

# A review of reviews exploring patient and public involvement in population health research and development of tools containing best practice guidance

Vinnicombe, Soo; Silveira Bianchim, Mayara; Noyes, Jane

#### **BMC** Public Health

DOI: 10.1186/s12889-023-15937-9

Published: 30/06/2023

Peer reviewed version

Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication

*Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA):* Vinnicombe, S., Silveira Bianchim, M., & Noyes, J. (2023). A review of reviews exploring patient and public involvement in population health research and development of tools containing best practice guidance. BMC Public Health, 23(1), Article 1271. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-15937-9

#### Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

• Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.

- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

#### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1	
2	
3	
4	A review of reviews exploring patient and public involvement in
5	population health research and development of tools containing
6	best practice guidance
7	
8	Soo Vinnicombe <sup>1</sup> , Mayara S. Bianchim <sup>1</sup> , Jane Noyes <sup>1*</sup>
9 10	<sup>1</sup> School of Medical and Health Sciences, Bangor University, Bangor, UK
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	*Corresponding author
18	Email: Jane.Noyes@bangor.ac.uk
19	
20	
21	

### 22 Abstract

23

24 Introduction: Patient and public involvement (PPI) is increasingly seen as something that is integral to research and of importance to research funders. There is general recognition that PPI is the right 25 thing to do for both moral and practical reasons. The aim of this review of reviews is to examine how 26 PPI can be done 'properly' by looking at the evidence that exists from published reviews and 27 28 assessing it against the UK Standards for Public Involvement in Research, as well as examining the 29 specific features of population health research that can make PPI more challenging. Methods: A review of reviews and development of best practice guidance was carried out following 30 31 the 5-stage Framework Synthesis method. 32 **Results**: In total 31 reviews were included. There is a lack of current research or clarity around 33 Governance and Impact when findings are mapped against UK Standards for Public Involvement in 34 Research. It was also clear that there is little knowledge around PPI with under-represented groups. 35 There are gaps in knowledge about how to ensure key specific attributes of population health research are addressed for PPI team members - particularly around how to deal with complexity and the data-36 driven nature of the research. Two tools were produced for researchers and PPI members to further 37 38 improve their PPI activity within population health research and health research more generally: A 39 framework of recommended actions to address PPI in population health research, and guidance on integrating PPI based on the UK Standards for Public Involvement in Research. 40

41 Conclusions: Facilitating PPI in population health research is challenging due to the nature of this
42 type of research and there is far less evidence on how to do PPI well in this context. The tools can
43 help researchers identify key aspects of PPI that can be integrated when designing PPI within projects.
44 Findings also highlight specific areas where more research or discussion is needed.

### 45 Keywords

46 Public and patient involvement, involvement, PPI, population health research, review of reviews,47 guidance

## 48 Background

49

50 The focus of this review of reviews is on Public and Patient involvement (PPI) in population health 51 research and the subsequent development of best practice guidance to further improve PPI practice. PPI is increasingly seen as something that is integral to research and of importance to research 52 funders. For our purposes, PPI is defined as 'research that is developed with the public'. Specifically, 53 54 patients or members of the public with relevant lived experience can be involved at any stage of the research project, including the research design, delivery and dissemination. When done well, PPI is 55 fundamental to protect and promote the interests of patients and the public, and it also helps to create 56 57 research that is more relevant, with clearer outcomes and impact (1). More practical benefits of including PPI in research are reduced waste and improved quality (2). High quality impactful research 58 59 addressing population health issues with planned and integrated PPI is needed now more than ever given the recent global Covid 19 pandemic where research was commonly conducted in isolation of 60 PPI, and the public lacked trust in some of the evidence produced (such as compulsory stay at home 61 62 orders and mask wearing) (3).

Defining when PPI is done well and has been effective has also been challenging for researchers to articulate. Research funders commonly set out expectations for including PPI in research studies but there is less acknowledgement as to what is sufficient PPI, what 'good' PPI looks like and what impact PPI has had on the research outcomes. In the UK, six standards (4) have been published as to what 'good PPI' looks like in relation to quality and consistency of involvement (see methods section for further details). Researchers are also increasingly reporting the outcomes of PPI on their research as well as the outcomes of the study (5,6).

It is important to highlight that public involvement is not the same as taking part in a study as a
research participant. Public involvement is not the same as public engagement. The latter refers to the
process of engagement to obtain feedback and sharing research findings with the public (1). There is
however sometimes confusion between what constitutes public engagement compared with
involvement. In some countries, such as Canada, it is also common to use 'public engagement' to

refer to public involvement (7). Similarly, the lines between stakeholder representation and public or
patient representation can sometimes be blurred.

77

## 78 **Population health research**

79

80 'Population health' is associated with several definitions and nuances and there is overlap with public health and aspects of more general health research. The King's Fund defined population health as: 81 82 Research that is designed with the aim to benefit the health of a population. It focuses on improving outcomes such as physical and mental health and wellbeing of a determined population while 83 84 reducing health inequalities. It can include the goals of reducing illnesses or/and delivering health and 85 care services. Population health focuses on the wider determinants of health and it can involve 86 communities and partner agencies (8). 87 'Public health', by comparison, can be defined as: Activities to strengthen public health capacities and service aims to provide conditions under which people can maintain their health, improve their health 88 89 and wellbeing, or prevent the deterioration of their health. Public health focuses on the entire 90 spectrum of health and wellbeing, not only the eradication of particular diseases (9). 91 Some refer to Public Health (note the capitalisation) as specifically about activities and interventions carried out by government agencies, health professionals, or other centralised bodies whereas 92 population health includes other, non-health related, influences such as housing, transport and 93 94 education. In reality, these various definitions can oversimplify our understanding and a rigid adherence to a perceived difference between the terms may serve to disguise relevant information 95 96 about successful PPI activity. For Diez-Roux, what really matters are the answers and actions arising from the questions raised regarding the health of the public, and everything else is a semantic 97 discussion (10). 98

99

# Specific challenges of integrating PPI in population health research

Population health research, or health research that considers population level questions, provides
challenges in terms of PPI that are not always present in condition-specific research projects. For
example:

Duration. Population health research often looks at health variables across a long period of
 time. This makes recruiting and retaining suitable PPI representation across the length of the
 project more challenging. Changes in personnel, in all parts of the research team and
 partners, can be expected in any project.

• Complexity. Population health is often multi-disciplinary and looks at health as the product 110 of multiple determinants (such as biology, genetics, behaviours, social and environmental 111 aspects) as well as looking at their interactions among individuals and groups and across time 112 and generations. With all these different variants involved it can be difficult for a lay person 113 to understand the complexity – or, to put it another way, for the researchers to explain the 114 research in a way that a lay person can understand. It may often be the case that a different 115 skill set, and therefore potentially a different person, is necessary at different stages of the 116 117 research or for different workstreams – something that applies to researchers as well as to PPI representatives. 118

Data-driven. Population health projects are often driven by large datasets and can involve
 knowledge of algorithms, advanced statistics, and analytical techniques that can be unfriendly
 to the non-mathematically minded. It can be a challenge for researchers to 'translate' both the
 process and the outcomes of their research in terms that can be more widely understood. This
 is one reason why PPI can be so helpful in such projects. For example, helping to design
 dissemination activity that is meaningful to a broad audience.

Representation. Population health research often addresses large and diverse population groups within the populations being researched, which raises issues about the PPI being representative. Even within disease-specific studies it is often difficult, if not practically impossible, to recruit someone who truly represents the breadth of people with a certain condition. Once that issue is expanded out to wider populations, the issue of true 130 representation is multiplied many times. Representation becomes particularly difficult with certain demographic groups which may be grouped together for convenience, but which 131 might hide a variety of differences. A prime example of this is the involvement of ethnic 132 133 minority communities – recruiting a single person of ethnic minority background risks 134 subsuming important differences according to specific cultural, genetic, class, education and 135 other factors. There is also an ongoing debate about terminology such as 'hard to reach', 'under-represented', 'seldom heard' and 'under-served' which often have problematic 136 137 resonances (11). The definition of 'under-served' is highly context-specific; it will depend on 138 the population, the condition under study, the question being asked by research teams, and the intervention being tested. No single, simple definition can encompass all under-served groups 139 140 (12).

# The need for a review of reviews and new guidance

As described above, population health presents specific challenges for researchers and there is a lack 143 144 of guidance on doing PPI well in population health research. Scoping searches identified a number of reviews of PPI involvement covering population health, public health as well as other more general 145 reviews that included population and public health studies of interest. None of the published reviews 146 had a specific focus on what worked to deliver optimal PPI in population health research. As core 147 researchers with the National Centre for Population Health and Wellbeing Research in Wales 148 (NCPHWR) (https://ncphwr.org.uk/), we were tasked with developing guidance to fill this identified 149 gap. We therefore decided to undertake a review of reviews to explore the challenges and solutions to 150 151 carrying out PPI well in population health research and to produce guidance to support further development of PPI practice in this field. Four tools reporting best practice guidance and highlighting 152 key resources were subsequently developed to further improve the quality of PPI activities in 153 154 population health research.

## 156 Materials and methods

157

158	This review of reviews assembled and interpreted the evidence on PPI involvement in population
159	health research. Question formulation was underpinned by the ECLIPSE (Expectation, Client Group,
160	Location, Professionals and Service) framework that is acknowledged to be most suitable for
161	searching for health policy or health management information (13).
162	We developed the following question: What evidence exists concerning the successful development,
163	implementation and evaluation of patient and public involvement activity or models in population
164	health research in the UK and equivalent health systems?
165	
166 167	Inclusion criteria
168	• Type of study: systematic and other reviews that focus on the concept of, or approaches to,
169	PPI and/or PPE (patient and public engagement) across population health, public health,
170	health and social care. Limited to systematic reviews, narrative reviews, literature reviews,
171	bibliometric reviews, scoping reviews and meta-analyses. Quantitative, qualitative and
172	mixed-methods reviews were of interest.
173	• Setting: any organisational setting that includes population health, public health, health or
174	social care aspects (e.g., primary care, mental health, hospital, tertiary care, voluntary, etc.).
175	• Type of involvement: not just being part of the research as a participant but being involved in
176	part or all of the following stages - research development, research monitoring, research
177	analysis and dissemination.
178	
179 180	Exclusion Criteria

• Articles not in English.

Reviews published before 2010. However, the timeframes for the primary studies included in
 the reviews varied and could go back to the inception of various databases. This timeframe
 was considered appropriate as public and patient involvement is something that has been
 developing rapidly in recent years and was not really established as a well-recognised term
 before then.

187

## **188** Search Strategy

189

An information scientist undertook the initial search of the Medline and PubMed databases. The full search strategy is included in supplementary file 1. The Involve Evidence Library was searched for 'systematic reviews'. Note that this library only includes references up to 2015. The original search was done in May 2020 with a follow up search (stages 2 and 3) carried out early in September 2021 to pick up new reviews up to end of August 2021.

#### 195 Screening

196

197 Titles and abstracts were screened to identify reviews that met the inclusion criteria. Potentially
198 relevant reviews were retrieved and the full text assessed for inclusion (Figure 1). The process was
199 undertaken by SV and independently checked by JN.

200

## 201 Quality appraisal

202

203 Originally the AMSTAR2 (14), method was trialled on six reviews but as most of the included

reviews were qualitative rather than quantitative many of the AMSTAR2 domains did not apply so we

switched to using CASP for systematic reviews (15). Included reviews were quality appraised by SV

and independently checked by JN (see supplementary file 2 for results of quality assessments).

207 Reviews were not excluded at this stage on methodological grounds as the focus was on PPI processes

208 reported in the review.

# 210 Data extraction and synthesis

212	Studies included in source reviews were mapped for duplication and this was taken account of in the						
213	analysis and synthesis. As this review of reviews did not require a transformative method of data						
214	synthesis to better understand the descriptive accounts of PPI in the source reviews, we selected the						
215	aggregative 5-stage Framework synthesis method for integrating evidence of interest from diverse						
216	review designs and to identify examples of best practice.						
217	It is a matrix-based method involving the construction of a priori thematic categories into which data						
218	can be coded (16). The five stages are:						
219	• Familiarisation						
220	• Identifying a thematic framework						
221	• Indexing						
222	Charting						
223	• Mapping and interpretation						
224	Initial data extraction was carried out against a framework designed by the authors based on close						
225	examination of background literature, initial review readings and a desire to identify best practice.						
226	(Table 1).						
227							
228							
229							
230							
231							
232							
233							

#### 234 Table 1. Initial framework: headings and details

Main info	Title			
	Authors			
Extracted information	Year published			
	Type of review			
	Area of focus			
	No. of studies			
	No. of papers			
	Full list			
	Databases searched			
	Other searches			
	Years searched			
	Exclusions			
	Geography			
	Methods used			
	Included PPI in own review			
Why do PPI?	Attribute			
	Who benefits?			
	Evidence for			
	Evidence against			
How to do PPI – especially in	Attribute – barrier			
population health research	Stage affected			
	Mitigation			
	Attribute - facilitator			
	Stage affected			
	Good practice			
Terminology	Types of PPI			
	Stages of research			
	Other			
Other	Gaps in Knowledge			
	Country specific legislation/ guidance			
	Case studies?			

235

236 Extracted data were subsequently mapped against a second framework (Table 2) and matched against

the UK Standards for Public Involvement to identify examples of solutions to problems and best

238 practice (4).

239

240

#### 242 Table 2. Secondary framework: thematic mapping

	Challenges			Solutions			
	Study	id	Problem	Consequence	Study id	Solution	Details
243 244	The UI	K Standard	ds for Public Invo	olvement are:			
245	•	Inclusive	e Opportunities -	Offer public invo	lvement opportu	nities that are acco	essible and that
246		reach peo	ople and groups a	according to resea	arch needs.		
247	•	Working	Together - Worl	k together in a wa	y that values all c	contributions, and	l that builds and
248		sustains	sustains mutually respectful and productive relationships.				
249	•	Support a	Support and Learning - Offer and promote support and learning that builds confidence and				
250		skills for	skills for public involvement in research.				
251	•	Governance - Involve the public in research management, regulation, leadership and decision					
252		making.					
253	•	Commur	nications - Use pl	ain language for	well-timed and re	levant communic	cations, as part of
254		involven	nent plans and ac	tivities.			
255	•	Impact -	Seek improveme	ent by identifying	and sharing the d	lifference that pul	blic involvement
256		makes to	research (4).				

## 257 **Development of tools containing best practice guidance**

258 Selected tables developed to display examples of best practice mapped against the UK standards for

259 PPI as part of the mapping and charting of the Framework synthesis easily translated with minor

editing into tools outlining best practice principles for researchers and PPI (Supplemental file 4).

261 These resources were shared with members of the NCPHWR and PPI members for feedback.

#### 263 **Public and patient involvement**

This review of reviews included PPI input, specifically, the draft review was read and commented on several times throughout its development by two PPI members from the Centre for Population Health Patient and Public Involvement Advisory Group. This PPI group meets quarterly to help set the strategic direction for PPI within the Centre.

268

## 269 **Results**

270 Thirty-one reviews were included covering around one thousand individual studies, which were

271 mainly based in the UK or USA. We took note of any duplication of studies across reviews to ensure

that we were not double counting the evidence.

273 The studies covered a range of settings and subject areas (see supplementary file 3 for a description of

all included studies). Reviews varied in quality (see supplementary file 2 for results of quality

assessments) but as the review methods and findings were not the primary phenomenon of interest,

we did not place a lot of emphasis on the quality of the source reviews when interpreting findings.

277 Specifically, the reviews covered, to varying degrees, three out of the four challenges, outlined earlier,278 that set population health research apart from many other research types.

**Representation** was extensively discussed in the studies reviewed. It is an aspect of PPI that does not have a simple solution for any type of research project. For population health projects that tend to be longer in duration, it may be that different people need to take part in different periods of the project and, for complex projects, that different people need to be involved in different work streams. Boote (17) noted a concern that PPI representatives taking part in research over time may become 'professionalised' and come to see things from the point of view of the research team rather than as a member of the public or patient demographic. 286 Complexity was also discussed when talking about support and learning requirements for PPI 287 members. Population health projects are often highly complex but, given the right support and 288 training, that is not a sufficient reason to exclude PPI activity.

The **data-driven** aspect was touched upon mainly in terms of ensuring that project specific training and support was available. Many population health projects include aspects of Big Data which can add a layer of difficulty to PPI activity, but which can also be addressed by considering tailored training and support. Having non-data experts involved in such projects may help when designing dissemination and communication activities around the project so that they can eventually be more accessible to a wider audience.

295 Duration was the only aspect that was not specifically discussed in the reviews and in finding 296 solutions. It is possible to postulate that building relationships and strong ways of working together 297 may help to address this issue. But also, that acknowledging upfront the changing requirements of a 298 long-term project will help researchers to plan accordingly – including planning for long term PPI.

#### 299 Common issues across PPI activity in population and other types of health research

300 There are several aspects of PPI activity that are common across various types of health research,301 including, but not exclusive to, population health research.

#### 302 Challenges

Just over half of the reviews (18 out of 31 (18-35)) noted a range of potential challenges with PPI that were reported to stand in the way of the successful development, implementation and evaluation of patient and public involvement activity or models in health research in the UK and equivalent health systems.

307 Consolidation of the challenges reported in the reviews suggested that the following (Table 3) were308 the key issues. These have been grouped into appropriate headings.

#### 310 Table 3. Full list of challenges identified

Heading	Sub-heading	Reviews
Resources	Lack of budget	18, 20, 22-24, 29, 31, 32
	Lack of time	18, 20, 22-24, 29, 31
	Emotional burden on PPI members	18, 24, 25, 29
	Complicated logistics/ infrastructure	20, 23
	Workload too high (on all sides)	24, 27
	Lack of incentives	20
	Lack of preparation	18
	Lack of staff continuity	19
	Lack of support for PPI members	28
	Scope creep <sup>1</sup>	30
<b>Conflict and control</b>	Allowing power to be shared with PPI	18-21, 23, 25, 26, 29
	Expectations (from all sides)	18, 20, 24, 25, 31, 33
	Conflicting perspectives	19, 20, 23, 27, 28
	A culture of researchers vs PPI members	18, 20, 24
	Ethical concerns	28, 29
	Challenging the establishment	18
	Differences within communities	18
	Accepting the legitimacy of PPI	23
	Prioritising personal experience	22
	Scepticism (from all sides)	18
	Unresolved conflict	35
Knowledge	Processes	18, 20, 23, 29, 31
	Language/ jargon	18, 19, 22, 23, 31
	Lack of skills or training	18, 23, 27, 28, 29
	Administration issues	21
	Working practices	18
Representation	Reflecting the diversity of affected populations	17, 21-23, 27, 29, 31, 34
	Tokenism of PPI (aka box-ticking)	26, 28, 30
	Getting early-stage involvement	21, 26
	Involving children	23
	Protecting anonymity	29
	Accessibility (venues)	32
Communication	Lack of meaningful and timely communication	18, 21, 25
	leading to disenfranchisement	
	Difficulty reporting impact of PPI	19, 28, 29
	Building relationships to sustain involvement	20, 23
	Transparency of research process	27
	Building trust (on all sides)	20
	Different values within team	31

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> When a project outgrows its original remit without any additional resources being available.

- 312 Many of these challenges will be even more apparent in population health research where projects
- tend to face the four challenges of: longer duration, involving more complex and varied processes,
- alongside issues of big data, and finding appropriate representation to cover the project breadth and
- 315 length.

#### 316 Solutions

- Nearly three quarters of the studies (23 out of 31) (7, 20-22, 24-42) noted a range of potential
- solutions for ensuring that PPI was more likely to be successful.
- 319 These proposed solutions have been collated, consolidated and sorted according to the UK Standards
- 320 for Involvement in Research as follows:

#### 321 Inclusive Opportunities

- 322 Solution: Offer public involvement opportunities that are accessible and that reach people and groups
- 323 according to research needs. Research also needs to be informed by a diversity of public experience
- and insight, so that it leads to treatments and services which reflect these needs.
- Eleven reviews mentioned inclusion (21-22, 24-25, 28, 34, 37-38, 40-42). Key themes are outlined in
- Table 4 below and explicitly address the problem area of Representation.
- 327
- 328
- 329
- 330
- 331
- 332

#### **334** Table 4. Solutions – Inclusive opportunities

Attribute	Study/Studies	Examples of reasoning
Representation and/or diversity	24, 28, 37, 40- 42	Use variety of methods (41) and partners (28) to recruit a range of participants, understand different motivations (24) and gain insight into the community (37), view differing perspectives as valuable (40), recognise and address issues concerning diversity (40), avoid tokenism (24)
Community consultation	22, 28, 34, 37- 38, 41	To fit better with wider community context (37), include relevant stakeholders and agencies (37) also clinicians, charities, specialist support services (41) plus patient and advocacy groups (28), be proactive and go out and get involved, don't expect people to come to you (38), build more meaningful relationships with target population (34)
Accessibility	24-25, 38, 41	Venues should be located for the ease of the participants (24), accessible and meetings should be timed appropriately (41) and include communication aids, breaks and refreshments as appropriate (25) for individual and collective needs (38)
Methods of engagement	21, 25, 41	Online could assist people to be included e.g. illness, time, caring (21), especially working with disabled children and young people be flexible for different abilities and ages and offer choice (25), use variety of methods (41)
Recruit well	24, 41-42	Fit skills and experiences to the project as well (24), recruit through a variety of ways (41), need to be not just representative but also collaborative (42)
Safe environment	25	Consider whether a trusted adult or facilitator is useful (25)

335

## 336 Working Together

337 Solution: Work together in a way that values all contributions, and that builds and sustains mutually

respectful and productive relationships. Public involvement in research is better when people work

together towards a common purpose, and different perspectives are respected.

340 Twenty-one reviews (7, 20-22, 24-25, 27-33, 35-43) discussed aspects of this standard. The main

341 areas of discussion are outlined in Table 5 below and explicitly address the problem area of Conflict

and Control.

#### 343 Table 5. Solutions – Working Together

Attribute	Study/Studies	Examples of reasoning
Relationships	7, 20, 22, 24- 25, 28-33, 35- 40, 42	Manage conflict (32, 37, 42), Take time to build partnerships built on joint ownership, trust, respect and transparency (7, 20, 20, 25, 28-31, 33, 35-40, 42), Empower PPI members by sharing power and knowledge (25, 36, 38-40), Explore risks together (28), Consider capacity of PPI members (28-29)
Resources	7, 22, 24-25, 28-32, 36, 38, 41	Budget/ funding (22, 24-25, 29, 31-32, 36, 38), Time to build relationships, communicate etc. (7, 22, 24-25, 29-31, 36, 38), Use existing PPI resources where available (41), Plan into proposals (28-29), Tailor to project (38)
Engagement	7, 20-22, 24, 27-28, 33, 42	Early on (7, 21-22, 27, 42), Multiple and varied opportunities (19, 33, 42), Appropriate (24, 28), Acknowledge contributions (21, 28, 42)
Clarity	7, 20, 22, 29- 30, 33, 40, 42	Roles (7, 20, 22, 29, 40, 42), Expectations (20, 30, 33, 40), Structures (7)
Flexibility	31, 24-25, 28- 29, 43	Confidence, personal circumstances and capacity may change over time (21, 25, 29), Keep tasks flexible and include time for training and questions (28, 43), In attitude and approaches to the project (29)

344

## 345 Support and Learning

346 Solution: Offer and promote support and learning that builds confidence and skills for public

347 involvement in research. Seek to remove practical and social barriers that stop members of the public

348 and research professionals from making the most of public involvement in research.

349 Seventeen reviews mentioned various aspects of support and learning (7, 20, 22, 25-26, 28-29, 31-33,

350 36-42). The findings are shown in Table 6 below, which is split into two sections to reflect

351 differences between support and learning methods, and explicitly addresses the problem area of

352 Knowledge.

353

## 355 Table 6. Solutions – Support and learning

SUPPORT -	Study/Studies	Examples of reasoning
Attribute	v	
Emotional support	7, 22, 28, 33, 37-38, 41-42	Recognise that experiences may be upsetting (22), Provide safe spaces (37), Provide consistent feedback and support (28), Consider how to deal with anxiety (33)
Practical support	28, 38-40	Think about details e.g. childcare, food, location, transport, compensation, timings (39), Have strategies for when people are ill/ can't take part (28)
Structural support	20, 29, 40	Make sure key project individuals support PPI (20), Provide structures that support PPI (40), Include relevant institutions such as charities, volunteer groups etc. (29)
Specific support	33, 37	Ensure support specific to topic area (33) and to their individual involvement (37).
LEARNING - Attribute	Study/Studies	Examples of reasoning
As appropriate	7, 22, 31, 36- 37, 40-42	Make learning relevant to the specific context of the research (7, 30, 37) and at the appropriate level for the PPI member (37) to allow full participation (42) and to build participant capacity (22)
Formal knowledge	20, 29, 36, 38	Formal development of knowledge and skills (20), supporting participants to be informed and make informed decisions (29) and to understand specific parts of the research process and/or context (36)
Research methods	26, 36, 41-42	Training in research components to give confidence in their involvement (36) and to explain 'rules' and constraints of research (26)
Variety of learning methods	28, 33, 38-39	Use a variety of methods such as supervision, mentoring, formal, workshops and team based (39), include everyone on the team if possible (28, 38)
Share knowledge	36-37	Acknowledge that knowledge and experience flow both ways and make ways to facilitate that flow (37)
General	25, 29, 32, 38	Provide, support and fund training and learning opportunities (29).

356

## 357 Governance

358 Solution: Involve the public in research management, regulation, leadership and decision making.

Public involvement in research governance can help research be more transparent and gain public trust. This section explicitly addresses the problem area of Conflict and Control. Only three of the reviews mentioned governance (7, 28, 39). They discuss the need for shared decision-making (at every level), power and leadership, in order to lead to a culture of deeper involvement. As limited suggestions were reported there is no table for this section.

#### 364 **Communications**

Solution: Use plain language for well-timed and relevant communications, as part of involvement
plans and activities. Communicate with a wider audience about public involvement and research,

367 using a broad range of approaches that are accessible and appealing.

368 Nine of the reviews discussed communication as being important to ensure PPI activity is successful

369 (7, 28-29, 31, 36, 38-39, 42). Various attributes of good communication were discussed with the

370 main points listed in Table 7 below, and explicitly addresses the problem area of Communications.

- 371
- 372
- •·-
- 373
- 374
- 375
- 376
- ....
- 377
- 378

379

Attribute	Study/Studies	Examples of reasoning
Listen, act and feed back	28, 31, 38-39	Helps address issues such as power (40), let people know what you are doing with their suggestions and why (28), ensures accountability (31)
Ongoing/ regular updates	29, 36, 41	Contribute to motivation and engagement, and to foster satisfying partnerships (36)
Creating space to voice concern/ open communication climate	28, 36	Contribute to motivation and engagement, and to foster satisfying partnerships (36)
Avoid/ translate jargon	28-29, 36	Ensuring everyone understood and felt comfortable and confident to engage in meaningful dialogue (36)
Use different materials (not just written reports etc)	36, 38, 41	Ensure people with different levels of literacy can participate (36)
Sharing information, experiences and knowledge	7, 38	Across all groups involved (7)
Clarifying and agree expectations upfront	28, 36	Could avoid conflicts, demotivation, dissolution of partnerships, or frustration in situations where stakeholders could perceive a lack of concrete actions (36), patients are 'partners' not 'are involved' (28)
Have stakeholders lead groups	36	But be careful they include all groups in the discussion (36)

#### 383 Impact

384 Solution: Seek improvement by identifying and sharing the difference that public involvement makes

to research. Understand the changes, benefits and learning gained from the insights and experiences of

386 patients, carers and the public.

387 Seven of the reviews discussed impact (7, 24, 28, 36, 38-39, 42-43). The general theme was that

- impact needs to be better evaluated throughout the whole research lifecycle. It was noted that this is
- 389 an area where the existing literature is scant and current working practices are perceived to be lacking
- in terms of rigour. Most studies focused on the impact of PPI activity on participants, researchers or
- the research itself rather than setting out to formally assess what works to make PPI activity

392 successful. Moreover, there is much still to be decided about what impact may be reasonably expected to be seen. Brett et al (44) noted particularly the lack of any evidence of any financial 393 analysis and Jones et al (45) suggested that the use of contemporaneous real time data concerning PPI 394 within surgical trials, currently lacking, could be made use of. Furthermore, it is not always possible 395 396 to predict the impact of the involvement, as we are not always able to determine or anticipate potential problems or issues raised by PPI as the study progresses. One important contextual factor consistent 397 398 throughout the research development is the researcher themselves, their previous experiences, skills, 399 knowledge and beliefs. The researcher experiences the impact of PPI as the research develops (46).

Evaluating impact through continuous assessment and feedback was seen to be important in order to ensure ongoing involvement, to identify best practice and areas for improvement, and to make sure that the experience is working for everyone involved. In addition to evaluating the process of PPI within health research, it was also noted that the impact of findings that are translated to real world settings, and ideally the contribution of PPI activity to that impact, should also be evaluated.

It is important to note that impact can be positive or negative and that impact may happen in a
complex way and to a range of areas, for example, impact on the research, on the research outcomes,
on the researchers, on the PPI members, on the wider community and stakeholders.

#### 408 **Other issues**

409 Interestingly considering the topic of the reviews, the use of PPI members in the reviews was not410 universal.

- 9 reviews described PPI throughout the review process;
- 3 reviews took their findings to PPI members for discussion;
- 3 reviews made use of external panels or organisations;
- Single reviews reported utilising PPI at specific stages:
- 415 o To identify research questions;
- 416 o Reviewing protocol;
- 417 During execution and translation;

418	• Reviewing the process;
419	• Feedback from stakeholder but stage not stated;
420	• 2 reviews mentioned that there had not been any PPI in the review;
421	• 9 reviews did not mention PPI in their own review process at all.
422	Few of the reviews detailed the studies discussed within them in terms of types of PPI or in terms of
423	stages of research although most included some discussion of these areas in general terms. Dawson et
424	al (47) is one exception where the studies are clearly detailed in terms of what PPI groups or

425 individuals were involved in various tasks.

There was no consistent terminology used for either types of PPI or stages of research. There has been some attempt to categorise these at a national level. For example, in the UK, INVOLVE distinguished between three PPI approaches: consultation, collaboration and user-led; while Health Canada divides PPI into five stages: inform or educate, gather information, discuss, engage and partner (Pii)(22).

431 Crocker et al (48) describes the types of involvement covered in the studies to range 'from one person 432 to many people or whole patient organisations, from one-off involvement in a particular aspect of the 433 trial (for example, reviewing draft information for patients or recruiting participants from their 434 communities) to involvement throughout the trial (for example, as members of a trial steering 435 committee), and from involvement with no decision making power (for example, as advisers) to 436 involvement in decision making as equal partners'. Some examples of the stages of research where 437 PPI was included are summarised in Table 8.

- 438
- 439
- 440

442	Table 8.	Examples	of stages	of research	where PPI	was included
	1 4010 00	Linumpies	or stages	or rescaren	where i i	mas meraaca

Wilsher (27)	Domecq (30)	Pii (22)
<ul> <li>Identify/prioritise</li> <li>Design</li> <li>Grant development</li> <li>Undertake/ Manage</li> <li>Analysing/ interpret</li> <li>Dissemination</li> <li>Monitoring/ evaluation</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Preparatory phase (agenda setting, prioritization of research topics and funding).</li> <li>Execution phase (study design &amp; procedures, study recruitment, data collection, and data analysis).</li> <li>Translation phase (dissemination, implementation, and evaluation).</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>Development of research focus Research definition Research prioritization</li> <li>Development of research design Method development Study design development</li> <li>Recruitment Recruitment strategy Recruitment</li> <li>Data generation</li> <li>Data processing/ Analysis</li> <li>Research dissemination Dissemination</li> </ol>
<ul> <li>development</li> <li>Undertake/ Manage</li> <li>Analysing/ interpret</li> <li>Dissemination</li> <li>Monitoring/ evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2) Execution phase (study design &amp; procedures, study recruitment, data collection, and data analysis).</li> <li>3) Translation phase (dissemination, implementation, and evaluation).</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Development of research design Method development Study design development</li> <li>Recruitment Recruitment strategy Recruitment</li> <li>Data generation</li> <li>Data processing/ Analysis</li> <li>Research dissemination Dissemination</li> <li>Dissemination strategy</li> </ol>

## 444 **Discussion**

445

446 This review of reviews set out to see what evidence there was concerning optimising patient and 447 public involvement specific to population health research. The novelty in this review of reviews is twofold: firstly, that the findings have been framed by the UK Standards and secondly, that the 448 challenges have been matched against potential solutions. The UK Standards were used to map 449 450 evidence of successful development, implementation and evaluation of patient and public 451 involvement and then translated into tools containing best practice guidance to further drive-up 452 standards in the conduct of PPI in population health research (see supplementary file 4 for new guidance and tools for use in population health research). 453 Most reviews were about PPI activity in specific thematic healthcare areas or in general health and 454 social care research but the details of the studies included in the reviews makes it clear that many 455 studies included were of direct relevance to population health research. The findings are, therefore, 456

- both generic across health and social care research as well as providing useful evidence-based
- 458 suggestions as to what works in PPI in population health research.

459 460	Comparing findings with recently published primary studies
461	Looking at recently published primary studies we found several of interest, mainly around data-driven
462	population health research. The principles that emerge from these studies fit well with the findings of
463	the review of reviews, but also suggest that there are a variety of approaches through which PPI can
464	be addressed and improved. We summarise recent primary studies in Table 9.
465	
466	Table 9. Specific population health primary studies addressing PPI.
467	
468	The specific aspect of longer-term duration that is often typical of population health studies is best
469	illustrated through the examination of existing longitudinal studies as case studies. Longitudinal
470	studies involve repeated observations of the same subjects, allowing researchers to analyse change at
471	the individual level. Such studies typically last decades, such as the 1970 British Cohort Study (54) or
472	the Medical Research Council National Survey of Health and Development (55) which started in
473	1946.
474	Considering involvement in longitudinal studies, one approach is that used by the ALSPAC study
475	could be considered an exemplar of best practice (56). Based at the University of Bristol, the Avon
476	Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children (ALSPAC), also known as Children of the 90s, is a
477	world-leading birth cohort study. One of the governance aspects of the study is the original cohort
478	advisory panel (OCAP) which is made up of more than 30 study participants who meet bi-monthly to
479	provide insights and advice on study design, methodology and acceptability for participants. The
480	group has been running since 2006.
481	The main aims of the OCAP group are:
482	• To represent the cohort of original study children;
483	• To review study documentation and provide feedback to CO90s staff;

• To represent and convey participants' opinions about planned research exercises.

Taken collectively, these supplementary sources suggest that certain solutions identified in the reviews, such as good communication and tailored training, are even more vital to PPI in population health research. One thing that emerges strongly from these studies is the idea that PPI selection and recruitment for population health research projects needs to be very carefully considered.

## 489 Fit of the UK Standards

490 The UK Standards proved to be a coherent framework for capturing solutions and no solution was 491 offered that did not fit in to one of the six categories. It was, however, notable that two standards were 492 less discussed than others: Governance and Impact. Capturing, measuring and illustrating the impact 493 of PPI within the entire lifespan of a project is an issue that has not yet been resolved but is currently 494 being addressed by various organisations. The absence of Governance may be a result of language 495 use, as some attributes of Working Together were relevant in terms of this standard but were not couched in terms of Governance specifically. It was also interesting to see that Communications is a 496 497 UK Standard separate from Working Together, as it was something that could be seen to be an 498 integral part of Working Together. One further point of consideration is that it could be considered 499 that the aspirational end point of PPI would be that any involvement would become so integral to the 500 project that it would be difficult to unpick whose contribution had led to an impact or outcome not originally anticipated. 501

In addition, peer reviewer feedback on this manuscript highlighted the notion of 'representation' or 502 503 'representativeness' as a very contentious subject in the context of public involvement in population 504 health research. The UK standards refer to offering opportunities to people and groups depending on 505 research needs but does not mention engaging with whole communities as would be expected in a 506 population health research context. There was a strong view expressed by one peer reviewer that 'no 507 one else is expected to be representative of a community in a research team so why should we expect 508 this of our public contributors? I actually think public/population health research provides an 509 excellent opportunity to move away from this by placing a greater emphasis on working with and co510 *producing with communities as opposed to individuals.*' We agree with this view and support the type511 of PPI engagement advocated by the peer reviewer for population health research.

## 512 Strengths and limitations of the review of reviews

513 The review of reviews was carried out using systematic processes and following production of an a 514 priori protocol. Not all data were however complete for all reviews and there was a wide variety 515 within the reviews that did report data. For example,

- The number of studies reported in each review varied from 4 (41) to 251 (39);
- Years searched ranged from time periods defined by the previous decade (22) to those that 518 searched back to the inception of the databases searched (30);
- Geography also varied but, of those reviews which gave details of geographical settings, the
  vast majority of the studies were from the UK (n = 292), followed by the USA (n = 95) and
  then other areas: Canada (n = 38), Europe (n = 29), Australia (n = 25), and other countries or
  multiple site studies (n = 17).

The reviews covered a range of diagnostic areas ranging from generic health and social care (18) or clinical trials (47) to condition specific areas such as diabetes (37) or palliative care (21). Although a broad range of conditions were covered, this review did not focus on condition-specific aspects which could act as challenges for involvement. However, this was not within the remit of this review which had a greater focus on PPI in population health research. Interestingly there were few reviews based on demographic groups who are generally acknowledged to be under-represented in healthcare decision making:

There was one review for ethnic minority communities (19) and the geography of the studies included were mainly in the United States.
There was one review for Older People (24) which covered nine qualitative articles.
Arguably studies around dementia and palliative care may be relevant to this demographic but that cannot be assumed.

535	• There were three reviews for Children and Young People – all of which had a specific
536	focus rather than looking at the involvement of Children and Young People in PPI
537	more generally:
538	<ul> <li>Children and Families in Pediatric Health Research (23);</li> </ul>
539	<ul> <li>Disabled children (25);</li> </ul>
540	<ul> <li>Paediatric Intensive Care (41).</li> </ul>
5/1	On the positive side Malterud et al (57) however noted the usefulness of 'two articles which describe
541	on the positive side, Material et al (57) however noted the discrimess of two articles which describe
542	in detail how individuals with limited literacy abilities can be supported to analyse and communicate
543	such processes'.

## 545 **Conclusions**

There are several important areas of PPI activity that require further research. With regards to 546 547 Population Health research, there remain gaps in knowledge about how to ensure key specific attributes of this type of research are addressed for PPI team members - particularly around how to 548 deal with complexity and the data-driven nature of the research. Looking at the UK Standards when 549 mapped against the findings, it is clear that there is a lack of current research or clarity around 550 Governance and Impact. There could also be more research done about PPI with under-represented 551 groups. The new tools containing best practice guidance produced from the synthesis and examples of 552 resources are designed to help population health researchers to facilitate better PPI and in turn to 553 conduct better research. 554

555

### 556 Abbreviations

557 ALSPAC Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children

558 CO90s Children of the 90s

559 CPH National Centre for Population Health and Wellbeing Research

560	HCRW	Health	and	Care	Research	Wales
-----	------	--------	-----	------	----------	-------

- 561 HE Health Economics
- 562 HTA Health Technology Assessment
- 563 IKT Integrated knowledge translation
- 564 OCAP Original Cohort Advisory Panel
- 565 PPEET Public and Patient Engagement Evaluation Tool
- 566 PPE Patient and Public Engagement/ Public and Patient Engagement
- 567 PPI Patient and Public Involvement / Public and Patient Involvement

## 569 **Declarations**

### 570 Ethics approval and consent to participate

- 571 Not applicable
- 572 **Consent for publication**
- 573 Not applicable
- 574 Availability of data and materials
- 575 All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article [and its
- 576 supplementary information files].

#### 577 Competing interests

578 The authors declare that they have no competing interests

#### 579 Funding

- 580 This evidence synthesis was funded by the National Centre for Population Health and Wellbeing
- 581 Research (CPH). Within the Centre for Population Health our aim is to develop research and
- interventions to 'support people's health and well-being throughout life, with our work exploring and
- tackling some of today's most difficult health and social challenges.'

584 The Centre for Population Health is funded by Health and Care Research Wales.

#### 585 Authors' contributions

JN and SV designed the review of reviews. SV undertook data processing and JN provided advice,
oversight and checked data processing and validity. MSB undertook additional critical data checks
and revisions to the manuscript. All authors developed the manuscript and approved the final version.

#### 589 Acknowledgements

590 This review of reviews was discussed with the Centre for Population Health Patient and Public

591 Involvement Advisory Group which meets quarterly to help set the strategic direction for PPI within

the Centre. The draft review was read and commented on several times throughout its development

593 by Dr. Helen Davies and Sarah Peddle – two of the PPI advisory group members. The authors would

594 like to thank the group, and particularly Helen and Sarah, for their valuable input. The authors would

also like to thank Kiara Jackson for providing input to the quality assessment section. We thank the

596 peer reviewers for their feedback and suggestions to further improve the manuscript.

597

#### 598 **Tables**

599

#### 600 Table 9. Recent population health primary studies addressing PPI.

Population Health Specific PPI Challenge Area	Study	Aspects of note
Data-driven	Johnson et al (49)	<ul> <li>There is little guidance on how to meaningfully involve the public in big data research.</li> <li>Involvement in big data research is significantly limited in comparison with other study designs.</li> <li>May be because common approaches to public involvement adopted in primary data research are not appropriate within big data analysis studies.</li> <li>The highly data driven discussions that underline this type of research can present a barrier to public involvement.</li> </ul>

		• There is now growing recognition that public involvement in big data research requires special considerations.
Data-driven	Hobbs et al (50)	Enhance public forum members' personal development in data-intensive health research through a personal development portfolio:
		<ul> <li>Personal Profile - Personal details including education, qualifications and employment</li> <li>Relevant Experience - Volunteering and personal experience</li> <li>Training Record - Training events attended and events where been trainer or facilitator</li> <li>Personal statement - Overall description of skills and experience they may have gained from involvement activities</li> <li>Involvement activities - Summary of each activity, skills and experience gained, evidence such as certificates or feedback and personal reflections on their involvement in this activity</li> <li>References - Details of relevant individuals and how known to the public contributor.</li> </ul>
Data-driven	'Consensus Statement on	Key Principles for Public Involvement and Engagement in Data-Intensive Health Research –
	Public Involvement and Engagement with Data Intensive Health Research'(51)	<ol> <li>Have institutional buy-in</li> <li>Have clarity of purpose</li> <li>Be transparent</li> <li>Have two-way communication</li> <li>Be inclusive and accessible to broad publics</li> <li>Be ongoing</li> <li>Be designed to produce impact</li> <li>Be evaluated.</li> </ol>
Complexity	Van Voorn et al (52)	<ul> <li>Involving patients in health economic research will require a serious investment of time and money for patients to get to a level at which they can contribute.</li> <li>Patients need to be able to 'rise above' their condition - to find an interest in the material itself and have an objective view.</li> <li>Proper selection procedures will have to be developed.</li> </ul>
Representation & data-driven	Jewell et al (53)	<ul> <li>Report on the setting up of a service user and carer advisory group supporting data linkage in mental health research.</li> <li>The general public feel that the complexities of data linkage research may be difficult to explain in lay terms and that patients and the public have limited knowledge about data, anonymisation, aggregation, and the regulations surrounding these.</li> <li>Training sessions were set up for all new group members. Training sought to provide members with information about data linkage, including the</li> </ul>

|--|

# **References**

603	1.	What is public involvement in research? Health Research Authority. 2020 Dec 16 [cited
604		2021 April 15]. Available from: https://www.hra.nhs.uk/planning-and-improving-
605		research/best-practice/public-involvement/
606	2.	Minogue V, Cooke M, Donskoy A-L, Vicary P, Wells B. Patient and public involvement in
607		reducing health and care research waste. Research Involvement and Engagement.
608		2018;4(1):5.
609	3.	Public involvement in a pandemic. Lessons from the UK Covid-19 public involvement
610		matching service. Health Research Authority. 2021 Nov 26 [cited 2023 April 14]. Available
611		from: https://www.hra.nhs.uk/planning-and-improving-research/best-practice/public-
612		involvement/public-involvement-pandemic-lessons-uk-covid-19-public-involvement-
613		matching-service/
614	4.	The UK Standards: Setting the scene. UK Standards for Public Involvement. [cited 2021
615		April 09]. Available from: https://sites.google.com/nihr.ac.uk/pi-standards/standards/setting-
616		the-scene
617	5.	Mc Laughlin L, Williams G, Roberts G, et al. Assessing the efficacy of coproduction to
618		better understand the barriers to achieving sustainability in NHS chronic kidney services and
619		create alternate pathways. Health Expect. 2022;25(2):579-606. doi:10.1111/hex.13391
620	6.	Noyes J, Mclaughlin L, Morgan K, et al. Designing a co-productive study to overcome
621		known methodological challenges in organ donation research with bereaved family
622		members. Health Expect. 2019;22(4):824-835. doi:10.1111/hex.12894
623	7.	Manafo E, Petermann L, Mason-Lai P, Vandall-Walker V. Patient engagement in Canada: a
624		scoping review of the 'how' and 'what' of patient engagement in health research. Health Res
625		Policy Syst. 2018 Mar 14;16(1):24. doi: 10.1186/s12961-018-0296-y.

626 8. Holmes J. What does improving population health really mean? The King's Fund. 2022 July 21 [cited 2022 July 21]. Available from: https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/publications/what-627 does-improving-population-health-mean 628 9. WHO. Public Health Services [cited 2021 September 09]. Available from: 629 630 https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/Health-systems/public-health-services 10. Diez-Roux AV. On the Distinction-or Lack of Distinction-Between Population Health 631 and Public Health. Am J Public Health. 2016 April; 106(4): 619-620. doi: 632 633 10.2105/AJPH.2016.303097 634 11. Ali H. I am not 'hard to reach'. UpRising. 2020 April 9 [cited 2021 November 7]. Available from: https://www.uprising.org.uk/news/i-am-not-hard-reach 635 636 12. Improving inclusion of under-served groups in clinical research: Guidance from INCLUDE project. National Institute for Health and Care Research, 2020 August 7 [cited 2021] 637 638 November 7]. Available from: https://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/improving-inclusion-ofunder-served-groups-in-clinical-research-guidance-from-include-project/25435 639 640 13. Wildridge, V & Bell, L 2002, 'How clip became eclipse: A mnemonic to assist in searching for health policy/management information', Health Information & Libraries Journal, vol. 19, 641 642 no. 2, pp. 113-115. 14. AMSTAR 2 – The new and improved AMSTAR. AMSTAR. 2021 [cited 2021 April 15]. 643 Available from: https://amstar.ca/Amstar-2.php 644 15. CASP Checklists. CASP [cited April 15]. Available from: https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-645 checklists/ 646 16. Iliffe S, Wilcock J, Drennan V, et al. Changing practice in dementia care in the community: 647 developing and testing evidence-based interventions, from timely diagnosis to end of life 648 (EVIDEM). Southampton (UK): NIHR Journals Library; 2015 Apr. (Programme Grants for 649 Applied Research, No. 3.3.) Appendix 65, Chapter 5: Five main stages in framework 650 analysis. [cited December 12]. Available from: 651 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK286110/ 652

653	17.	Boote J, Telford R, Cooper C. Consumer involvement in health research: a review and
654		research agenda. Health Policy. 2002 Aug;61(2):213-36. doi: 10.1016/s0168-
655		8510(01)00214-7. PMID: 12088893.
656	18.	Brett J, Staniszewska S, Mockford C, Herron-Marx S, Hughes J, et al. A systematic review
657		of the impact of patient and public involvement on service users, researchers and
658		communities. Patient. 2014;7(4):387-95. doi: 10.1007/s40271-014-0065-0. PMID:
659		25034612.
660	19.	Dawson S, Campbell SM, Giles SJ, Morris RL, Cheraghi-Sohi S. Black and minority ethnic
661		group involvement in health and social care research: A systematic review. Health Expect.
662		2018 Feb;21(1):3-22. doi: 10.1111/hex.12597. Epub 2017 Aug 15. PMID: 28812330;
663		PMCID: PMC5750731.
664	20.	Zych MM, Berta WB, Gagliardi AR. Conceptualising the initiation of researcher and
665		research user partnerships: a meta-narrative review. Health Res Policy Sys 18, 24 (2020).
666		doi.org/10.1186/s12961-020-0536-9
667	21.	Scholz B, Bevan A, Georgousopoulou E, Collier A, Mitchell I. Consumer and carer
668		leadership in palliative care academia and practice: A systematic review with narrative
669		synthesis. Palliat Med. 2019 Sep;33(8):959-968. doi: 10.1177/0269216319854012. Epub
670		2019 Jun 14. PMID: 31199194.
671	22.	Pii KH, Schou LH, Piil K, Jarden M. Current trends in patient and public involvement in
672		cancer research: A systematic review. Health Expect. 2019 Feb;22(1):3-20. doi:
673		10.1111/hex.12841. Epub 2018 Oct 30. PMID: 30378234; PMCID: PMC6351419.
674	23.	Flynn R, Walton S, Scott SD. Engaging children and families in pediatric Health Research: a
675		scoping review. Res Involv Engagem 5, 32 (2019). doi.org/10.1186/s40900-019-0168-9
676	24.	Baldwin JN, Napier S, Neville S, Wright-St Clair VA. Impacts of older people's patient and
677		public involvement in health and social care research: a systematic review. Age Ageing.
678		2018 Nov 1;47(6):801-809. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afy092. PMID: 29939208.

679	25.	Bailey S, Boddy K, Briscoe S, Morris C. Involving disabled children and young people as
680		partners in research: a systematic review. Child Care Health Dev. 2015 Jul;41(4):505-14.
681		doi: 10.1111/cch.12197. Epub 2014 Oct 16. PMID: 25323964.
682	26.	Brett J, Staniszewska S, Mockford C, Herron-Marx S, Hughes J, et al. Mapping the impact of
683		patient and public involvement on health and social care research: a systematic review.
684		Health Expect. 2014 Oct;17(5):637-50. doi: 10.1111/j.1369-7625.2012.00795.x. Epub 2012
685		Jul 19. PMID: 22809132; PMCID: PMC5060910.
686	27.	Wilsher SH, Brainard J, Loke Y. et al. Patient and public involvement in health literacy
687		interventions: a mapping review. Res Involv Engagem 3, 31 (2017). doi.org/10.1186/s40900-
688		017-0081-z
689	28.	Price A, Albarqouni L, Kirkpatrick J, Clarke M, Liew SM, Roberts N, et al. Patient and
690		public involvement in the design of clinical trials: An overview of systematic reviews. J Eval
691		Clin Pract. 2018 Feb;24(1):240-253. doi: 10.1111/jep.12805. Epub 2017 Oct 27. PMID:
692		29076631.
693	29.	Bethell J, Commisso E, Rostad HM, Puts M, Babineau J, Grinbergs-Saull A, et al. Patient
694		engagement in research related to dementia: A scoping review. Dementia (London). 2018
695		Nov;17(8):944-975. doi: 10.1177/1471301218789292. PMID: 30373460.
696	30.	Domecq JP, Prutsky G, Elraiyah T, et al. Patient engagement in research: a systematic
697		review. BMC Health Serv Res 14, 89 (2014). doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-14-89
698	31.	Boote J, Baird W, Beecroft C. Public involvement at the design stage of primary health
699		research: a narrative review of case examples. Health Policy. 2010 Apr;95(1):10-23. doi:
700		10.1016/j.healthpol.2009.11.007. Epub 2009 Dec 5. PMID: 19963299.
701	32.	Nunn JS, Tiller J, Fransquet P, Lacaze P. (2019). Public Involvement in Global Genomics
702		Research: A Scoping Review. Frontiers in public health, 7, 79.
703		doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2019.00079
704	33.	Sangill C, Buus N, Hybholt L, Berring LL. (2019). Service user's actual involvement in
705		mental health research practices: A scoping review. International Journal of Mental Health
706		Nursing, 28(4), 798-815. doi.org/10.1111/inm.12594

- 707 34. Fergusson D, Monfaredi Z, Pussegoda K, et al. The prevalence of patient engagement in
  708 published trials: a systematic review. Res Involv Engagem 4, 17 (2018).
  709 doi.org/10.1186/s40900-018-0099-x
- 710 35. Jagosh J, Macaulay AC, Pluye P, Salsberg J, Bush PL, Henderson J, et al. Uncovering the
- benefits of participatory research: implications of a realist review for health research and
- 712 practice. Milbank Q. 2012 Jun;90(2):311-46. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0009.2012.00665.x. PMID:
- 713 22709390; PMCID: PMC3460206.
- 36. Camden C, Shikako-Thomas K, Nguyen T, Graham E, Thomas A, Sprung J, et al. Engaging
  stakeholders in rehabilitation research: a scoping review of strategies used in partnerships
- and evaluation of impacts. Disabil Rehabil. 2015;37(15):1390-400. doi:
- 717 10.3109/09638288.2014.963705. Epub 2014 Sep 22. PMID: 25243763.
- 37. Harris J, Haltbakk J, Dunning T, et al. How patient and community involvement in diabetes
  research influences health outcomes: A realist review. Health Expect. 2019;22(5):907-920.
  doi:10.1111/hex.12935
- 38. Baines RL, Regan de Bere S. Optimizing patient and public involvement (PPI): Identifying
  its "essential" and "desirable" principles using a systematic review and modified Delphi
  methodology. Health Expect. 2018 Feb;21(1):327-335. doi: 10.1111/hex.12618. Epub 2017
  Sep 19. PMID: 28929554; PMCID: PMC5750770.
- 39. Vaughn LM, Whetstone C, Boards A, Busch MD, Magnusson M, Määttä S. Partnering with
  insiders: A review of peer models across community-engaged research, education and social
  care. Health Soc Care Community. 2018 Nov;26(6):769-786. doi: 10.1111/hsc.12562. Epub
  2018 Mar 7. PMID: 29512217.
- 72940. Chambers E, Gardiner C, Thompson J, Seymour J. Patient and carer involvement in
- palliative care research: An integrative qualitative evidence synthesis review. Palliat Med.
- 731 2019 Sep;33(8):969-984. doi: 10.1177/0269216319858247. Epub 2019 Jun 28. PMID:
- 732 31250702; PMCID: PMC6691598.

733	41.	Menzies JC, Morris KP, Duncan HP. et al. Patient and public involvement in Paediatric
734		Intensive Care research: considerations, challenges and facilitating factors. Res Involv
735		Engagem 2, 32 (2016). doi.org/10.1186/s40900-016-0046-7
736	42.	Shippee ND, Domecq GJP, Prutsky LGJ, Wang Z, Elraiyah TA, Nabhan M, et al. Patient and
737		service user engagement in research: a systematic review and synthesized framework. Health
738		Expect. 2015 Oct;18(5):1151-66. doi: 10.1111/hex.12090. Epub 2013 Jun 3. PMID:
739		23731468; PMCID: PMC5060820.
740	43.	Miah J, Dawes P, Edwards S. et al. Patient and public involvement in dementia research in
741		the European Union: a scoping review. BMC Geriatr. 2019. 19, 220.
742		https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-019-1217-9
743	44.	Brett J, Staniszewska S, Mockford C, Seers K, Herron-Marx S, Bayliss H. The PIRICOM
744		study: a systematic review of the conceptualisation, measurement, impact and outcomes of
745		patients and public involvement in health and social care research: University of Warwick;
746		2010.
747	45.	Jones EL, Williams-Yesson BA, Hackett RC, Staniszewska SH, Evans D, Francis NK.
748		Quality of reporting on patient and public involvement within surgical research: a systematic
749		review. Ann Surg. 2015 Feb;261(2):243-50. doi: 10.1097/SLA.000000000000768. PMID:
750		24950279.
751	46.	Staley, K. 'Is it worth doing?' Measuring the impact of patient and public involvement in
752		research. Res Involv Engagem 1, 6 (2015). doi.org/10.1186/s40900-015-0008-5
753	47.	Dawson S, Campbell SM, Giles SJ, Morris RL, Cheraghi-Sohi S. Black and minority ethnic
754		group involvement in health and social care research: A systematic review. Health Expect.
755		2018 Feb;21(1):3-22. doi: 10.1111/hex.12597. Epub 2017 Aug 15. PMID: 28812330;
756		PMCID: PMC5750731.
757	48.	Crocker JC, Ricci-Cabello I, Parker A, Hirst JA, Chant A, Petit-Zeman S, et al. Impact of
758		patient and public involvement on enrolment and retention in clinical trials: systematic
759		review and meta-analysis BMJ 2018; 363 :k4738 doi:10.1136/bmj.k4738

760	49.	Johnson H, Davies JM, Leniz J, Chukwusa E, Markham S, Sleeman KE. Opportunities for
761		public involvement in big data research in palliative and end-of-life care. Palliative
762		Medicine. 2021;35(9):1724-1726. doi:10.1177/02692163211002101
763	50.	Hobbs G, Tully MP. Realist evaluation of public engagement and involvement in data-
764		intensive health research. Res Involv Engagem 6, 37 (2020). doi.org/10.1186/s40900-020-
765		00215-4
766	51.	Aitken M, Tully MP, Porteous C, Denegri S, Cunningham-Burley S, Banner N, et al. (2020)
767		"Consensus Statement on Public Involvement and Engagement with Data-Intensive Health
768		Research", International Journal of Population Data Science, 4(1). doi:
769		10.23889/ijpds.v4i1.586.
770	52.	van Voorn GA, Vemer P, Hamerlijnck D, et al. The Missing Stakeholder Group: Why
771		Patients Should be Involved in Health Economic Modelling. Appl Health Econ Health
772		Policy. 2016;14(2):129-133. doi:10.1007/s40258-015-0200-7
773	53.	Jewell A, Pritchard M, Barret, K. et al. The Maudsley Biomedical Research Centre (BRC)
774		data linkage service user and carer advisory group: creating and sustaining a successful
775		patient and public involvement group to guide research in a complex area. Res Involv
776		Engagem 5, 20 (2019). doi.org/10.1186/s40900-019-0152-4
777	54.	1970 British Cohort Study. Centre for Longitudinal Studies. [cited 2021 November 7].
778		Available from: https://cls.ucl.ac.uk/cls-studies/1970-british-cohort-study/
779	55.	National Survey of Health and Development. Medical Research Council. [cited 2021
780		November 7]. Available from: https://www.nshd.mrc.ac.uk/
781	56.	Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. University of Bristol. [cited 2021
782		November 7]. Available from: http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/about/
783	57.	Malterud K, Elvbakken KT. Patients participating as co-researchers in health research: A
784		systematic review of outcomes and experiences. Scand J Public Health. 2020 Aug;48(6):617-
785		628. doi: 10.1177/1403494819863514. Epub 2019 Jul 18. PMID: 31319762.