

1           **Co-development of a best practice checklist for mental health data science: A Delphi study**

2

3   **Kirkham, E.J.\*<sup>1</sup>, Crompton, C.J.<sup>1</sup>, Iveson, M.H.<sup>1</sup>, Beange, I.<sup>1</sup>, McIntosh, A.<sup>1</sup> & Fletcher-Watson, S.<sup>1</sup>**

4

5   **Affiliations:**

6   1: Division of Psychiatry, Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Kennedy Tower,

7   Royal Edinburgh Hospital, Morningside Park, Edinburgh, EH10 5HF, UK

8

9   **\*Correspondence:**

10   Elizabeth Kirkham

11   Division of Psychiatry

12   Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences

13   University of Edinburgh

14   Royal Edinburgh Hospital

15   Edinburgh EH10 5HF

16   Email: [elizabeth.kirkham@ed.ac.uk](mailto:elizabeth.kirkham@ed.ac.uk)

17

18

19   **Keywords: mental health, data science, health data, participatory research, Delphi, lived**  
20   **experience, co-produced research**

21

22

## Abstract

### 23 **Background**

24 Mental health research is commonly affected by difficulties in recruiting and retaining participants,  
25 resulting in findings which are based on a sub-sample of those actually living with mental illness.  
26 Increasing the use of Big Data for mental health research, especially routinely-collected data, could  
27 improve this situation. However, steps to facilitate this must be enacted in collaboration with those  
28 who would provide the data - people with mental health conditions.

### 29 **Methods**

30 We used the Delphi method to create a best practice checklist for mental health data science.  
31 Twenty participants with both expertise in data science and personal experience of mental illness  
32 worked together over three phases. In the Phase 1, participants rated a list of 63 statements and  
33 added any statements or topics that were missing. Statements receiving a mean score of 5 or more  
34 (out of 7) were retained. These were then combined with the results of a rapid thematic analysis of  
35 participants' comments to produce a 14-item draft checklist, with each item split into two  
36 components: best practice now and best practice in the future. In Phase 2, participants indicated  
37 whether or not each item should remain in the checklist, and items that scored more than 50%  
38 endorsement were retained. In Phase 3 participants rated their satisfaction with the final checklist.

### 39 **Results**

40 The final checklist was made up of 14 "best practice" items, with each item covering best practice  
41 now and best practice in the future. At the end of the three phases, 85% of participants were (very)  
42 satisfied with the two best practice checklists, with no participants expressing dissatisfaction.

### 43 **Conclusions**

44 Increased stakeholder involvement is essential at every stage of mental health data science. The  
45 checklist produced through this work represents the views of people with experience of mental  
46 illness, and it is hoped that it will be used to facilitate trustworthy and innovative research which is  
47 inclusive of a wider range of individuals.

48

49

## Introduction

50 Data science, in which knowledge is derived from high volume data sets (McIntosh et al., 2016),  
51 holds great potential for mental health research (Simon, 2019). Specifically, large quantities of  
52 routinely-collected data, such as NHS health records, represent an opportunity to overcome one of  
53 the greatest problems previously inherent to such research: recruiting and retaining a representative  
54 sample of participants (Furimsky, Cheung, Dewa, & Zipursky, 2008; Woodall, Morgan, Sloan, &  
55 Howard, 2010). Recruitment in itself is often time consuming and can be one of the most challenging  
56 parts of a research study, whilst the recruitment of a representative sample is harder still (Martin et  
57 al., 2018). In mental health research, the representativeness of a sample can be influenced by  
58 numerous factors, including clinicians' willingness to refer participants (Patterson, Kramo, Soteriou,  
59 & Crawford, 2010), the severity of participants' mental illness (Lally et al., 2018), and participants'  
60 employment status (Kannisto et al., 2017). Of particular concern is evidence that people from ethnic  
61 minorities are under-represented in mental health research (Gulsuner et al., 2020; Iwamasa,  
62 Sorocco, & Koonce, 2002), despite having higher rates of diagnosis for some conditions, such as  
63 psychosis (Coid et al., 2008). These factors mean that the groups of individuals who take part in  
64 mental health research studies rarely represent the population of people living with mental illness  
65 (Kline et al., 2019), which could have serious implications for treatment outcomes (Iltis et al., 2013).

66 Increased use of routinely-collected mental health data is likely to make research more inclusive and  
67 to contribute to the development of more tailored treatments (Iltis et al., 2013; McIntosh et al.,  
68 2016). However, work which uses routinely-collected health data, especially sensitive mental health  
69 data (King, Brankovic, & Gillard, 2012; Martínez & Farhan, 2019), relies upon the trust of the public  
70 whose data are being accessed (Aitken, Jorre, Pagliari, Jepson, & Cunningham-Burley, 2016) – by  
71 definition, analysis of routinely-collected data does not involve informed consent from the  
72 individuals who provide such data. This means that researchers who work with mental health data  
73 must understand and incorporate the views of people with experience of mental illness in their  
74 research practice. Such consultation is especially timely in light of the ongoing rapid expansion  
75 within mental health data science; after all, it is these individuals whose lives mental health research  
76 seeks to improve (Ford et al., 2019).

77 To this end, we sought to generate a best practice checklist for use in mental health data science to  
78 support research that is both rigorous and trusted by those who provide mental health data. The  
79 checklist was designed to complement other guidance regarding good practice within data science,  
80 such as the UK Data Ethics Framework (Government Digital Service, 2020), the UK Government's  
81 Code of Conduct for Data-Driven Health and Care Technology (Department of Health and Social  
82 Care, 2019), and recent work on the development of data governance for the use of clinical free-text  
83 data (Jones et al., 2020). Its unique contribution is to encapsulate the perspective of people with  
84 lived experience of mental illness, without making recommendations that contravene existing data  
85 science frameworks.

86 To create a checklist that enshrines the principles of trustworthiness and patient-driven priorities  
87 within existing research practice, we worked directly with people with expertise in both mental  
88 illness and data science. We chose to use the Delphi method, an iterative process in which a group of  
89 experts anonymously contributes to the development of consensus on a given topic (Okoli &  
90 Pawlowski, 2004). Delphi studies, which typically recruit between 15 and 30 experts (De Villiers, De  
91 Villiers, & Kent, 2005), have previously been used to derive guidelines in mental health-related areas  
92 such as post-disaster psychosocial care, and first aid recommendations for psychosis and suicidal  
93 ideation (Bisson et al., 2010; Jorm, 2015; Kelly, Jorm, Kitchener, & Langlands, 2008; Langlands, Jorm,  
94 Kelly, & Kitchener, 2008). Whilst some previous studies have sought to consolidate the views of

95 distinct groups of stakeholders (Murphy, Thorpe, Trefusis, & Kousoulis, 2020), we took the approach  
96 of recruiting people with personal or professional expertise in both mental illness and data science.  
97 This ensured that the participants themselves were in a position to weigh up the relative merits of  
98 the information from both perspectives, and reduced the need for researcher involvement in  
99 handling potential trade-offs. The Delphi took place over three phases; each phase involved an  
100 online survey completed by participants, followed by analysis by the research team and creation of  
101 the next survey (Figure 1).

102

103

## Methods

### 104 Pre-design phase

105 A pre-design phase was used to identify topics and statements to be included in the first phase of  
106 the Delphi study. Initial discussion amongst the research team generated a series of statements  
107 which covered the following categories relating to data sharing: users of data, access to data, data  
108 linkage, anonymity and de-identification, consent, governance, and community. The research team  
109 then produced a draft version of the Phase 1 survey and presented it to a group of people (n = 4)  
110 with expertise in mental health, including people with lived experience of mental illness and  
111 psychology researchers. These individuals were independent of the participants who took part in the  
112 three key phases of the Delphi study. The group recommended improvements primarily based  
113 around clarity and usability, and the research team updated the survey accordingly.

### 114 Participants

115 Participants were recruited if they had both experience with mental illness and experience with data  
116 science or research methods. The criteria used to assess this experience, and the number of  
117 participants within the final sample who fell into each category, are listed in Table 1 (note that most  
118 participants fell under multiple criteria within each category). Before entry into the study potential  
119 participants were asked by email to confirm that they met at least one of the criteria in each  
120 category. Notably, all participants included in the final sample reported that they had been  
121 diagnosed with mental illness at some time in their life, and the majority considered themselves to  
122 be living with mental illness when they took part in the study.

123 Participants were recruited through a snowballing technique with relevant contacts and through  
124 social media. Thirty-nine participants agreed by email to take part in the study. Of these, 35  
125 individuals provided sufficient data for analysis, though one participant was excluded due to  
126 insufficient experience of mental illness and four participants were excluded due to a technical error.  
127 Consequently, 30 participants were included in Phase 1 of the study. Of these, 26 provided sufficient  
128 data for analysis during Phase 2 of the study, and of these, 20 provided data for Phase 3. Participants  
129 who did not provide data for a given phase were excluded from subsequent phases. It should be  
130 noted that data collection coincided with the start of the Covid-19 pandemic and UK lock-down,  
131 which could have increased drop-out. Nevertheless, a sample of 20 participants is considered a good  
132 sample size for a Delphi study (De Villiers et al., 2005).

133

134

*[Table 1 about here]*

135

136

137 **Overview of phases**

138 An illustrative overview of the phases included in the Delphi study can be found in Figure 1. The  
139 research received ethical approval from the School of Health in Social Science Ethics Committee,  
140 University of Edinburgh, ref STAFF212. Potential participants were sent an overview information  
141 sheet by email, and those who chose to take part were provided with this overview again at the start  
142 of the first survey. All participants provided informed consent to the whole Delphi study at the  
143 beginning of the first online survey by responding by tick box to a series of consent statements. An  
144 additional, phase-specific information sheet was provided at the beginning of each of the three  
145 phases. All data were collected online using surveys hosted by Qualtrics ([www.qualtrics.com](http://www.qualtrics.com)). In all  
146 three surveys, words whose meaning could have been unfamiliar or ambiguous were highlighted in  
147 red, and defined in a glossary that was available to download on each page of the survey (Appendix  
148 1).

149

150 *[Table 2 about here]*

151

152 *[Figure 1 about here]*

153

154 **Phase 1**

155 ***Materials and procedure***

156 Table 2 provides definitions for the terms used in the subsequent paragraphs. Participants were  
157 given 10 days to complete the first survey, and were sent reminder emails during this period. The  
158 survey presented participants with a series of 63 statements (Appendix 2). The statements were  
159 organised into seven categories (users of data, access to data, data linkage, anonymity and de-  
160 identification, consent, governance and community), each of which was divided into two or three  
161 sub-categories (Table 3). Each sub-category contained between 2 and 5 statements, and each  
162 category (i.e. the combination of sub-categories) contained between 8 and 10 statements. Each  
163 category was presented on a separate page of the survey, resulting in between 8 and 10 statements  
164 per page. Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they believed that the given  
165 statement represented best practice for mental health data science, using a 7-point Likert scale  
166 which ranged from “strongly disagree (1)” to “strongly agree (7)”. At the end of each category of  
167 statements, participants were presented with a text box in which they could make comments on the  
168 wording of the statements within that category. At the end of the survey, participants were  
169 presented with an additional text box in which they could enter any topics or statements concerning  
170 best practice in mental health data science that had been missed during the survey.

171

172 *[Table 3 about here]*

173

174 ***Analysis methods***

175 We began Phase 1 with a large quantity of statements (n = 63, see Appendix 2), some of which  
176 contradicted one another, in order to cover as many potential viewpoints as possible. As described

177 above, the original statements were organised by category and sub-category (Table 3). The initial  
178 aim of the Phase 1 analysis was to prune and condense the extensive list of statements into one  
179 statement per sub-category. The Phase 1 analysis took place over two stages, which we refer to as  
180 Stage A and Stage B below (note these “stages” are distinct from the “Phases”, the latter of which  
181 represent timeframes of data collection and analysis).

#### 182 **Stage A.**

183 Stage A involved the initial processing of the quantitative (participant scoring of statements) and  
184 qualitative data (participant comments). Statements which received clear support (mean score of  
185 more than 5 out of 7) would be retained for Stage B of Phase 1 analysis. Statements which received  
186 clear disagreement (mean score of less than 3) were either removed or, alternatively, retained for  
187 Stage B but reversed so that they represented the opposite position (Sinclair et al., 2020).  
188 Statements with a mean score greater than or equal to 3 and less than or equal to 5 were discarded,  
189 due to the absence of a consensus opinion from participants. Next, after quantitative responses to  
190 the statements had been analysed, we continued with Stage A by processing the qualitative text  
191 responses provided by participants. These data were analysed using a “rapid assessment” version of  
192 thematic analysis (McNall & Foster-Fishman, 2007), in which the content of each response was  
193 coded and common themes were extracted.

194 Throughout Stage A analysis, the data were processed within the sub-categories that were present  
195 in the Phase 1 survey (Table 3). At the end of Stage A, it was apparent that some of these sub-  
196 categories were not useful. For example, quantitative and qualitative responses to the three  
197 “consent” sub-categories used in the Phase 1 survey (individual control, scientific access, and  
198 alternative models; Table 3) indicated that participants’ views of consent did not fit into these three  
199 sub-categories. As a result, a single “consent” category was used instead. In this manner, where  
200 appropriate, the sub-categories used in Phase 1 were updated (Table 3).

201 Once Stage A was complete, we were left with a dataset divided into 14 sub-categories. Each sub-  
202 category contained a list of statements that had received clear support (mean score of 5 or more out  
203 of 7), and additional recommendations that had been derived from participants’ qualitative  
204 responses. Taking for example the sub-category “where data are accessed,” one of the three  
205 statements was retained (“...only allowing researchers to see data in specific digital environments  
206 (a.k.a. 'safe havens')”; see Appendix 2 for statements that were discarded). In addition, the data for  
207 this sub-category contained the recommendation, derived from participants’ qualitative responses,  
208 that digital controls were preferable to physical controls, a comparison that had not been explicitly  
209 addressed within the statements themselves.

#### 210 **Stage B.**

211 In Stage B of the Phase 1 analysis, all the data for a given sub-category (retained statements and  
212 additional information, as described above) were collated. The initial aim of Stage B was to distil all  
213 the data within each sub-category into one checklist item. However, when examining the data, it  
214 became apparent that in many cases the data collated for each sub-category contained two distinct  
215 elements of best practice: recommendations that could be implemented immediately, and those  
216 that would depend upon future development and supporting infrastructure. Therefore, instead of  
217 following the initial aim of creating one overarching checklist item from the data contained within  
218 each sub-category, we decided to create an item which would contain two components: one that  
219 referred to best practice that could be implemented immediately, and one that referred to “ideal”  
220 best practice to be put in place in future. For example, for the sub-category “responding to

221 mistakes,” the best practice item was divided into a current component: “Best practice for mental  
222 health data science means planning in advance to avoid data breaches, utilising a recording process  
223 for data breaches, and reporting near misses”, and a future component: “Best practice for mental  
224 health data science means developing robust systems to prevent data leaks and breaches”. The  
225 newly-created checklist items for each sub-category were then used to create the Phase 2 survey,  
226 described below.

227

## 228 **Phase 2**

### 229 ***Materials and procedure***

230 Participants were given 11 days to complete the second survey, and were sent reminder emails  
231 during this period. Participants were presented with the new items (each with a “now” and a  
232 “future” component) for each of the 14 sub-categories. For example, one “now” component was  
233 “Best practice for mental health data science means allowing other researchers to check analyses  
234 wherever possible.” Its corresponding “future” component was “Best practice for mental health data  
235 science means providing access to synthetic data where real data cannot be shared, in order to allow  
236 other researchers to check analyses.” The full list of items included in this second survey is illustrated  
237 in Table 4.

238 For each component, participants were asked to respond “yes” or “no” to whether it should be  
239 included in the relevant checklist. After each statement, participants were provided with a text box  
240 in which they could make comments on the wording of the component. After this, participants were  
241 presented with all the components relating to current best practice (the “now” checklist) and asked  
242 to organise them in order of importance. This was then repeated with the future best practice  
243 components (the “future” checklist). These rankings are presented in Figures 2 and 3.

### 244 ***Analysis methods***

245 The data from the second survey were analysed using both quantitative and qualitative methods.  
246 The data used for the quantitative analysis were the yes/no responses provided for each  
247 component. Components which received a “yes” response from fewer than 50% of participants were  
248 discarded. The qualitative responses, entered in the aforementioned text boxes, were classified into  
249 three categories: meaningful recommendation, formatting/language comment, not relevant/refers  
250 to different statement. The content of these comments was then used to refine the existing  
251 components, and the updated list of components was used to produce the Phase 3 survey.

252

## 253 **Phase 3**

### 254 ***Materials and procedure***

255 Participants were given 8 days to complete the third survey, and were sent reminder emails during  
256 this period. Participants were presented with the updated items derived during the analysis stage of  
257 Phase 2. As before, two components (corresponding to current and future best practice) were  
258 presented for each of the 14 items. Participants were asked if the given component should be  
259 included in the relevant final best practice checklist, and could choose “yes”, “no”, or “other”. If a  
260 participant chose “other”, they were presented with a text box in which they could indicate how the  
261 component should be changed. Participants were then asked to open a pdf file of a mock-up version  
262 of the current best practice checklist, and asked to indicate how satisfied they would be (on a 5-

263 point scale from “very dissatisfied” to “very satisfied”) with a professionally-designed version of this  
264 mock-up. This process was repeated for the future best practice checklist.

### 265 ***Analysis methods***

266 Statements which received a “yes” response (as opposed to “no” or “other”) from fewer than 50% of  
267 participants were discarded. In addition, participants’ comments were assessed and minor changes  
268 to the wording of the statements were made. Finally, the median level of satisfaction with each  
269 mock-up checklist was measured.

270

## 271 **Results**

### 272 **Phase 1**

#### 273 ***Stage A***

274 As described in the Methods, the first stage of Phase 1 analysis, Stage A, involved processing the  
275 quantitative and qualitative data collected during the Phase 1 survey. Of the 63 original statements,  
276 12 had a mean value between 3 and 5 and were therefore discarded (Appendix 2). The remaining 51  
277 original statements had a mean value of 5 or greater and were retained (Appendix 2). None of the  
278 original statements received a mean score of less than 3. Next, participants’ comments were labelled  
279 and sorted into themes by EJK, following training from SFW. These themes provided a way of  
280 extracting general recommendations from the set of individual participant responses.

#### 281 ***Stage B***

282 The data (included statements and participant recommendations) were grouped by sub-category.  
283 Whilst the initial aim had been to produce one checklist item for each sub-category, it was decided  
284 that two components, a “current” and a “future” statement, would be created for each item (see  
285 Methods for details). These components are presented in Table 4.

286

### 287 **Phase 2**

288 The list of components included in the Phase 2 survey can be seen in Table 4. All components were  
289 given a mean “yes” rating higher than 50%; with the lowest rating at 56%, the highest at 100% and  
290 the majority (23/28) falling at or above 75% (see Appendix 3). Therefore, no components were  
291 discarded. The number of text responses to each component is presented in Table 4, organised by  
292 classification (meaningful recommendation, formatting/language, not relevant/refers to a different  
293 statement). These comments were used to update the components for use in Phase 3. Mean and  
294 median rankings of component importance were calculated for the “right now” and “in the future”  
295 checklists (Figures 2 and 3). Finally, satisfaction ratings for the two checklists were observed (Figure  
296 4). The median satisfaction rating for both checklists was “satisfied”.

297

298 *[Table 4 about here]*

299

300 *[Figure 2 about here]*



301

302

*[Figure 3 about here]*

303

304

*[Figure 4 about here]*

305

306

### 307 **Phase 3**

308 All statements were given a mean “yes” rating higher than 50%; with the lowest rating at 65%, the  
309 highest at 100% and the majority (24/28) falling at or above 75% (see Appendix 4). Therefore no  
310 statements were discarded. Minor comments regarding the wording of the statements were  
311 considered and the statements were altered where appropriate. Satisfaction ratings for the two  
312 checklists are illustrated in Figure 5. The median satisfaction rating for both checklists was  
313 “satisfied”. The median satisfaction rating for both checklists was “satisfied”. The final versions of  
314 the two checklists can be viewed at [OSF link, redacted].

315

316

*[Figure 5 about here]*

317

318

### **Discussion**

319 This research used the Delphi method to create guidelines for best practice in mental health data  
320 science. A group of participants with expertise in mental illness and data science contributed  
321 responses over three phases to produce two checklists: one focused on what mental health  
322 researchers can do now, and one focused on what the wider mental health data science community  
323 can put in place in the future. Each checklist features 14 items that cover issues pertaining to de-  
324 identification of data, data security, transparency and oversight, and community perspectives. Each  
325 final checklist was approved by all remaining participants, receiving comprehensive support at the  
326 level of individual statements and for the checklist as a whole.

327 As mental health data science moves forward, it is essential to obtain and maintain the trust of those  
328 who provide the data, and represent their views in how data science is conducted (Ford et al., 2019).  
329 The use of the Delphi methodology ensures that participants’ involvement goes beyond consultation  
330 and becomes part of the scientific process itself. We anticipate that the resultant checklists will be  
331 used in conjunction with other work which seeks to apply high standards of data governance to the  
332 rapidly evolving field of data science, such as Jones et al.’s (2020) position paper on standards for the  
333 use of clinical free-text data.

334 Examination of the rankings for the current best practice checklist (Figure 2) showed that de-  
335 identification of data was expert participants’ highest priority for researchers currently working with  
336 mental health data. It is possible that this could reflect particular concerns regarding privacy of  
337 mental health data (King et al., 2012), though previous research with the general public suggests  
338 that de-identification (which is sometimes perceived as anonymisation; Aitken et al., 2016) is also  
339 important when considering health data more generally (Aitken et al., 2016; Buckley, Murphy, &  
340 MacFarlane, 2011; Jung, Choi, & Shim, 2020). The rankings also demonstrated an emphasis on

341 keeping data safe and secure, though making data accessible was also viewed as important. This  
342 pattern of responses complements previous research with the general public, who were supportive  
343 of health data sharing assuming certain conditions (such as trust in those handling the data) were  
344 met (Aitken et al., 2016).

345 The top three ranked statements for the future best practice checklist all fell under the sub-category  
346 “users of data”, covering who accesses the data, where it is accessed, and how this access is  
347 monitored. The top three statements (Figure 3) reflect a desire for a landscape in which data are  
348 well protected via training and supervision for those using the data, and via ongoing oversight of  
349 projects. There was a sense that sanctions for inappropriate use of data should be used, but that  
350 these should be in proportion to the “offence”; for example, an innocent mistake should be treated  
351 differently to deliberate misuse of data, and whole research groups should not be sanctioned based  
352 on the behaviour of one individual.

353 Whilst data protection was clearly of central importance to the expert participants, it became  
354 apparent that some current practices for accessing data can be cumbersome and inefficient,  
355 especially where physical procedures, such as attending safe settings, are required before access is  
356 gained. As one participant noted, this could unintentionally introduce barriers for certain groups of  
357 people, such as those with access needs, who may require access to the data. Furthermore, there  
358 was concern that extensive and inconvenient barriers to data access could encourage unsafe  
359 workarounds, such as using the same password for multiple situations. Delphi participants were  
360 generally in favour of moving away from physical controls and towards more efficient, digital control  
361 of data. The innovation of more secure, streamlined access to mental health data would have wide-  
362 ranging benefits, not least within academia where the time it takes to access data can out-run the  
363 length of a project that seeks to study such data (Ford et al., 2019; Iveson & Deary, 2019). This is an  
364 important factor for the mental health data science community to consider when designing future  
365 procedures and systems.

366 With respect to the topic of consent, although all participants had expertise in data science, none of  
367 the Phase 1 statements concerned with consent procedures which maximise access for scientific  
368 research received sufficient consensus for inclusion in later phases (Appendix 2). Consent statements  
369 which were retained tended to favour giving individuals control over their data, though a number of  
370 individual participants recognised the inherent difficulties with this approach (such as restrictions on  
371 research and excessive burden on individuals). Dealing with consent is arguably one of the most  
372 challenging issues for the mental health data science community, though innovative models are  
373 being developed (Budin-Ljosne et al., 2017; Vayena & Blasimme, 2017). With respect to our  
374 research, the expert participants as a group rejected the concept of allowing consent to be provided  
375 by a representative sample of participants rather than by all participants, but endorsed the  
376 possibility of moving away from individualised models of consent in the future.

377 With respect to limitations, we acknowledge that there was some drop-out across the three phases,  
378 due both to technical error (four participants) and participant attrition (11 participants from Phase 1  
379 to Phase 3). It could be suggested that some of the participants left the study due to disagreement  
380 with the concept behind the study. However, this is unlikely given that participants were asked to  
381 review an information sheet describing the aims and procedures by sent to them by email before  
382 they agreed to begin the study. It is also possible that some of the participant attrition was  
383 connected to participants’ mental health, which could have left a final sample who were more well  
384 than the sample that initially agreed to take part. Nevertheless, the vast majority of the final sample  
385 considered themselves to have a mental illness at the time of the research, suggesting that the views  
386 of people with current lived experience were represented. Similarly, we cannot be sure of the extent

387 to which the participants in the present study were representative of people with experience of  
388 mental illness more generally; by definition – due to the data science experience criterion - our  
389 sample were more highly educated than the general population, and although participants were  
390 able to provide additional information about their mental health if they chose to, we did not  
391 systematically collect data on the specific mental health conditions they experienced. It is therefore  
392 possible that the sample did not represent the full range of people with mental health conditions  
393 whose data may be included in future mental health data science research. Finally, whilst a key  
394 strength of our study was the inclusion of expert participants with both experience of mental illness  
395 and professional knowledge of data science, it is possible that this group of people may differ in their  
396 views from those with experience of mental illness but less knowledge of data science. Having said  
397 this, given that our study was designed to create guidelines for mental health data science rather  
398 than gather opinions on the topic, this is perhaps a less pressing concern.

399 The underuse of increasingly large sources of data is arguably leading to avoidable health harms  
400 (Jones et al., 2017), not least in mental health research, where big data are less widely used than in  
401 fields such as oncology or cardiology (McIntosh et al., 2016). However, as mental health data science  
402 develops, it is essential that those with experience of mental illness are included every step of the  
403 way. Our two resultant checklists focus, respectively, on what mental health researchers working  
404 now can do to make their data trustworthy, and on the actions the wider mental health data science  
405 community should take in the future. By “in the future”, we refer especially to new platforms for  
406 mental health data science; such developments should aim to adhere to the advice provided by the  
407 future checklist, and to use it as a guide in the creation of new infrastructure. The rapidly-growing  
408 opportunities for using routinely-collected mental health data offer the chance for more inclusive  
409 research which captures information from those who are, for whatever reason, unable to engage  
410 with traditional research methodologies (Lally et al., 2018; Woodall et al., 2010). We hope that these  
411 checklists will facilitate such use, in turn supporting the development of outcomes which include and  
412 benefit those who need them most.

413

414

415

References

- 416 Aitken, M., Jorre, J. D., Pagliari, C., Jepson, R., & Cunningham-Burley, S. (2016). Public responses to  
417 the sharing and linkage of health data for research purposes: a systematic review and  
418 thematic synthesis of qualitative studies. *Bmc Medical Ethics*, *17*. doi:10.1186/s12910-016-  
419 0153-x
- 420 Bisson, J. I., Tavakoly, B., Witteveen, A. B., Ajdukovic, D., Jehel, L., Johansen, V. J., . . . Olff, M. (2010).  
421 TENTS guidelines: development of post-disaster psychosocial care guidelines through a  
422 Delphi process. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, *196*(1), 69-74. doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.109.066266
- 423 Buckley, B. S., Murphy, A. W., & MacFarlane, A. E. (2011). Public attitudes to the use in research of  
424 personal health information from general practitioners' records: a survey of the Irish general  
425 public. *J Med Ethics*, *37*(1), 50-55. doi:10.1136/jme.2010.037903
- 426 Budin-Ljosne, I., Teare, H. J. A., Kaye, J., Beck, S., Bentzen, H. B., Caenazzo, L., . . . Mascalzoni, D.  
427 (2017). Dynamic Consent: a potential solution to some of the challenges of modern  
428 biomedical research. *Bmc Medical Ethics*, *18*, 10. doi:10.1186/s12910-016-0162-9
- 429 Coid, J. W., Kirkbride, J. B., Barker, D., Cowden, F., Stamps, R., Yang, M., & Jones, P. B. (2008). Raised  
430 incidence rates of all psychoses among migrant groups: findings from the East London first  
431 episode psychosis study. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*, *65*(11), 1250-1258.  
432 doi:10.1001/archpsyc.65.11.1250
- 433 De Villiers, M. R., De Villiers, P. J. T., & Kent, A. P. (2005). The Delphi technique in health sciences  
434 education research. *Medical Teacher*, *27*(7), 639-643. doi:10.1080/13611260500069947
- 435 Department of Health and Social Care (2019). *Code of conduct for data-driven health and care*  
436 *technology*. UK Government, retrieved 19.12.20 from:  
437 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/code-of-conduct-for-data-driven-health-and-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/code-of-conduct-for-data-driven-health-and-care-technology/initial-code-of-conduct-for-data-driven-health-and-care-technology)  
438 [care-technology/initial-code-of-conduct-for-data-driven-health-and-care-technology](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/code-of-conduct-for-data-driven-health-and-care-technology/initial-code-of-conduct-for-data-driven-health-and-care-technology)
- 439 Ford, E., Boyd, A., Bowles, J. K. F., Havard, A., Aldridge, R. W., Curcin, V., . . . Sperrin, M. (2019). Our  
440 data, our society, our health: A vision for inclusive and transparent health data science in the  
441 United Kingdom and beyond. *Learning Health Systems*, *3*(3), 12. doi:10.1002/lrh2.10191
- 442 Furimsky, I., Cheung, A. H., Dewa, C. S., & Zipursky, R. B. (2008). Strategies to enhance patient  
443 recruitment and retention in research involving patients with a first episode of mental  
444 illness. *Contemporary Clinical Trials*, *29*(6), 862-866. doi:10.1016/j.cct.2008.07.005
- 445 Government Digital Service (2020). *Data Ethics Framework*. UK Government, retrieved on 19.12.20  
446 from [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/data-ethics-framework/data-ethics-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/data-ethics-framework/data-ethics-framework-2020)  
447 [framework-2020](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/data-ethics-framework/data-ethics-framework-2020)
- 448 Gulsuner, S., Stein, D. J., Susser, E. S., Sibeko, G., Pretorius, A., Walsh, T., . . . McClellan, J. M. (2020).  
449 Genetics of schizophrenia in the South African Xhosa. *Science*, *367*(6477), 569-573.  
450 doi:10.1126/science.aay8833
- 451 Iltis, A. S., Misra, S., Dunn, L. B., Brown, G. K., Campbell, A., Earll, S. A., . . . DuBois, J. M. (2013).  
452 Addressing Risks to Advance Mental Health Research. *Jama Psychiatry*, *70*(12), 1363-1371.  
453 doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2013.2105
- 454 Iveson, M. H., & Deary, I. J. (2019). Navigating the landscape of non-health administrative data in  
455 Scotland: A researcher's narrative [version 2; peer review: 2 approved]. *Wellcome Open*  
456 *Research*, *4*(97). doi:10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15336.2
- 457 Iwamasa, G. Y., Sorocco, K. H., & Koonce, D. A. (2002). Ethnicity and clinical psychology: a content  
458 analysis of the literature. *Clin Psychol Rev*, *22*(6), 931-944. doi:10.1016/s0272-  
459 7358(02)00147-2
- 460 Jones, K. H., Ford, E. M., Lea, N., Griffiths, L. J., Hassan, L., Heys, S., . . . Nenadic, G. (2020). Toward  
461 the Development of Data Governance Standards for Using Clinical Free-Text Data in Health  
462 Research: Position Paper. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *22*(6), 16. doi:10.2196/16760
- 463 Jones, K. H., Laurie, G., Stevens, L., Dobbs, C., Ford, D. V., & Lea, N. (2017). The other side of the coin:  
464 Harm due to the non-use of health-related data. *International Journal of Medical*  
465 *Informatics*, *97*, 43-51. doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2016.09.010

- 466 Jorm, A. F. (2015). Using the Delphi expert consensus method in mental health research. *Australian*  
467 *and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 49(10), 887-897. doi:10.1177/0004867415600891
- 468 Jung, Y., Choi, H., & Shim, H. (2020). Individual Willingness to Share Personal Health Information with  
469 Secondary Information Users in South Korea. *Health Communication*, 35(6), 659-666.  
470 doi:10.1080/10410236.2019.1582311
- 471 Kannisto, K. A., Korhonen, J., Adams, C. E., Koivunen, M. H., Vahlberg, T., & Välimäki, M. A. (2017).  
472 Factors Associated With Dropout During Recruitment and Follow-Up Periods of a mHealth-  
473 Based Randomized Controlled Trial for Mobile.Net to Encourage Treatment Adherence for  
474 People With Serious Mental Health Problems. *Journal of medical Internet research*, 19(2),  
475 e46-e46. doi:10.2196/jmir.6417
- 476 Kelly, C. M., Jorm, A. F., Kitchener, B. A., & Langlands, R. L. (2008). Development of mental health  
477 first aid guidelines for suicidal ideation and behaviour: A Delphi study. *Bmc Psychiatry*, 8, 10.  
478 doi:10.1186/1471-244x-8-17
- 479 King, T., Brankovic, L., & Gillard, P. (2012). Perspectives of Australian adults about protecting the  
480 privacy of their health information in statistical databases. *International Journal of Medical*  
481 *Informatics*, 81(4), 279-289. doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2012.01.005
- 482 Kline, E., Hendel, V., Friedman-Yakoobian, M., Meshulam-Gately, R. I., Findeisen, A., Zimmet, S., . . .  
483 Seidman, L. J. (2019). A comparison of neurocognition and functioning in first episode  
484 psychosis populations: do research samples reflect the real world? *Social Psychiatry and*  
485 *Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 54(3), 291-301. doi:10.1007/s00127-018-1631-x
- 486 Lally, J., Watkins, R., Nash, S., Shetty, H., Gardner-Sood, P., Smith, S., . . . Gaughran, F. (2018). The  
487 Representativeness of Participants With Severe Mental Illness in a Psychosocial Clinical Trial.  
488 *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 9, 7. doi:10.3389/fpsy.2018.00654
- 489 Langlands, R. L., Jorm, A. F., Kelly, C. M., & Kitchener, B. A. (2008). First aid recommendations for  
490 psychosis: Using the delphi method to gain consensus between mental health consumers,  
491 carers, and clinicians. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 34(3), 435-443. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbm099
- 492 Martin, A. M., Zakrzewski, J. J., Chou, C.-Y., Uhm, S. Y., Gause, R. M., Chan, J., . . . Mathews, C. A.  
493 (2018). Recruiting under-represented populations into psychiatric research: Results from the  
494 help for hoarding study. *Contemporary Clinical Trials Communications*, 12, 169-175.  
495 doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conctc.2018.11.003
- 496 Martínez, C., & Farhan, I. (2019). *Making the right choices: Using data-driven technology to*  
497 *transform mental healthcare*. Retrieved from Westminster, UK:
- 498 McIntosh, A. M., Stewart, R., John, A., Smith, D. J., Davis, K., Sudlow, C., . . . Grp, M. D. S. (2016). Data  
499 science for mental health: a UK perspective on a global challenge. *Lancet Psychiatry*, 3(10),  
500 993-998. doi:Doi 10.1016/S2215-0366(16)30089-X
- 501 McNall, M., & Foster-Fishman, P. G. (2007). Methods of Rapid Evaluation, Assessment, and  
502 Appraisal. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 28(2), 151-168. doi:10.1177/1098214007300895
- 503 Murphy, C., Thorpe, L., Trefusis, H., & Kousoulis, A. (2020). Unlocking the potential for digital mental  
504 health technologies in the UK: a Delphi exercise. *Bjpsych Open*, 6(1), 5.  
505 doi:10.1192/bjo.2019.95
- 506 Okoli, C., & Pawlowski, S. D. (2004). The Delphi method as a research tool: an example, design  
507 considerations and applications. *Information & Management*, 42(1), 15-29.  
508 doi:10.1016/j.im.2003.11.002
- 509 Patterson, S., Kramo, K., Soteriou, T., & Crawford, M. J. (2010). The great divide: A qualitative  
510 investigation of factors influencing researcher access to potential randomised controlled  
511 trial participants in mental health settings. *Journal of Mental Health*, 19(6), 532-541.  
512 doi:10.3109/09638237.2010.520367
- 513 Simon, G. E. (2019). Big Data From Health Records in Mental Health Care Hardly Clairvoyant but  
514 Already Useful. *Jama Psychiatry*, 76(4), 349-350. doi:10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2018.4510
- 515 Sinclair, S., Jaggi, P., Hack, T. F., Russell, L., McClement, S. E., Cuthbertson, L., . . . Leget, C. (2020).  
516 Initial Validation of a Patient-Reported Measure of Compassion: Determining the Content

517            Validity and Clinical Sensibility among Patients Living with a Life-Limiting and Incurable  
518            Illness. *Patient-Patient Centered Outcomes Research*, 13(3), 327-337. doi:10.1007/s40271-  
519            020-00409-8  
520    Vayena, E., & Blasimme, A. (2017). Biomedical Big Data: New Models of Control Over Access, Use  
521            and Governance. *Journal of Bioethical Inquiry*, 14(4), 501-513. doi:10.1007/s11673-017-  
522            9809-6  
523    Woodall, A., Morgan, C., Sloan, C., & Howard, L. (2010). Barriers to participation in mental health  
524            research: are there specific gender, ethnicity and age related barriers? *Bmc Psychiatry*, 10,  
525            10. doi:10.1186/1471-244x-10-103  
  
526  
  
527

528

**Tables**

529

**Table 1:** *Participants' experience relevant to mental illness and data science or research methods*

<b>Experience relevant to mental illness</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Experience relevant to data science or research methods</b>	<b>Number</b>
I have been diagnosed with a mental illness at some time in my life.	20	I have an undergraduate qualification in an area relevant to data science or research methods <i>(e.g. psychology, clinical science, epidemiology, statistics etc.)</i> .	13
I consider myself to have a mental illness at the moment.	16	I have a postgraduate qualification in an area relevant to data science or research methods <i>(e.g. psychology, clinical science, epidemiology, statistics etc.)</i> .	14
I have family members or close friends who live with mental illness.	15	I have advised on a research study/worked on a research team.	17
I work in an occupation which is related to mental health.	10	I work or have worked as a peer researcher.	6
I am a mental health practitioner.	2	I work or have worked in a research setting.	15
		I work or have worked in a setting that interfaces with research <i>(e.g. third sector organisation, NHS)</i> .	14

530

*Note.* Participants included in this table are those who took part in all three phases, n = 20. Most

531

participants fell into more than one category per column.

532

533

534

535

536 **Table 2:** Terminology used to describe survey contents

<b>Term</b>	<b>Use in text</b>	<b>Phase</b>
statement	Refers to one of the 63 statements included in the Phase 1 survey	1
category	Refers to the seven categories used to sort the 63 statements in Phase 1	1
sub-category	Refers to the sub-sections of the seven categories used in Phase 1	1
item	One of the 14 items included in the (draft) checklist in Phases 2 and 3. Each item is divided into two components, a “best practice now” component and a “best practice in the future” component.	2 and 3
component	Each of the 14 checklist items is divided into two components, a “best practice now” component and a “best practice in the future” component. Therefore, there are 28 components in total within the best practice checklist.	2 and 3

537

538

539



540 **Table 3:** Categories and sub-categories for statements and items included in the surveys

<b>Category</b>	<b>Survey sub-categories (Phase 1)</b>	<b>Survey sub-categories (Phases 2 and 3)</b>
1. Users of data	Who uses data	Who uses data
	Where data are accessed	Where data are accessed
	Checks on data users/how access is monitored	Checks on data users/how access is monitored
2. Access to data	Giving access	Giving access
	Getting access	Getting access
	<i>Use of synthetic data</i>	
3. Data linkage	<i>Linking mental health data with data from other public services</i>	<b>Data linkage</b>
	<i>Linking mental health data with individually-created data</i>	
4. Anonymity and de-identification	De-identifying data	De-identifying data
	Protecting against accidental identification	Protecting against accidental identification
5. Consent	<i>Giving people control over their data</i>	<b>Consent</b>
	<i>Ensuring maximum access for scientific purposes</i>	
	<i>Using alternative models of consent</i>	
6. Governance	Dealing with requests for data withdrawal	Dealing with requests for data withdrawal
	How we respond to mistakes	How we respond to mistakes
	How we enact quality control	How we enact quality control
7. Community	Ensuring public trust in mental health data science	Ensuring public trust in mental health data science

How we understand the context  
in which mental health data  
science occurs

How we understand the context  
in which mental health data  
science occurs

---

541 Note. Sub-categories that were removed are highlighted in italics, sub-categories that were added  
542 are highlighted in bold. The other sub-categories remained the same throughout.  
543

**Table 4:** Phase 2 survey components with their corresponding number of participant comments, divided by comment classification

Current or future	Best practice for mental health data science means...	Meaningful recommendation	Formatting/language comment	Not relevant/refers to different statement
Current	Best practice for mental health data science means data should be accessible to a range of people who conduct research, including academics and health workers.	5	2	0
Future	Best practice for mental health data science means providing appropriate training and supervision for data users, and carrying out criminal record checks.	4	2	0
Current	Best practice for mental health data science means ensuring that data are accessed in safe settings, but that procedures should not be too complicated (to avoid encouragement of unsafe "workarounds").	3	5	0
Future	Best practice for mental health data science means providing digital controls to allow remote access from private settings, using procedures that are not too complicated.	2	5	0
Current	Best practice for mental health data science means creating data management plans and ensuring that these are adhered to over time.	1	6	0
Future	Best practice for mental health data science means incorporating inspection processes to ensure ongoing compliance with good data practice, and responding proportionately to inappropriate data use with measures such as temporary or long-term suspension of access.	4	3	0
Current	Best practice for mental health data science means researchers, scientists and clinical services making data and findings (including null results) open-access where possible, but taking extra care when making decisions regarding access to qualitative data such as free text information.	6	5	1
Future	Best practice for mental health data science means building plans for data collected by researchers, scientists and clinical services to be made available for analysis on an open-access basis.	6	1	0
Current	Best practice for mental health data science means allowing other researchers to check analyses wherever possible.	5	0	0

Future	Best practice for mental health data science means providing access to synthetic data where real data cannot be shared, in order to allow other researchers to check analyses.	5	1	0
Current	Best practice for mental health data science means responsible linking of mental health data with other sources of public data, such as education or welfare data, in order to provide new information of public benefit about mental health.	4	2	0
Future	Best practice for mental health data science means developing effective measures, including secure linking systems, to protect against identification and misuse.	3	1	0
Current	Best practice for mental health data science means using de-identified data, except where identifiable information (including information about protected characteristics) is essential to beneficial outcomes. In all cases the health and benefit of people with lived experience should be prioritised.	2	4	0
Future	Best practice for mental health data science means developing methods for de-identification, including innovative ways to mask identifiable information.	2	1	0
Current	Best practice for mental health data science means incorporating rules-based statistical disclosure control.	3	7	1
Future	Best practice for mental health data science means incorporating principles-based statistical disclosure control with training and external oversight.	4	4	1
Current	Best practice for mental health data science means ensuring that participants have as much control over consent as possible.	4	1	0
Future	Best practice for mental health data science means exploring alternative models of consent, such as blanket consent for a research topic (e.g. drug development for depression), or blanket consent for a type of data being accessed (e.g. blood test data).	8	1	0
Current	Best practice for mental health data science means ensuring that researchers have a process in place for responding to withdrawal requests and that they provide transparency on whether, how and when participants can withdraw their data.	0	0	0

Future	Best practice for mental health data science means appointing an independent arbiter to arbitrate on complex questions relating to consent and data withdrawal.	5	0	0
Current	Best practice for mental health data science means planning in advance to avoid data breaches, utilising a recording process for data breaches, and reporting near misses.	1	2	0
Future	Best practice for mental health data science means developing robust systems to prevent data leaks and breaches.	5	1	0
Current	Best practice for mental health data science means monitoring data quality and taking account of the origin and quality of data when drawing conclusions.	1	0	0
Future	Best practice for mental health data science means incorporating both stakeholder and procedural oversight of data repositories, with the latter tasked with monitoring data quality and responding to public questions.	5	5	0
Current	Best practice for mental health data science means incorporating the views of people with lived experience throughout the course of each project, and providing sensitive and high quality public communication of findings.	2	2	0
Future	Best practice for mental health data science means following the principles of open access throughout; publicly pre-registering studies, providing online information of each overarching request to use data and consequent outputs, and publication of null results.	4	3	1
Current	Best practice for mental health data science means ensuring that data users understand the underlying data collection tools as well as the socio-cultural context in which studies are designed and findings are disseminated.	4	0	0
Future	Best practice for mental health data science means active commitment and working to reduce stigma associated with the phenomena being studied and to increase public understanding of science.	8	1	0

Note: Number of participants was 26.

### Figure captions

**Figure 1.** Illustration of the phases of the Delphi process.

**Figure 2.** Mean ranking of statements in the current best practice checklist during Phase 2, ordered by median ranking. Lower scores (at the top of the figure) indicate higher importance (number of participants = 25).

**Figure 3.** Mean ranking of statements in the future best practice checklist during Phase 2, ordered by median ranking. Lower scores (at the top of the figure) indicate higher importance (number of participants = 24).

**Figure 4.** Participant satisfaction with the draft checklist during Phase 2 (n = 25)

**Figure 5.** Participant satisfaction with the checklist during Phase 3 (n = 20)

**Conflict of interest:**

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

**Author contributions:**

SFW, AM and CC contributed to the conception of the study. EK, SFW, IB, CC and MI contributed to the design of the study. EK and SFW performed the analysis. EK wrote the first draft of the manuscript. CC, SFW, IB and MI made revisions to the draft manuscript. All authors read and approved the submitted version.

**Funding:**

This project has received funding from the Medical Research Council (grant number MC\_PC\_17209) and the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement n° 847776). The funding bodies had no role in the design of the study, the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data or in writing the manuscript.

**Acknowledgements:**

The authors would like to thank the Delphi experts who co-produced these guidelines, Mahmud Al-Gailani and VOX Scotland, Suzy Syrett (University of Glasgow), Liz MacWhinney (Lanarkshire Links), the MRC Pathfinder Stakeholder Advisory Group at the University of Edinburgh, our MRC Pathfinder colleagues both within the University of Edinburgh and across the UK, and all those who helped us to recruit our panel of experts.

**Data availability:**

The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

## Pre-design phase

- Research team generate first survey with input from group of stakeholder advisors.
- Recruitment of expert Delphi participants with experience of both mental illness and data science (n = 39).

## Phase 1

- Survey 1: expert participants (n = 35) complete first online survey individually, indicating their (dis)agreement with statements (using Likert scale 1 – 7) and adding missed information.
- Analysis 1: survey responses analysed to derive condensed list of items, translated into current-future best practice pairs. Used to produce next survey.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.16.21251761>; this version posted February 19, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](#).

## Phase 2

- Survey 2: expert participants (n = 26) complete second online survey individually, responding “yes” or “no” to the inclusion of each item presented, and commenting on item wording. Participants rank items in order of importance.
- Analysis 2: items refined based on survey responses. Used to produce next survey.

## Phase 3

- Survey 3: expert participants (n = 20) complete third online survey individually, responding “yes” or “no” to the inclusion of each item presented. Participants view mock-up of final checklists and indicate their satisfaction.
- Analysis 3: minor changes to wording made based on survey responses.



## Best practice for mental health data science right now means...

using de-identified data, except where identifiable information (including information about protected characteristics) is essential to beneficial outcomes. In all cases the health and benefit of people with lived experience should be prioritised.

data should be accessible to a range of people who conduct research, including academics and health workers.

ensuring that data are accessed in safe settings, but that procedures should not be too complicated (to avoid encouragement of unsafe "workarounds").

allowing other researchers to check analyses wherever possible.

planning in advance to avoid data breaches, utilising a recording process for data breaches, and reporting near misses.

researchers, scientists and clinical services making data and findings (including null results) open-access where possible, but taking extra care when making decisions regarding access to qualitative data such as free text information.

creating data management plans and ensuring that these are adhered to over time.

incorporating the views of people with lived experience throughout the course of each project, and providing sensitive and high quality public communication of findings.

responsible linking of mental health data with other sources of public data, such as education or welfare data, in order to provide new information of public benefit about mental health.


ensuring that participants have as much control over consent as possible.

ensuring that researchers have a process in place for responding to withdrawal requests and that they provide transparency on whether, how and when participants can withdraw their data.

ensuring that data users understand the underlying data collection tools as well as the socio-cultural context in which studies are designed and findings are disseminated.

monitoring data quality and taking account of the origin and quality of data when drawing conclusions.


incorporating rules-based statistical disclosure control.





## Best practice for mental health data science in the future means...






Best practice right now

Best practice in the future

0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

Very dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very satisfied



Best practice right now

Best practice in the future

0% 20% 40% 60% 80% 100%

Very dissatisfied Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied Very satisfied