

#### 6 **Financial challenges**

7 Developing a sustainable financial strategy emerged as a key challenge for  
8 policymakers. Despite realizing the necessity of addressing NCDs, participants (MoHP  
9 Representative, Clinician and Researcher) noted that balancing technical feasibility  
10 with financial sustainability was a persistent concern.

11 *“We realized that it was necessary. We were trying to strike a balance between*  
12 *technical and financial feasibility. So, that was the concern to begin with because*  
13 *once you start the range of free medicines, the public funding, public expenditure will*  
14 *go up, and that responsibility will have to be taken by the central government.”- (Clinician)*

#### 15 **Health system capacity and implementation challenges**

16 Another concern raised during policy selection included integration into routine primary  
17 healthcare services. Participants (Researcher and INGO Representative) noted that  
18 while primary healthcare staff could manage communicable diseases, they lacked the  
19 capacity and training to manage NCDs effectively. Integrating PEN within the primary  
20 health system required task shifting, training, and systemic restructuring (Government  
21 of Nepal 2014), which were perceived as major challenges.

22

## 1 **Politics stream: National and international commitments**

2 International engagement played crucial role in influencing political support.

3 Participants (MoHP, INGO Representatives, and Public Health Professional)

4 highlighted that Nepal's participation in global health events, particularly in the 2011

5 Political Declaration of High-Level Meeting on the Prevention and Control of NCD,

6 played a significant role in catalyzing policy response in favour of NCD prevention and

7 control (Government of Nepal 2014; United Nations 2011).

8 Participants (MoHP, INGO Representatives and Public Health Professionals) noted

9 the significant influence of commitment to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG)

10 on NCD recognition on the national agenda that catalyzed policy response (Ministry of

11 Health and Population, 2019). The NCD policies also aligned with Nepal's prevailing

12 laws and constitutional provisions on health (Government of Nepal 2015; Ministry of

13 Health and Population 2019).

14 *"This policy is also imperative to address the national and international commitments*

15 *made by Nepal and to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals..."* (Ministry of

16 Health and Population 2019, p.22)

17 Most participants recognized that advocacy by both national and international

18 actors helped sensitize political leaders to the growing NCD burden and the importance

19 of addressing NCDs. It strengthened political support despite donor dependence

20 continuing to influence priorities.

## 21 **Policy entrepreneurs and opening of the policy window**

22

23 Most participants did not explicitly identify policy entrepreneurs although the WHO and

1 selected national actors played significant entrepreneurial roles by raising NCD  
2 awareness, promoting feasible solutions, and coupling the three streams.

3 The findings demonstrated that the convergence of the three streams, *Problem, Policy*  
4 *and Politics*, created a conducive environment to open the policy window for the NCD  
5 policy formulation in Nepal. In the problem stream, NCD was recognized as a major  
6 public health concern, supported by evidence from national and global studies. The  
7 availability of feasible and evidence-informed policy alternatives, such as the PEN  
8 interventions, enabled its adoption in the policy stream. The politics stream gained  
9 momentum through participation in international health fora, international  
10 commitments like SDGs, and advocacy from national and international stakeholders.  
11 These three streams intersected and opened a policy window that enabled  
12 policymakers to prioritize NCDs and the PEN programme.

### 13 **Discussion**

14  
15 This study examined how NCDs became a national priority, how they gained political  
16 prioritization, how policy option(s) were decided, how political factors, including others,  
17 facilitated or hindered the process, and how the three streams converged to open a  
18 policy window and formulate the policy. Applying Kingdon's MSF generated insights  
19 into the dynamics of policy formulation process in Nepal and highlighted areas where  
20 the framework may require refinement for LMICs (Figure 1). Study limitations are  
21 presented in Supplementary file 5.

22 (Insert Figure 1 here).

23 Overall, the findings demonstrated that the convergence of global commitments,

1 global guidance particularly from WHO, combined with credible national evidence and  
2 increasing political attention, strengthened policymakers' perception of urgency and  
3 feasibility of policy actions. This alignment opened a policy window, resulting in  
4 political prioritization of NCDs and adoption of the PEN programme.

5 However, several challenges were faced during the process. Competing health  
6 priorities, the chronic nature of NCDs requiring long term interventions, limited  
7 donor investment in NCDs, financial constraints, and weak multisectoral coordination  
8 hindered the process. Despite these challenges, credible indicators, advocacy from  
9 national and international actors, and international commitments facilitated political  
10 prioritization of NCDs, leading to NCD policy formulation.

### 11 **Stakeholder involvement and multisectoral coordination**

12 Although a wide range of stakeholders were consulted during the policy formulation  
13 process, their engagement was neither systematic nor expertise driven. Meaningful  
14 stakeholder participation was constrained by political relationships, limited use of  
15 research expertise, and weak multisectoral collaboration mechanisms. The participants  
16 highlighted insufficient engagement of key stakeholders, such as researchers, civil  
17 society, individuals living with NCDs, and frontline implementers, compromising the  
18 policy formulation process.

19 Clinicians were preferred over researchers for consultation during the policy formulation  
20 process, limiting balanced participation. Policymakers' emphasis on clinical  
21 perspectives over research evidence reflects a narrow understanding of expertise and  
22 potentially limiting evidence-informed decision-making (Lange et al., 2022; Stephens et  
23

1 al., 2024). The exclusion of individuals living with NCDs engagement further limited  
2 incorporation of experiential knowledge in the policy formulation process, which could  
3 contribute meaningfully to the design of interventions (Shiroya et al., 2019) and  
4 strengthen citizen-focused policy design (Health and Global Policy Institute & NCD  
5 Alliance 2022; Singh et al., 2023; You et al., 2024). In Nepal's context, this exclusion  
6 may stem from policymakers' assumption that public involvement would be of little  
7 value to the policy process (Stephens et al., 2024).

8 Although the PEN programme was intended to be implemented at the primary  
9 healthcare facilities, there was limited involvement of frontline implementers, also  
10 referred to as street-level bureaucrats (frontline staff who deliver services to the  
11 public) (Buse et al., 2012) in the policy formulation process. Exclusion of these key  
12 stakeholders may weaken policy design and implementation fidelity (Liu et al., 2010;  
13 Sanni et al., 2019). These dynamics underscore the need for a more structured and  
14 evidence-informed stakeholder engagement plan that can help ensure engagement of  
15 an adequate and broad array of relevant stakeholders in future NCD policy formulation,  
16 further ensuring the policy acceptability and effectiveness among stakeholders (Lane et  
17 al., 2020).

18 The findings highlighted persistent institutional and perceptual barriers to effective  
19 multisectoral coordination. Despite the MoHP's efforts to engage non-health ministries  
20 during the policy formulation process, coordination, shared accountability, and sustained  
21 participation remained a significant challenge. These challenges were attributed to  
22 competing priorities and perceptions that NCDs were solely a health sector  
23 responsibility, undermining a whole of government approach. Similar coordination

1 challenges were reported in African LMICs, often due to a lack of clear coordination  
2 mechanisms to guide different inter-sector collaboration (Juma et al., 2018).

3 These findings highlight the need for structured stakeholder engagement strategies.  
4 Engaging diverse sector stakeholders such as civil society and non-health ministries in  
5 the policy formulation process from the start may enable a trusting relationship with the  
6 legislators and allow a “whole of society, whole of government approach” (Loffreda et  
7 al., 2024). Similarly, capacitating leadership across sectors and all government levels to  
8 cultivate champions in different sectors can lead to better policy coherence and  
9 accountability among the multiple sector stakeholders, which is essential to effectively  
10 respond to NCDs (Juma et al., 2018; Loffreda et al., 2024). This approach can enhance  
11 their knowledge about the issue, enabling all to engage more effectively in the policy  
12 process (Latu et al., 2018). Strengthening these mechanisms is essential for effective  
13 multisectoral coordination and sustainable NCD governance in Nepal.

#### 14 **Problem stream: The role of evidence**

15 Recognition of NCD as a public health problem was a gradual process. Initially, limited  
16 local evidence constrained political prioritization. However, the progressive increase in  
17 NCD-related global and local evidence, particularly the Global Burden of Disease study  
18 and STEPS survey, sensitized policymakers to the rising NCD burden and drove  
19 political attention. These findings align with other LMIC studies (Amerzadeh et al., 2020;  
20 Faraji et al., 2015; Lange et al., 2022; Mukanu et al., 2017; Nepal Health Research  
21 Council et al., 2021; Ndinda et al., 2018; Pradhan et al., 2023; Unwin et al., 2017;  
22 Wickramasinghe et al., 2018; ) and support the relevance of the problem stream in  
23 Nepal (Kingdon 1984).

1 The STEPS survey findings were perceived as highly credible as it was conducted by  
2 a government organization closely affiliated with the MoHP and supported by the  
3 WHO. These findings echo studies from Iran, Mozambique, and a recent systematic  
4 review (Amerzadeh et al., 2020; Loffreda et al., 2024; Munguambe et al., 2021).  
5 Evidence produced by institutions with trusted relationships with the MoHP appeared  
6 more influential in the policy formulation process than research from independent  
7 researchers. While institutional trust and proximity enhanced evidence uptake,  
8 reliance on government-affiliated evidence may narrow the scope of evidence. A  
9 South African study highlights the importance of consistent and comparable data in  
10 understanding NCD patterns, informing policy decisions, and achieving the reduction  
11 targets (Ndinda et al., 2018). Strengthening the utilization of diverse, high quality local  
12 research could enhance the inclusivity and robustness of future NCD policymaking.  
13 Moreover, involving MoHP officials or policymakers in research design could enhance  
14 their awareness and appreciation of evidence, thereby improving research uptake.  
15 Low research uptake of NCD research by policymakers was also attributed to  
16 ineffective communication by researchers and evidence sharing at inopportune times  
17 (Barreto et al., 2024). Addressing these barriers requires targeted strategies to tailor  
18 evidence dissemination to policymakers' needs, such that accessibility and timely  
19 availability is ensured.

#### 20 **Policy stream: Adopting the PEN programme**

21 The decision to adopt the PEN programme was largely influenced by global evidence  
22 and WHO advocacy. The WHO advocated PEN adoption and its guidance ensured  
23 that Nepal's policy was evidence informed. These findings were consistent with

1 studies from Mozambique and Afghanistan (Lange et al., 2022; Munguambe et al.,  
2 2021). The institutional trust between the WHO and MoHP further enhanced  
3 policymakers' perceived legitimacy of PEN as a credible and feasible policy option.  
4 These findings aligned with Kingdon's policy stream, where policy communities  
5 develop viable solutions to the identified problems (Kingdon 1984).

6 Unlike contexts like Romania, where policy adoption decision was guided by local  
7 evidence, in Nepal it was mainly based on global evidence and WHO  
8 recommendations. While external support accelerated policy adoption, it also reflects  
9 capacity limitations among national actors to formulate the policy and reliance on  
10 external stakeholders. Similar patterns were observed in other LMICs, underscoring  
11 the necessity to strengthen domestic research capacity, national ownership, contextual  
12 adaptation of strategies, and an evidence-informed policy culture for long term  
13 sustainability and policy success (Essue and Kapiriri 2018; Mamka Anyona et al., 2014;  
14 Wang et al., 2021).

15 A balanced and effective collaboration between global and national actors, where  
16 international support complements local evidence, is essential to ensure that the  
17 policy decisions are feasible, contextually relevant and align with global best practices.  
18 This aligns with Lange et al. (2022), who highlighted the importance of aligning global  
19 strategies like PEN with national needs for effective and sustainable policy  
20 implementation.

21 Financial feasibility emerged as a key concern among policymakers while deciding the  
22 policy option in Nepal due to persistent donor dependency, and limited domestic

1 funding. Challenges in balancing technical feasibility and financial sustainability posed  
2 risks for long-term sustainability of policy interventions, echoing challenges across  
3 LMICs (Essue and Kipiriri 2018; Juma et al., 2018a). Strengthening financial  
4 planning, diversifying funding resources, and embedding NCD interventions within  
5 national budgets could enhance sustainability and reduce reliance on external  
6 sources.

### 7 **Politics stream: International commitments and political will**

8 Political prioritization of NCDs intensified following Nepal's participation in the 2011  
9 UN Political Declaration of High-Level Meeting on Prevention and Control of NCDs.  
10 This event initiated global momentum on NCDs by bringing NCDs to the forefront in  
11 the global discussions and influencing the member states, including the GoN, to  
12 commit to national-level policy actions (United Nations 2011). The event therefore  
13 marked a milestone that facilitated recognition of NCD as a national priority and  
14 formulation of the NCD policies in Nepal. Furthermore, international commitments,  
15 including the SDGs, reinforced NCD prioritization and policy initiatives (United Nations  
16 2015), as also observed in Iran, Zambia, and Barbados (Amerzadeh et al., 2020;  
17 Mukanu et al., 2017; Unwin et al., 2017). This highlights the vital role of global health  
18 governance and international commitments in shaping national priorities and NCD  
19 policy formulation in LMICs.

20 Although the government's participation in global events demonstrated strong political  
21 commitment, Nepal's dependence on donors for financial and technical assistance  
22 constituted a challenge. Donor priorities often focusing on communicable diseases  
23 influenced national priorities. Limited donor funding for NCDs impeded NCD policy

1 expansion and implementation, consistent with findings from Africa (Juma et al.,  
2 2018a; Oladepo 2018). Similar trends were witnessed elsewhere, where policy  
3 priorities aligned with donor-funded areas, demonstrating how donor dependency  
4 shapes national policy directions (Essue and Kapiriri 2018; Wang et al., 2021).  
5 Strengthening domestic resource mobilization, continued advocacy, and fostering  
6 national ownership, are therefore essential to translating political commitments into  
7 effective and sustained policy outcomes.

### 8 **Policy entrepreneurs**

9 The findings showed that the concept of *policy entrepreneurs* among policymakers in  
10 Nepal was relatively unclear and not widely recognized. Although stakeholders did not  
11 formally identify themselves as policy entrepreneurs, their actions demonstrated  
12 entrepreneurial behaviour. For example, the WHO actors, alongside national ones,  
13 played vital roles in raising awareness of NCDs and the need to address them  
14 (according to Kingdon - “soften up”), and recommended policy options that were  
15 technically and financially feasible for the local context and acceptable by  
16 policymakers (“coupling”) (Kingdon 1984). Similar dynamics were witnessed in  
17 Belarus and Barbados (Famenka et al., 2018; Unwin et al., 2017;). Recognizing such  
18 actors’ roles may enhance future policy processes.

### 19 **Application of Multiple Streams Framework: Emergence of a “global stream”**

20 The application of Kingdon’s MSF offered insight into the multifaceted aspects of the  
21 NCD policy formulation process in Nepal. A key finding was the significant influence of  
22 external factors across all three streams- problem, policy, and politics (Figure 1).

1 Global evidence, participation in international health events, global commitments, and  
2 WHO advocacy shaped problem recognition, policy selection and political momentum.  
3 The emergence of what may be conceptualized as a “global stream”, in addition to  
4 Kingdon’s three streams, was evident in Nepal. Nepal’s participation in international  
5 fora, the SDGs, WHO’s advocacy, technical support, and recommendations,  
6 particularly regarding PEN adoption, were key drivers that opened the policy window.  
7 These findings demonstrated the crystallization of a distinct *global stream* that  
8 interacted with the domestic policy processes during the NCD policy formulation.  
9 Understanding the role of external factors is, therefore, essential when assessing the  
10 policy formulation process in LMICs like Nepal, where international actors often play a  
11 significant role in shaping national priorities.

12 Kingdon’s MSF was primarily developed to understand the policymaking process in the  
13 USA, focusing mainly on the role of domestic actors and does not explicitly account for  
14 influence of external dynamics. In Nepal, like many LMICs, global governance  
15 structures significantly influenced national policymaking processes (Hoe et al., 2016;  
16 Smith 2014). Further research is needed to test whether a global stream enhances the  
17 explanatory strength of Kingdon’s MSF in LMIC settings and how this global stream can  
18 be integrated into the theoretical framework.

## 19 **Conclusion**

20 This study examined the NCD policy formulation process in Nepal using Kingdon’s MSF,  
21 contributing to limited empirical evidence on NCD policy formulation in LMICs. The  
22 convergence of global and local evidence, global guidance, feasible policy options, and

1 international political commitments opened a policy window that enabled adoption of the  
2 PEN programme. The STEPS survey findings played central role in NCD recognition,  
3 while WHO guidance and recommendations for the PEN programme provided a feasible  
4 policy option. Political engagement and global commitments further created a supportive  
5 environment for policy adoption, indicating the interaction between domestic and global  
6 forces on the policy process. The findings support the use of Kingdon's MSF to  
7 understand the complex dynamics of NCD policy formulation in Nepal but also suggest  
8 the relevance of an additional global stream.

9 For researchers and policymakers, who are embarking on a similar process to  
10 understand and strengthen the policy process, particularly in LMICs, the study  
11 underscores the importance of strengthening research capacity, institutionalizing  
12 multisectoral coordination, balancing global guidance with national ownership and  
13 enhancing sustainable financial mechanisms (Table 4). These components are  
14 essential to ensure that political prioritization is translated into effective NCD policy  
15 implementation.

16 Insert Table 4 here

## 17 References

18 Ackrill R, Kay A, Zahariadis N. Ambiguity, multiple streams, and EU policy. *Journal of*  
19 *European Public Policy* 2013; 20: 871–887. Doi:  
20 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2013.781824>

21 Amerzadeh M, Salavati S, Takian A. Proactive agenda setting in creation and approval  
22 of national action plan for prevention and control of non-communicable diseases in  
23 Iran: The use of multiple streams model. *Journal of Diabetes and Metabolic Disorders*  
24 2020;31:801-816. Doi: 10.1007/s40200-020-00591-4.

25 Aryal KK, Mehata S, Neupane S. *et al.* The burden and determinants of non  
26 communicable diseases risk factors in Nepal: Findings from a nationwide STEPS  
27 survey. *PloS One* 2015; 10: e0134834. Doi:

1 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0134834>  
2

3 Barreto JOM, de Melo RC, da Silva LALB *et al.* Research evidence communication for  
4 policy-makers: A rapid scoping review on frameworks, guidance and tools, and barriers  
5 and facilitators. *Health Research Policy and Systems* 2024;**22**:9–19. Doi:  
6 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-024-01169-9>  
7

8 Buse K, Mays N, Walt G. *Making health policy* (Second edn). Maidenhead: Open  
9 University Press, 2012.  
10

11 Butler S. Ireland’s public health (alcohol) bill: Policy window or political sop?  
12 *Contemporary Drug Problems* 2015; 42:106–117. Doi:  
13 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091450915579873>  
14

15 Clark T, Foster L. Sloan L *et al.* *Bryman’s Social Research Methods*. Sixth Edition. Oxford:  
16 Oxford University Press, 2021.  
17

18 Crowley K. Irresistible force? Achieving carbon pricing in Australia. *The Australian*  
19 *Journal of Politics and History* 2013; 59: 368–381. Doi:  
20 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajph.12021>  
21

22 Dhimal M, Bista B, Bhattarai S *et al.* *Noncommunicable Disease Risk Factors: STEPS*  
23 *Survey Nepal 2019*. Kathmandu: Nepal Health Research Council, 2019.  
24

25 Department of Health Services. *Annual Report (2021/22)*. Kathmandu: Government of  
26 Nepal, Department of Health Services, 2023.  
27

28 Department of Health Services. *Annual Health Report 2079/80*. Ministry of Health and  
29 Population, 2024. <https://hmis.gov.np/media/51/Annual-Health-Report-207980.pdf>  
30

31 Department of Health Services. *Annual Health Report 2080/81*. Ministry of Health and  
32 Population, 2025. [https://hmis.gov.np/media/40/Annual-Health-Report-](https://hmis.gov.np/media/40/Annual-Health-Report-208081_compressed.pdf)  
33 [208081\\_compressed.pdf](https://hmis.gov.np/media/40/Annual-Health-Report-208081_compressed.pdf)  
34

35

36 Duke K, Herring R, Thickett A *et al.* Substitution treatment in the era of ‘Recovery’: An  
37 analysis of stakeholder roles and policy windows in Britain. *Substance Use & Misuse*  
38 2013; 48: 966–976. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.3109/10826084.2013.797727>  
39

1 Dykeman S, Williams AM. Agenda-setting for Canadian caregivers: Using media analysis  
2 of the maternity leave benefit to inform the compassionate care benefit. *BMC Women's*  
3 *Health* 2014; 14: 60. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6874-14-60>  
4

5 Essue BM, Kapiriri L. The unfunded priorities: An evaluation of priority setting for  
6 noncommunicable disease control in Uganda. *Globalization and Health* 2018;**14**:22.  
7 Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-018-0324-2>  
8

9 Exworthy M, Powell M. Big windows and little windows: Implementation in the  
10 'Congested State'. *Public Administration (London)* 2004; 82: 263–281. Doi:  
11 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0033-3298.2004.00394.x>  
12

13 Famenka A, Berdyklychev B, Rusovich V *et al.* Accelerating the response to  
14 noncommunicable diseases in Belarus: The role of focusing events and policy  
15 entrepreneurs in enabling policy transfer. *Public Health Panorama* 2018;**4**:232–9.  
16

17 Faraji O, Etemad K, Akbari Sari A *et al.* Policies and programs for prevention and  
18 control of diabetes in Iran: A document analysis. *Global Journal of Health Science*  
19 2015;**7**:187–97. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.5539/gjhs.v7n6p187>  
20

21 Goldsmith L. Using framework analysis in applied qualitative research. *The Qualitative*  
22 *Report* 2021; 26: 2061-2076. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2021.5011>  
23

24 Government of Nepal. Multisectoral Action Plan for the Prevention and Control of *Non*  
25 *Communicable Diseases (2014–2020)*. Kathmandu: Government of Nepal, 2014.  
26

27 Government of Nepal. *Constitution of Nepal*. Government of Nepal, 2015.  
28 <https://lawcommission.gov.np/category/1807/>  
29  
30

31 Gyawali B, Khanal P, Mishra SR *et al.* Building strong primary health care to tackle  
32 the growing burden of non-communicable diseases in Nepal. *Global Health Action*  
33 2020;**13**:1788262–1788262. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/16549716.2020.1788262>  
34

35 Hammersley M. *Questioning qualitative inquiry: Critical essays*. London: Sage, 2008.  
36

37 Health and Global Policy Institute & NCD Alliance. *Policy recommendations – Further*  
38 *promoting patient and public involvement in the policy-making process*. 2022.  
39 <https://ncdjapan.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/Policy>  
40 Recommendations\_Further-Promoting-Patient-and-Public-Involvement-in-the-Policy

1 Making-Process\_ENG\_20220701.pdf  
2  
3 Hoe C, Rodriguez DC, Uzumcuoglu Y *et al.* “Quitting like a Turk:” How political  
4 priority developed for tobacco control in Turkey. *Social Science & Medicine* (1982)  
5 2016;**165**:36–45. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.07.027>  
6  
7 Jansson EV, Tillgren PE. Health promotion at local level: A case study of content,  
8 organization and development in four Swedish municipalities. *BMC Public Health*  
9 2010; 10: 455. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-10-455>  
10  
11 Jones S, Ownsworth T, Shum DHK. Feasibility and utility of telephone-based  
12 psychological support for people with brain tumor: A single-case experimental study.  
13 *Front Oncology* 2015;**5**:71. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2015.00071>  
14  
15 Jones MD, Peterson HL, Pierce JJ *et al.* A river runs through it: A multiple streams meta-  
16 review. *Policy Studies Journal* 2016; 44: 13–36. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12115>  
17  
18 Juma PA, Mapa-Tassou C, Mohamed SF *et al.* Multi-sectoral action in non-  
19 communicable disease prevention policy development in five African countries. *BMC*  
20 *Public Health* 2018, 18: 953. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-018-5826-6>  
21 Juma PA, Mohamed SF, Matanje Mwagomba BL *et al.* Non-communicable disease  
22 prevention policy process in five African countries. *BMC Public Health* 2018a;**18**:1–  
23 12. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-018-5825-7>  
24  
25 Kingdon JW. *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies*. Brown and Company, 1984.  
26  
27 Kingdon JW. *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies*. Longman, 2011.  
28  
29 Lane J, Andrews G, Orange E *et al.* Strengthening health policy development and  
30 management systems in low- and middle- income countries: South Africa’s approach.  
31 *Health Policy OPEN* 2020;**1**:100010–100010. Doi:  
32 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hpopen.2020.100010>  
33  
34 Lange IL, Feroz F, Naeem AJ *et al.* The development of Afghanistan’s integrated  
35 package of essential health services: Evidence, expertise and ethics in a priority  
36 setting process. *Social Science & Medicine* 2022;**305**:115010–115010. Doi:  
37 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2022.115010>

- 1  
2 Latu C, Moodie M, Coriakula J *et al.* Barriers and facilitators to food policy  
3 development in Fiji. *Food and Nutrition Bulletin* 2018; 39:621-631. Doi:  
4 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0379572118797083>
- 5 Li J, Pandian V, Davidson PM *et al.* Burden and attributable risk factors of non-  
6 communicable diseases and subtypes in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2021: A  
7 systematic analysis for the global burden of disease study 2021. *International Journal*  
8 *of Surgery* 2025; 111: 23852397. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1097/JS9.0000000000002260>
- 9  
10 Liu X, Lindquist E, Vedlitz A *et al.* Understanding local policymaking: Policy elites'  
11 perceptions of local agenda setting and alternative policy selection. *Policy Studies*  
12 *Journal* 2010; 38: 69–91. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.2009.00345.x>
- 13  
14 Loffreda G, Arakelyan S, Bou-Orm I *et al.* Barriers and opportunities for WHO “Best  
15 Buys” non-communicable disease policy adoption and implementation from a political  
16 economy perspective: A complexity systematic review. *International Journal of Health*  
17 *Policy and Management* 2024; **13**:7989– 14. Doi:  
18 <https://doi.org/10.34172/ijhpm.2023.7989>
- 19  
20 Malterud K, Siersma VD, Guassora AD. Sample Size in Qualitative Interview Studies:  
21 Guided by Information Power. *Qualitative Health Research* 2016; 26: 1753-60. Doi:  
22 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732315617444>
- 23  
24 Mamka Anyona R, de Courten M, An Analysis of the policy environment  
25 surrounding noncommunicable diseases risk factor surveillance in Kenya. *AIMS*  
26 *Public Health* 2014; **1**:256–74. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.3934/publichealth.2014.4.256>
- 27  
28 Ministry of Health and Population. *National Health Policy 2014*. Kathmandu:  
29 Government of Nepal, Ministry of Health and Population, 2014.
- 30  
31 Ministry of Health and Population. *National Health Policy 2019*. Kathmandu:  
32 Government of Nepal, Ministry of Health and Population, 2019.
- 33  
34 Mukanu MM, Zulu JM, Mweemba C *et al.* Responding to non-communicable  
35 diseases in Zambia: A policy analysis. *Health Research Policy and Systems*  
36 2017; **15**:34. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-017-0195-7>
- 37  
38 Munguambe KR, Madede T, Muchanga V *et al.* The reality of the noncommunicable  
39 disease policy landscape in low income countries: The example of Mozambique.  
40 2021. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-240060/v1>

- 1  
2 Ndinda C, Ndhlovu TP, Juma P *et al.* The evolution of non-communicable diseases  
3 policies in post-apartheid South Africa. *BMC Public Health* 2018;**18**:956–956. Doi:  
4 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-018-5832-8>  
5  
6 Nepal Health Research Council, Ministry of Health and Population, Institute for  
7 Health Metrics and Evaluation *et al.* *Nepal Burden of Disease 2019: A Country*  
8 *Report Based on the 2019 Global Burden of Disease Study.* Nepal Health Research  
9 Council, Ministry of Health and Population, Institute for Health Metrics and  
10 Evaluation and Monitoring Evaluation and Operational Research, 2021.  
11  
12 Noy C. Sampling knowledge: The hermeneutics of snowball sampling in qualitative  
13 research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 2008;**11**:327–44.  
14 Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645570701401305>  
15  
16 Oladepo O, Oluwasanu M, Abiona O. Analysis of tobacco control policies in Nigeria:  
17 Historical development and application of multi-sectoral action. *BMC Public Health*  
18 2018;**18**:959–959. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-018-5831-9>  
19  
20 Oltmer M, Lohr M. Tracing actors in policy mixes for transitions: A systematic literature  
21 review and insights from policy process theories. *Environmental Innovation and Societal*  
22 *Transitions* 2025; **56**: 100989. Doi: [https://doi-](https://doi-org.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/10.1016/j.eist.2025.100989)  
23 [org.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/10.1016/j.eist.2025.100989](https://doi-org.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/10.1016/j.eist.2025.100989)  
24  
25 Padgett DK. *Qualitative methods in social work research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2017.  
26  
27 Patton MQ. *Qualitative research and evaluation methods: Integrating theory and*  
28 *practice.* London: Sage, 2015.  
29  
30 Pradhan PMS, Bhatt RD, Pandit R *et al.* Needs assessment of leadership and  
31 governance in cardiovascular health in Nepal. *Journal of Hypertension*  
32 2023;**41**:e491. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/01.hjh.0000917932.09373.47>  
33  
34 Rawat P, Morris JC. Kingdon's 'Streams' model at thirty: Still relevant in the 21st  
35 century? *Politics & Policy* 2016; **44**:608–638. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/polp.12168>

- 1
- 2 Ritchie J, Spencer L. Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research. In: Bryman  
3 A, Burgess R.G. (eds.), *Analyzing qualitative data*. London: Routledge, 1994, 173-194.  
4
- 5 Roth GA, Abate D, Abate KH *et al.* Global, regional, and national age-sex-specific  
6 mortality for 282 causes of death in 195 countries and territories 1980–2017: A  
7 systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. *The Lancet (British  
8 edition)* 2018;**392**:1736–88. Doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)32203-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32203-7)  
9
- 10 Saetren H. Lost in translation: Re-conceptualising the multiple-streams framework  
11 back to its source of inspiration. In Zohlnfer R, Rub FW (Eds.), *Decision-making under  
12 ambiguity and time constraints: Assessing the multiple-streams framework*. ECPR  
13 Press, 2016, 21–33.  
14
- 15 Sanni S, Wisdom JP, Ayo-Yusuf, OA *et al.* Multi-sectoral approach to  
16 noncommunicable disease prevention policy in Sub-Saharan Africa: A conceptual  
17 framework for analysis. *International Journal of Health Services* 2019; 49: 371–392.  
18 Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020731418774203>  
19
- 20 Sharma SR, Page R, Matheson A *et al.* Non-communicable disease prevention in  
21 Nepal: Systemic challenges and future directions. *Global Health Promotion* 2019; 26: 94-  
22 97. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1757975917720800>  
23
- 24 Shiroya V, Neuhann F, Muller O *et al.* Challenges in policy reforms for non-  
25 communicable diseases: The case of diabetes in Kenya. *Global Health Action*  
26 2019;12: 1611243. Doi: [https://doi-  
27 org.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/10.1080/16549716.2019.1611243](https://doi-org.libaccess.hud.ac.uk/10.1080/16549716.2019.1611243)
- 28 Simanjuntak I, Frantzeskaki N, Enserink B *et al.* Evaluating Jakarta’s flood defence  
29 governance: The impact of political and institutional reforms. *Water Policy* 2012; 14:  
30 561–580. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.2166/wp.2012.119>
- 31 Singh DR, Sah RK, Simkhada B *et al.* Potentials and challenges of using co-design in  
32 health services research in low-and middle-income countries. *Global Health Research  
33 and Policy* 2023; 8: 5. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41256-023-00290-6>
- 34 Smith SL, Shiffman J, Kazembe A. Generating political priority for newborn survival  
35 in three low-income countries. *Global Public Health* 2014;**9**:538–54. Doi:  
36 <https://doi.org/10.1080/17441692.2014.904918>  
37
- 38 Smith V. *Bargaining power: Health policymaking from England and New Zealand*. Springer  
39 Singapore, 2018. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-7602-2>  
40

1 Spencer L, Ritchie J, Conner WO *et al.* Analysis in practice. In: Ritchie J, Lewis, J,  
2 McNaughton Nicholls, S *et al.* (eds). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social*  
3 *science students and researchers (Second Ed.)*. London: Sage, 2014, 295-345.

4  
5 Spohr F. Path-departing labour-market reforms in the United Kingdom and Sweden: An  
6 analysis combining the multiple-streams framework and historical institutionalism. In  
7 Rub F, Zohlnhofer R (Eds.), *Decision-making under ambiguity and time constraints:*  
8 *Assessing the multiple-streams framework*. ECPR Press, 2016.

9  
10 Stephens J., Simkhad P, van Teijlingen E *et al.* An analysis of Nepal's Draft Mental Health  
11 Acts 2006–2017: competing values and power. *Health Policy and Planning* 2024;39:499-  
12 508. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czae023>

13  
14 Tobacco Control Laws. *Nepal health warnings challenge*. 2014.  
15 [https://www.tobaccocontrolaws.org/litigation/decisions/nepal-health-warnings-](https://www.tobaccocontrolaws.org/litigation/decisions/nepal-health-warnings-challenge)  
16 [challenge](https://www.tobaccocontrolaws.org/litigation/decisions/nepal-health-warnings-challenge)

17  
18 United Nations. *Political declaration of the high-level meeting of the general*  
19 *assembly on the prevention and control of non-communicable diseases*. New York:  
20 United Nations, 2011.

21  
22 United Nations. Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable  
23 Development. Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform. 2015.  
24 <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda> (29 May 2025, last accessed).

25  
26 Unwin N, Samuels TA, Hassell T *et al.* The development of public policies to address non-  
27 communicable diseases in the Caribbean country of Barbados: The importance of  
28 problem framing and policy entrepreneurs. *International Journal of Health Policy and*  
29 *Management* 2017;6:71–82. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.15171/ijhpm.2016.74>

30  
31 Wang H, Chukwuma A, Comsa R *et al.* Generating political priority for primary health  
32 care reform in Romania. *Health Systems and Reform* 2021;7:e1898187–e1898187.

33  
34 World Health Organization. *Global action plan for the prevention and control of*  
35 *noncommunicable diseases 2013-2020*. World Health Organization, 2013a.  
36 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241506236>

37  
38 World Health Organization. *Implementation tools: Package of essential*  
39 *noncommunicable (PEN) disease interventions for primary health care in low-resource*

1 settings. World Health Organization, 2013b. <https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/133525>  
2

3 World Health Organization. Noncommunicable diseases factsheet. *World Health*  
4 *Organization* 2018. [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/noncommunicable-diseases)  
5 [sheets/detail/noncommunicable-diseases](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/noncommunicable-diseases) (29 May 2025, last accessed).  
6

7 World Health Organization. *World Health Statistics Overview 2019: Monitoring*  
8 *Health for the SDGs, Sustainable Development Goals*. World Health Organization,  
9 2019.  
10

11 World Health Organization. *Package of essential non communicable disease (PEN)*  
12 *intervention at primary health service setting: PEN training trainee's manual*. World  
13 Health Organization, 2019a. <https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/310930>  
14  
15

16 World Health Organization. *Noncommunicable diseases: NCD risk factors*. World  
17 Health Organization 2025. [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/noncommunicable-diseases)  
18 [sheets/detail/noncommunicable-diseases](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/noncommunicable-diseases) (29 May 2025, last accessed).  
19  
20

21 Wickramasinghe K, Wilkins E, Foster C *et al*. The development of national  
22 multisectoral action plans for the prevention and control of noncommunicable diseases:  
23 Experiences of national-level stakeholders in four countries. *Global Health Action*  
24 2018;**11**:1532632–8. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/16549716.2018.1532632>  
25

26 Yin RK. *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2014.  
27

28 You J, Ganann R, Wilson M *et al*. Public engagement in health policy making for older  
29 adults: A systematic search and scoping review. *Health Expectations* 2024; 27: e70008.  
30 Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.70008>  
31

32 Zohlnhofer RR, Friedbert W. *Decision-making under ambiguity and time constraints:*  
33 *Assessing the multiple-streams framework*. NBN International, 2016.  
34

1 **Legends**

2

3 **List of figures**

4 Figure 1. Non-communicable diseases policy formulation process in Nepal.

5

6 **List of tables**

7 Table 1. Overview of non-communicable diseases

8

9 Table 2. List of reviewed documents

10

11 Table 3. Participant characteristics

12

13 Table 4. Policy and practice recommendations

14

15 *Table 1: Overview of non-communicable diseases policies*

Policies	Focus
National Health Policy 2014	It focuses on universal access to health services, basic health services, health financing, governance and human resources.
Multisectoral action plan for prevention and control of NCDs (2014-2020)	It mainly focuses on prevention of NCDs, including lifestyle and behaviour change (tobacco and alcohol control), strengthening PHC, monitoring and supervision, and multi-sectoral coordination.
National Health Policy 2019	It focuses on more comprehensive health services such as Universal Health Coverage, integrated services (promotive, curative, rehabilitative, and palliative), financing, governance, and health information systems.
Package of essential non communicable disease (PEN) intervention at primary health service setting: PEN training trainee's manual	PEN interventions have four simplified protocols. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Protocol 1: Heart attack, stroke and kidney disease prevention via integrated management of diabetes and hypertension.</li> <li>ii. Protocol 2: Health education and counselling on healthy behaviours.</li> <li>iii. Protocol 3: Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease and Asthma Management</li> </ol>

---

iv. Protocol 4: Assessment and referral of women with suspected cancer (breast and cervix)

The main objectives of PEN interventions are (i) strengthen the health system to prevent and control NCDs and their risk factors through PHC services, (ii) strengthen capacity and coordination at the national and local levels for effective NCD prevention and control, (iii) Reduce NCD-related modifiable risk factors and social determinants through health promotion initiatives.

---

1 NCDs: Non-communicable disease; PEN: Package of Essential Non-communicable  
2 diseases; PHC: Primary Health Care.

3

4 Table 2: List of reviewed documents

Author	Name of the document
World Health Organization, 2013a	Global action plan for the prevention and control of noncommunicable diseases 2013-2020.
World Health Organization, 2013b	Implementation tools: Package of essential noncommunicable (PEN) disease interventions for primary health care in low-resource settings.
Ministry of Health and Population, 2014	National Health Policy 2014
Government of Nepal, 2014	Multisectoral Action Plan for Prevention and Control of Non-communicable Diseases (2014-2020)
Government of Nepal, 2015	Constitution of Nepal
Ministry of Health and Population, 2019	National Health Policy 2019
World Health Organisation et al., 2019	Package of Essential Non communicable Disease (PEN) intervention at primary health service setting: PEN training trainee's manual
Department of Health Services, 2023	Annual Report (2021/22)
Department of Health Services, 2024	Annual Health Report 2079/80
Department of Health Services, 2025	Annual Health Report 2080/81

5

1 Table 3: Participant characteristics

Type of respondent	Total number
Government actors	8
Ministry of Health and Population (1)	
Government organization (2)	
Research/Academic institutions (3)	
Hospital (2)	
Non-government actors	4
International organization (1)	
NGOs/Civil Society Organization (2)	
Research/Academic institutions (1)	

2 NGOs: Non-governmental organizations

3


ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

1 Table 4: Policy and practice recommendations

Challenges	Possible policy response
Limited involvement of relevant stakeholders in the policy formulation process due to a lack of stakeholder analysis framework	Adopt a comprehensive stakeholder selection approach to ensure inclusiveness and engagement of relevant stakeholders.
Limited engagement of non-health stakeholders in the policy formulation process	Enhance awareness about multi-faceted nature of NCDs, importance of addressing them, and how non-health stakeholders can contribute to addressing these issues.
Sporadic, individualized and limited advocacy efforts for NCDs.	Promote a more systematic and coordinated approach to advocacy for NCDs.
Limited uptake of local evidence by policymakers	Establish effective mechanism to integrate local and context specific evidence in policy decisions. Improve communication and collaboration between researchers and policymakers.
Reliance on external stakeholders to formulate the policy due to limited capacity of national actors	Strengthen capacity of national stakeholders to generate, interpret and use evidence. This approach can enable them to better contextualise policy decisions and align with both country's needs and global guidelines.

2 NCD: Non-communicable disease

3



1  
2  
3

Figure 1  
165x165 mm (x DPI)