

1 **Title page**

2 Exploring factors for meaningful patient involvement in  
3 infectious disease clinical studies: A qualitative pilot study  
4 among key stakeholders.  
5

6 **Authors**

7 S. Moggré;<sup>1,2</sup> T. ten Doesschate;<sup>1,3</sup> E. Sieswerda;<sup>1,4</sup> and K.A.G.J. Romijnders <sup>1</sup>

8

9 **Affiliations**

10 1 Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center Utrecht,  
11 Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands

12 2 Department of Medical Microbiology, Tergooi MC, Hilversum, The Netherlands

13 3 Department of internal medicine, Jeroen Bosch Hospital, 's-Hertogenbosch, The Netherlands

14 4 Department of Medical Microbiology, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht University,  
15 Utrecht, The Netherlands.

16

17 **Corresponding author**

18 Sebastiaan Moggré

19 Universiteitsweg 100

20 Utrecht, 3584 CG, The Netherlands

21 Phone: +31653971094

22 Email: s.moggre@umcutrecht.nl

23

24

25

1 **Abstract**

2 **Introduction** The attitude towards patient involvement in clinical research has changed  
3 dramatically over the years, from research about patient to research with patients. This  
4 qualitative study aimed to explore perceptions, ideas, and opinions of stakeholders about  
5 integrating the patient perspective into clinical research in infectious diseases in the  
6 Netherlands.

7 **Methods** Stakeholders involved with clinical research in infectious diseases were purposefully  
8 sampled between March and June 2023. Interviews were conducted using a semi-structured  
9 guide based on the Consolidated Framework for Intervention Research and feasibility  
10 framework.

11 **Results** Of the thirteen stakeholders, six were (clinical) researchers, two represented  
12 pharmaceutical companies, two were involved with policy making, and three were patient  
13 representatives. Patient involvement in the design and conduct of clinical research in infectious  
14 diseases was seen as crucial, although the mode of involvement could differ between research  
15 in acute and chronic infections. Stakeholders observed a gap among patients and clinical  
16 researchers, which was believed to lead to a phenomenon described as an ivory tower. Key  
17 opinion leaders may potentially bridge these barriers and serve as protagonists for meaningful  
18 patient involvement. Stakeholders acknowledged the need of communication and expertise to  
19 integrate the patient perspective in clinical research in infectious diseases.

20 **Conclusion** Our qualitative analysis underlines that despite barriers, such as communication  
21 and expertise, stakeholders recognize the importance of integrating the patient perspective in  
22 clinical research in infectious diseases to improve the quality, relevance, recruitment, and  
23 dissemination. Further research is needed to address distinctions between acute and chronic  
24 infectious diseases in terms of patient involvement.

## 1 **Introduction**

2 The perspective towards involving patients in clinical research has changed dramatically over  
3 the years, changing from research about patient to research with patients (1-5). Integrating the  
4 perspective of patients in clinical trials is essential to optimize clinical care. This shift was  
5 driven by the recognition that patient involvement enhances the quality, efficiency, impact, and  
6 outcomes of research (6). In addition, this shift was prompted by ethical and political  
7 considerations associated with the empowerment of patients and increased demand of  
8 accountability and transparency of public spendings (6-8). Despite this trend of increased  
9 patient involvement in clinical research, hardly any efforts have been made to improve patient  
10 involvement within the research in acute infectious diseases (9, 10).

11 Implementation of the perspective of patients in clinical research in infectious diseases is strived  
12 for and desired by clinicians, researchers, patient representatives, pharmaceutical industry,  
13 policy makers, and funders to improve the quality, relevance, recruitment, and dissemination  
14 of clinical research (11, 12). Most research has focused on augmenting the influence,  
15 significance, and evaluative efforts concerning the engagement of patients in clinical research.  
16 (1, 4-11, 13-28). In addition, in a review of the literature several barriers and opportunities of  
17 patient involvement in clinical research for patients and researchers were discussed (9).  
18 However, these barriers and opportunities within stakeholders beyond the researchers remain  
19 unclear. Some studies addressed the patient perspective in clinical studies in infectious diseases  
20 (9, 10, 29-31). To the best of our knowledge, a comprehensive overview of factors related to  
21 integrating the perspective of patients in the design and conduct of clinical research in infectious  
22 diseases has not been reported. In addition, several studies investigated the opinions of patients  
23 and clinical researcher about patient involvement in clinical research (10, 23, 24, 26, 27). We  
24 aim to include a wider variety of stakeholders involved in clinical research to build a  
25 comprehensive overview of opinions, ideas, and perspectives. The inclusion of various  
26 stakeholders involved in clinical research in infectious diseases is important to direct the clinical  
27 research community towards optimal integration of the patient perspective in the design and  
28 conduct of clinical research (9). The inclusion of various stakeholders involved in clinical  
29 research in infectious diseases is important to direct the clinical research community towards  
30 optimal integration of the patient perspective in the design and conduct of clinical research (9,  
31 32).

32 Our qualitative study aims to explore perspectives, ideas, and opinions related to integrating the  
33 perspective of patients in the design and conduct of clinical research in infectious diseases

- 1 among all stakeholders involved. In the context of this paper, we refer to patients as people who
- 2 have experience with infectious disease and participation in a clinical study.

## 1 **Materials and Methods**

2 This qualitative study was approved by the ethics committee of the University Medical Centre  
3 Utrecht (UMCU): 23U-0086. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative studies (COREQ)  
4 (33) are reported in supplementary table 1.

### 6 **Study population**

7 Between March 2023 and June 2023, stakeholders involved in the field of clinical studies  
8 related to infectious disease were purposely sampled. Eligibility criteria were being a Dutch or  
9 English-speaking adult (>18 years) and experienced with infectious disease clinical studies. To  
10 ensure maximum variation, we included participants who differed by gender, age, and expertise.  
11 Sampling was scheduled to stop after a priori thematic saturation was reached (34).

### 13 **Data collection**

14 Potential participants could contact K.A.G.J.R. to make an appointment for the interview, which  
15 was confirmed by e-mail with more information about the study aims and interview procedures.  
16 All interviews were audio-recorded and conducted via Microsoft teams (n=13). Participants  
17 received no reimbursement for their time.

18 Semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted using an interview topic guide using  
19 constructs from the Consolidated Framework for Intervention Research (CFIR) (35) and  
20 feasibility framework of (36). The interviews explored perceptions and acceptability in relation  
21 to integrating the perspective of patients in clinical studies focused on infectious diseases (table  
22 1). In addition, the implementation and practicality of the patient perspective in clinical studies  
23 were explored. The topic guide was pre-tested during three pilot interviews and subsequently  
24 revised.

25 The interviews were conducted by K.A.G.J.R., an experienced social science researcher and  
26 I.V. a MSc medical student. The interview started with an introduction of the study and an  
27 explanation of the interview. Next, the interviewer discussed the informed consent orally with  
28 the participant and asked whether the stakeholder had any questions. Open-ended questions  
29 were used to stimulate stakeholder's own interpretation, and stakeholders were encouraged to  
30 elaborately describe their point of view. Prompts were used to further encourage deliberation.  
31 During the interviews, notes were taken to describe nonverbal communication. Finally, the  
32 stakeholders were asked to provide background information. Interviews lasted approximately  
33 45 minutes and were conducted in Dutch (n=12) or in English (n=1).

## 1 **Table 1 Interview topic guide**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Example question or description</b>
Introduction	Introduction of the interview, researcher, and participant
<b><i>Intervention characteristics</i></b>	
Acceptability	Can you elaborate on the added value of the patient perspective in clinical studies?
Relative advantage	What are advantages of integrating the patient perspective in clinical studies? What are disadvantages of integrating the patient perspective in clinical studies?
<b><i>Outer setting</i></b>	
Patient needs & resources	To what extent are you aware of the needs, perspectives, and wishes of patients with regards to integrating their perspective in clinical studies?
Implementation	What are barriers of integrating the perspective of patients in clinical studies? What are facilitators of integrating the perspective of patients in clinical studies?
<b><i>Inner setting</i></b>	
Readiness for implementation	Can you elaborate on creating a patient outcome measure? Can you elaborate on the process of working with patients in creating outcome measures? Can you elaborate on your experience with working together with patients to integrate their perspective in clinical studies?
Integration	What do you need to apply the patient perspective in clinical studies?
<b><i>Individual characteristics</i></b>	
Value	Can you summarize your experience with integrating the patient perspective in clinical studies?
Constructs and questions derived from Damschroder et al., (35, 37) and Bowen et al., (36)	

2

## 3 **Data analysis**

4 The data analysis consisted of several stages and two cycles (38). A priori thematic saturation  
5 was evaluated after the first and second cycle. By the completion of the second cycle, a priori  
6 thematic saturation was achieved (34). The scheduled interviews were still conducted (38).  
7 Verbatim transcription was applied to the interviews. A methodical examination of the data was  
8 carried out by K.A.G.J.R. and S.M., employing Braun and Clarke's thematic analysis (39) to  
9 facilitate transformation of the data (40). Our analytical aim was to engage in interpretative  
10 thematic analysis, transcending mere description, and delving into the underlying explanations  
11 inherent to the data (39, 40). Independent coding of the data was undertaken by both  
12 researchers, followed by consensus-building discussions. The analytical process was fortified  
13 through a peer review with an expert in clinical research (T.t.D.) (39). Guided by the stages of  
14 qualitative analyses (39) (see table 2), recurring themes, concepts, and patterns within the data  
15 were discerned. NVivo, version 20 (41) was employed as a supportive tool for data analysis.  
16 Translations of Dutch quotations into English were meticulously executed by K.A.G.J.R. and  
17 S.M. using the forward-backward translation method. Ensuring the reliability of the data  
18 analysis, we adhered to the 15-item checklist articulated by Braun and Clarke (39). This  
19 checklist provided an additional layer of rigor to the analytical process.

1

2 **Table 2 Stages of thematic analysis.**

<b>Stage</b>	<b>Description</b>
1) Familiarization of data	K.A.G.J.R. and S.M. transcribed the data, re-read transcripts, and initial ideas were noted down.
2) Generating initial codes	K.A.G.J.R. and S.M. systematically applied coding to the entire dataset using NVivo. This process involved the grouping of relevant codes in the data.
3) Searching for themes	K.A.G.J.R. and S.M. engaged in a process of aligning distinct codes, orchestrating potential themes where all pertinent data were systematically coded and aggregated within these emerging themes. Following this, a deliberate exploration by K.A.G.J.R. and S.M. revealed additional patterns and repetitions within the data, facilitating a departure from the initially addressed subjects. This approach generated a thematic map.
4) Reviewing themes	K.A.G.J.R. and S.M. meticulously examined coded excerpts corresponding to the identified themes, seeking out consistent patterns. Following this initial review of the coded extracts, transcripts underwent a thorough re-reading, aimed at assessing the soundness and authenticity of the identified themes. This dual review process involving the coded excerpts and transcripts ensured a rigorous evaluation of the extent to which the themes captured the essence and meaning inherent within the data.
5) Defining and naming themes	K.A.G.J.R. and S.M. consistently refined each theme, ensuring that the narrative captured within the data was accurately conveyed through the refined thematic constructs. These developed themes subsequently underwent a peer review process by a clinical research expert (T.t.D.).
6) Producing the report	K.A.G.J.R. and S.M. curated compelling examples – direct quotes – extracted from our data pertaining to the themes identified and research question. These illustrative quotes shaped the narrative of our comprehensive report.
Stages derived from the thematic analysis of Braun and Clarke (39).	

3

## 1 **Results**

### 2 **Participant characteristics**

3 Thirteen participants were scheduled and participated in the interviews. Eight of interviewed  
4 stakeholders were female and five were male. Age ranged between 30 and 59 years, with a  
5 mean age of 44.7 years old. Of the thirteen stakeholders, six were (clinical) researchers, two  
6 represented pharmaceutical companies, two were involved with policy making, and three were  
7 patient representatives.

### 8 **Synthesizing stakeholder perspectives: implications for patient involvement in clinical** 9 **research about infectious diseases**

10 Stakeholders shared their experiences and perspectives towards involvement of patients in  
11 clinical research in infectious diseases. Despite their various backgrounds and expertise, all  
12 stakeholders agreed that the patient perspective is important for the quality, relevance,  
13 recruitment, and dissemination of clinical research. They believed that patient involvement in  
14 clinical research may improve treatment guidelines. Stakeholders shared multiple facilitating  
15 and impeding factors related to patient involvement. Two main themes and several sub-themes  
16 were explored in the following sections.

#### 17 ***Endeavor to transcend the existing paradigm in clinical research***

18 Participating stakeholders were aware of recent developments related to patient involvement in  
19 clinical research in infectious diseases, such as empowerment of the public during the COVID-  
20 19 pandemic. Within the light of these developments, researchers mentioned that patients,  
21 patient representatives, and society demand more patient involvement in research. Many  
22 stakeholders noticed a top-down demand for involvement from patients, for example, from  
23 funding parties, as illustrated by quote 1 (see table 3). Stakeholders observed that currently,  
24 funders require patient involvement in the design of studies. Clinical researchers reported the  
25 added benefit of increased involvement of patients. For instance, a stronger link between the  
26 chosen trial outcomes and the needs of patients. Despite the increased attention for patient  
27 involvement and the perceived added benefit, stakeholders observed no increase in patient  
28 involvement in clinical research in infectious diseases (table 3, quote 2).

29 To following sub-themes, describe and explain how stakeholders perceive the developments  
30 regarding the developments towards an increase in patient involvement in clinical research in  
31 infectious diseases.

1 *Enthusiasm for integrating patients into the design of clinical research in infectious diseases*  
2 Many stakeholders shared a piqued interest in patient involvement in clinical research in  
3 infectious disease. Interest seemed to differ between stakeholders. Clinical research expressed  
4 this interest as an intrinsic motivation to ensure that healthcare is in the best interest for the  
5 patient (table 3, quote 3). Patient representatives expressed an interest to ensure that patient  
6 participation and involvement is a priority in clinical research in infectious diseases (table 3,  
7 quote 4. Some stakeholders aim to ensure that the experiences of patients are heard, and that  
8 decisions in clinical research are made based on the wishes of patients. Stakeholders  
9 emphasized that outcomes of clinical research in infectious disease are based on assumptions  
10 of clinical researchers about what patients find important (table 3, quote 5). Several  
11 stakeholders acknowledged to not explore the perception and experience of patients. For  
12 example, stakeholders explained that working with patient representatives never provides a  
13 representative overview of all affected patients, leaving room for disparity between research  
14 and end users.

15 *Evolving patient empowerment: ‘nothing about us, without us’*

16 Stakeholders explained that patients are increasingly more empowered to participate in the  
17 design and conduct of clinical research in infectious diseases. They believed that this increased  
18 empowerment was inspired by situations, such as COVID-19. Clinical researchers and patient  
19 representatives shared examples of patients striving for equality in conversations to feel taken  
20 seriously (table 3, quote 6). Striving for equality was also observed in conceptualizing the  
21 design of new clinical research Stakeholders underlined the need for important outcomes for  
22 patients, which may differ from outcomes deemed important by researchers (table 3, quote 7).  
23 This difference in perceived importance and strive towards equality was believed by  
24 stakeholders to possibly cause some unrest because it was perceived to diminish the ivory tower  
25 of research.

26 *Gaining insight into the ivory tower*

27 Stakeholders mentioned an ivory tower in research. They explained this phenomenon as a  
28 privileged position of power of clinical researchers, in which they felt – as it were – superior to  
29 patients as illustrated by quote 8 (see table 3). Often, clinical researchers make decisions about  
30 the design and conduct of clinical research without involving patients (table 3, quote 9).  
31 Stakeholders were able to observe this phenomenon in clinical research in infectious diseases  
32 and highlight key aspects of this phenomenon as explained in quote 10 (table 3) and the  
33 following sub-theme, but they were unable to determine how to resolve this phenomenon.

1 *Factors underpinning the power dynamics of the ivory tower in clinical research*

2 Stakeholders were able to identify several factors that maintain the phenomenon of an ivory  
3 tower in clinical research in infectious diseases. A persistent factor that was mentioned many  
4 times was the difference in knowledge, expertise, and language used by clinical researchers  
5 versus patients or patient representatives, as explained in quote 11 (table 3). Clinical researchers  
6 explained that a patient or patient representative is not often able to follow along with the  
7 knowledge, expertise, and language of professionals. This phenomenon was referred to as  
8 health literacy, as illustrated by quote 12 (table 3). Patient representatives underlined that,  
9 because of this gap, communication takes time and is sometimes difficult. In addition, a  
10 maintaining factor of the ivory tower phenomenon is the importance attributed to the  
11 assumptions of key researcher and clinical researchers. Stakeholders explained that for specific  
12 infectious diseases there are key opinion leaders valued by funders, such as the pharmaceutical  
13 industry (table 3, quote 13). Quote 14 explains how these key opinion leaders influence the  
14 research agenda, and thus, the conceptualization and space for involvement of patients in the  
15 design and conduct of clinical research (table 3).

16 *Stakeholders' perceptions about foundations for meaningful patient engagement*

17 Stakeholders mentioned that several conditions are required to involve patients in clinical  
18 research in infectious diseases. Many of these conditions were labeled as practical by  
19 stakeholders, which is illustrated by quote 15 (table 3). Stakeholders often stated a lack of time  
20 and money to design and conduct research (table 3, quote 16). Next, the lack of knowledge and  
21 expertise to involve the patient perspective was emphasized by all stakeholders (table 3, quote  
22 17). Ideally, patients, and clinical researchers would speak the same language but currently this  
23 gap was highlighted as a barrier in integrating the patient perspective in clinical research in  
24 infectious diseases. Efforts were made to bridge this gap. One patient representative explained  
25 that their organization trains patients to ease their involvement in the design and conduct of  
26 clinical research.

**Table 3 Quotes supporting endeavor to transcend the existing paradigm in clinical research**

Theme	Sub-theme	Quote #	Final quote
Endeavor to transcend the existing paradigm in clinical research		Quote 1	Nowadays it is simply a required part of ZonMw grant applications to include patients. You can't really ignore them anymore, but I think that is a good thing. [clinical researcher]
		Quote 2	I think we are still in the old culture. Now, the focus is on the medical side of research. If there is more and more research that includes the patient perspective, that will become the new norm at some point. [pharmaceutical representative]
	Enthusiasm for integrating patients into the design of clinical research in infectious diseases	Quote 3	I just think it's really important that the developments that are taking place within healthcare actually benefits the patient. Ultimately, patients are the ones who really matter. Yes, I really am the patient advocate and I think it is important to give the patient a voice in my work. [patient representative]
	Enthusiasm for integrating patients into the design of clinical research in infectious diseases	Quote 4	Yes, certainly for us, patient participation is the most important thing. Everything we do is from the patient perspective. And we notice that especially PROMS [ <i>patient reported outcomes measures</i> ] are very important for patients [policy maker & patient representative]
Endeavor to transcend the existing paradigm in clinical research	Enthusiasm for integrating patients into the design of clinical research in infectious diseases	Quote 5	It is a study that has been designed by the research. With our ideas and perceptions. I believe to have a general idea of what people [patients] think and want. But it might be a good idea to ask and measure it once... [clinical researcher]
	Evolving patient empowerment: 'nothing about us, without us'	Quote 6	You both have your own expertise. One [the researcher] has the expertise in data collection and analysis. But the other [the patient] possesses the experience of what it's like to live with infection diseases, both before and after treatment, or over an extended period. Together, you determine what the research is about, what is important, and what you want. Yes, what are the outcomes you strive for. That you really work together and see each other as full partners. [patient representative]
	Evolving patient empowerment: 'nothing about us, without us'	Quote 7	If you are trying to bring something like this about [involving the patient in clinical research], then you need a balance [for both perspectives]. Just have a discussion with someone. Ask: 'how do you weigh being a day longer in the hospital against a higher chance of mortality?' That's almost impossible to do. ... I think it's going to be very difficult to implement such a procedure. But I do think it's worth trying. Because now if you look at outcomes of clinical trials then they report usually all these outcome measures, such as mortality and hospitalization time... Things like that. And you also leave it to the person who reads and interprets that study to form an opinion on that [these outcomes]. But if you can create a consensus opinion ... that would be additional information [clinical researcher]

Gaining insight into the ivory tower	Quote 8	This occurs quite regularly, for example, in guideline development, and it really depends on which guidelines. Some are genuinely enthusiastic about it, but we also have examples of guidelines where it's still somewhat challenging to incorporate the patient perspective. Because the doctor knows it better and they make the decisions, and sometimes you notice that patients aren't given enough opportunity to express themselves. [policy maker and patient representative]
Gaining insight into the ivory tower	Quote 9	That researcher in their ivory tower has no idea what's going on. You must be careful. [male, clinical researcher]
Gaining insight into the ivory tower	Quote 10	The international scientific community is often quite influenced by a few egos. These egos are prominent in that field and conducting numerous studies in that field, publishing extensively about it. You know science is... I just... There are a few very important people who have very strong opinion [about involving the patient in clinical research]. They dominate professional literature, I think. [clinical researcher]
Factors underpinning the power dynamics of the ivory tower in clinical research	Quote 11	I guess it's [a barrier for clinical researchers to perceive patient involvement enthusiastically as an added value] because it's easier to talk to colleagues, right? You can discuss things easier with your own colleagues because you have the same training so that of course helps enormously. You know? And [with patients involved] before you know it, you're also saying something like... You just must be a little more careful with your words. It just takes more energy [a meeting with patients]. You sometimes must give a lecture. It takes more effort; it takes more time. [clinical researcher]
Factors underpinning the power dynamics of the ivory tower in clinical research	Quote 12	To explain, I think a lot of people... the groups that we want to reach... People with low health literacy, People with low economic status, People with disadvantages... We just don't reach [with patient representatives], nor with research [patient representative]
Factors underpinning the power dynamics of the ivory tower in clinical research	Quote 13	The key opinion leaders as they are called, that's what the industry really listens to. All the management layer does is see if the key opinion leader/professor is satisfied with the program. And when the professor says boy, I don't really like it. Then the top management does that and then the whole program is stopped and then they start doing something else with the money. So, I think those key opinion leaders have a key role to play. [clinical researcher]
Factors underpinning the power dynamics of the ivory tower in clinical research	Quote 14	Often, the international research community is influenced by a few egos, those well-known in that field, who conduct a lot of studies in that field and publish a lot about it. Those are often not the youngest researchers, but researchers who have just been working in the field for a long time and who have, I believe, a firm and biased opinion about what they think is best [related to integrating the patient perspective]. [clinical researcher]
Stakeholders' perceptions about foundations for meaningful patient engagement	Quote 15	I think a lot of the considerations [about involving patients] are related to doing it right thing [to conduct good research for the patient]. Also [these considerations] are sometimes more of a practical note, not necessarily in a 'I want, or I don't want to do this' type of way. Or even in a whether 'I find it useful way'. [clinical researcher]

Stakeholders'  
perceptions about  
foundations for  
meaningful patient  
engagement  
Stakeholders'  
perceptions about  
foundations for  
meaningful patient  
engagement

Quote 16

I don't think you can ever have enough time or money when it comes to clinical trials.  
[clinical researcher]

Quote 17

It is kind of a new field and I think that in terms of clinical trials, getting that type of information in there is often hard and that's more based just because the process of collecting patient information is new and time consuming. [pharmaceutical representative]

---

## 1 *Considering the Future Landscape of Patient Involvement*

2 Quote 18 illustrates the realization and desire of stakeholders observed to increase the  
3 involvement of patients in clinical research (table 4). Many stakeholders perceived a role for  
4 patients in the conceptualization of new clinical research in infectious disease (table 4, quote  
5 19), but it was stressed that not every research opportunity is suited for patient involvement  
6 (table 4, quote 20). Stakeholders also noted that the role of patients cannot be the same in all  
7 types of clinical research. Barriers for patient involvement were acknowledged, and solutions  
8 to overcome these were also shared. For example, quote 21 illustrates an idea to start with  
9 patient involvement in clinical research during a medical education (table 4).

10 The following sub-themes explain in more detail facilitators and barriers perceived by  
11 stakeholders towards integrating the perspective of patients in clinical research in infectious  
12 diseases.

### 13 *Understanding the role of patient-centered outcomes*

14 Some stakeholders perceived patient-centered outcomes in clinical research as subjective and  
15 therefore secondary to more objective primary outcomes. This was related to the subjective  
16 experience a patient can describe compared to outcomes, such as reduced mortality. Several  
17 stakeholders perceived too much variety in the experience of patients, they believed these  
18 outcomes would not be useful in determining whether a medicine is efficacious to target an  
19 infectious disease (table 4, quote 22). However, as illustrated by quote 23, other stakeholders  
20 argued that this believe is outdated and that the impact of a new medicine to target an infectious  
21 disease should account for the relevance it offers a patient (table 4). Stakeholders acknowledged  
22 that the outcomes of clinical research result in treatment guidelines for infectious diseases.  
23 Currently, the hierarchy in determining primary and secondary outcomes is not influenced by  
24 the experience and meaning attributed by patients.

### 25 *Interests at play in clinical research*

26 All participating stakeholders expressed their own interests regarding the involvement of  
27 patients in the design, conduct, and impact of clinical research. Stakeholders recognized that  
28 patients, researchers, health insurance companies, and pharmaceutical companies all have their  
29 own agenda and aim to influence treatment guidelines with outcomes of clinical studies. Quote  
30 24 explains how that the acceptance of a guideline is contingent upon obtaining approval from  
31 these different parties, where their independence on each other is apparent (table 4). Many  
32 stakeholders indicated a difference between chronic and acute infectious diseases, as shown in  
33 quote 25 (table 4). They noted that individuals with chronic infections tend to display greater

1 interest and attribute more significance to being actively engaged in clinical research, primarily  
2 due to the chronic nature of the disease. Stakeholders believed that patients with acute infections  
3 exhibit different priorities. In addition, they observed that patients with chronic infectious  
4 diseases tend to have more knowledgeable representation, and the presence of organizations is  
5 more prevalent.

6 *Navigating the lack of clarity in the conceptualization of patient perspectives in clinical*  
7 *research*

8 Stakeholders agreed that the variety and lack of clarity in outcomes measured used to capture  
9 the patient perspective does not aid the implementation of these outcome measures in clinical  
10 research. Furthermore, it remains unclear to the stakeholders which entity is accountable for the  
11 implementation of the patient perspective (table 4, quote 26). Worries were expressed by  
12 stakeholders regarding the rigor of research if outcomes measures represented the patient  
13 perspective. Some researchers agreed that patient reported outcomes (PROs) resemble clinical  
14 outcomes most and thus, are usable (table 4, quote 27). Others argued that this variety and lack  
15 of clarity reduces the feasibility, measurability, and reproducibility of results. This reduced the  
16 usability for outcome measures, as it is difficult to base treatment guidelines on inconclusive  
17 results (table 4, quote 28).

**Table 4 Quotes supporting considering the Future Landscape of Patient Involvement**

Theme	Sub-theme	Quote #	Final quote
Considering the Future Landscape of Patient Involvement		Quote 18	Because it becomes clear that if you really want things to improve in healthcare, you must ask the end users. Those are the patients. [clinical researcher]
Considering the Future Landscape of Patient Involvement		Quote 19	In the ideal situation: First of all, you need each other. You both have your own expertise; one has the expertise of collecting data and analyzing it. But the other one who has the experience of what it's like to live with an infectious disease. [patient representative]
Considering the Future Landscape of Patient Involvement		Quote 20	I don't think it's a bad development itself. Only sometimes it is a bit over the top. It must be done with every study and all the time, without exception. While there are actually no suitable patients to be found [ <i>to be involved with the design of a clinical study</i> ]. [clinical researcher]
Considering the Future Landscape of Patient Involvement		Quote 21	I do think it's essential that you already start teaching students how to do research. That's top down: 'Let's get the opinion of another patients. That's fun, right?' Not: 'that's another check the box' [involving a patient in a study proposal]. No. Involve a patient in research from the beginning, because then you get very valuable conversations about what matters. That provides your research more relevance. [patient representative]
	Understanding the role of patient-centered outcomes	Quote 22	It's [patient-centered outcomes] more subjective. It measures less of a direct pathological effect, but a, what shall I say, an experience of the disease. There is a large range [of experiences] between patients. It is also impressionable: patients can adjust their experience based on what they hope or think a medical professional expects from them. It seems to me that it is less valuable for determining whether a drug against infectious diseases work. [clinical researcher]
Considering the Future Landscape of Patient Involvement	Understanding the role of patient-centered outcomes	Quote 23	I think that's great. I think that's the impact on the patient should be measured and more than just clinical outcomes because a lot of times what you'll see as a clinically relevant outcome is not relevant to the patient as the receiver. [pharmaceutical representative]
	Interests at play in clinical research	Quote 24	Well, you know, in all [the importance of patient participation], including for health insurance companies. And because, well, a guideline like this needs to be endorsed by three parties, which means it should also be signed by patient organizations. If that's not signed, then such a guideline won't be adopted. So, you have a problem because you simply don't have a valid guideline. Everywhere, it's increasingly apparent that patient perspectives, especially those through PROMs, are becoming more significant. To ensure providing the right and suitable care, you know? Something that's becoming more obliged. So, it's really in the interest of, well, physicians and healthcare professionals too. It's important that it's well incorporated, because otherwise, they

---

Interests at play in clinical research	Quote 25	<p>could encounter issues in delivering and getting their care reimbursed by insurance companies. If, you know, they want to do something that patients don't support. [policy maker &amp; patient representative]</p> <p>In the case of an acute infection, you're hospitalized, you know, you're more focused on survival. Or well, it catches you off guard, so you have other things on your mind, and you're not really preoccupied with those kinds of matters [participating in clinical research]. Whereas if you're aware that you'll be dealing with something as a patient for the rest of your life or for the coming years, you might also become more inclined to organize things, especially in the context of a chronic condition. [clinical researcher]</p>
Navigating the lack of clarity in the conceptualization of patient perspectives in clinical research	Quote 26	<p>But well, who assesses the extent and, well, how or what? [in the context of implementing patient perspective] Yeah, I don't know. Should the METC do that then? I don't know.</p>
Navigating the lack of clarity in the conceptualization of patient perspectives in clinical research	Quote 27	<p>Pros are kind of what people focus on. If we're talking about: 'We want patient-based information' It's almost always a PRO and I think this has to do with the fact that it's conceptually, the most similar to a clinical outcome. [pharmaceutical representative]</p>
Navigating the lack of clarity in the conceptualization of patient perspectives in clinical research	Quote 28	<p>There is a lot of variation, including in what outcome measures are used in clinical research [<i>PRO, PROM, PREM variations</i>]. That also makes the comparability difficult.</p> <p>You know the definitions [<i>of PRO, PROM, PREM</i>], they're all slightly different.</p> <p>And if one study says, 'We do see effects on this outcome measure', the other study says: 'We don't see any effect on another outcome measure'. What do you end up doing with that [information] in practice?</p> <p>That creates a jumble of studies that all contradict each other. Clinicians don't know what to do with it [<i>guidelines based on these different study findings</i>]. You don't really know what to do with it, so I think that's not an effective way of doing research. [clinical researcher]</p>

---

## 1 **Discussion**

2 Our thematic analyses illustrated the perceived importance of patient involvement in clinical  
3 research in infectious disease. Although barriers for integrating the patient perspective in  
4 clinical research were discussed, stakeholders underlined the importance for patient  
5 involvement for the quality, relevance, recruitment, and dissemination for clinical research in  
6 infectious Stakeholders believed money, time, expertise, clarity of conceptualization of patient  
7 involvement, and weighing perspectives of stakeholders to make designs would be needed to  
8 integrate the patient perspective in the design and conduct of clinical research in infectious  
9 diseases.

10 Our results demonstrate a vision stakeholders shared with regards to integrating the patient  
11 perspective in clinical research in infectious diseases. However, stakeholders were not able to  
12 identify a responsible party to ensure this vision would become a reality. A review of the  
13 literature investigated by Price, Albarqouni (9) illustrated similar findings related to unclear  
14 roles and boundaries. Many stakeholders in our study reported a lack of responsibility among  
15 involved parties, such as clinical researchers, pharmaceutical parties and regulating  
16 organizations, towards integrating the patient perspective in clinical research. A possible  
17 explanation for this lack of responsibility may be related to tensions and barriers observed (9,  
18 13, 16, 19-21, 23, 24, 27, 42). For example, participating stakeholders seemed to perceive a  
19 tension between the wishes of patient representatives and those of clinical researchers in the  
20 choice of outcomes of clinical research. In addition, the lack of a shared language between  
21 patients and clinical researchers was perceived to hinder any form of collaboration by some.  
22 The perceived tension and barriers may reduce a feeling of responsibility and increase feelings  
23 of power among clinical researchers to integrate the perspective of patients themselves in their  
24 own clinical research.

25 The sub-theme “Gaining insight into the ivory tower” revealed a prevailing tendency to rely on  
26 the assumptions of key opinion leaders instead of the perspectives and experiences of patients.  
27 This was also observed in literature (6, 15, 17, 28). Many stakeholders, in particular patient  
28 representatives and clinical researchers, reflected on their respective roles in clinical research.  
29 For example, stakeholders described the tendency to rely on key opinion leaders as out-of-date  
30 from the perspective of the patient and other clinical researchers. We hypothesize that key  
31 opinion leaders could potentially serve as a facilitator in integrating the patient perspective in  
32 clinical trials (9, 35, 43). These key opinion leaders may function as champions in this

1 process(43) and highlight external benefits, strengths, and functionality to increase patient  
2 involvement (9).

3 Stakeholders indicated to not being able to describe the optimal level of patient involvement in  
4 clinical research in infectious diseases. Similar findings were observed in previous research (5,  
5 9, 16, 18). Domecq, Prutsky (16) demonstrated an absence and support of a general method for  
6 including patients in the design and conduct of clinical research. This lack of expertise for  
7 meaningful patient involvement was also observed in a mixed method study conducted among  
8 trial managers and patients in the UK (26). Our qualitative results indicate that participating  
9 stakeholders struggled with the lack of scientific methods of integrating the perspective of  
10 patients regardless of their willingness to do so. A possible explanation of the lack of the  
11 knowledge on how to integrate the perspective of patients in infectious diseases might be related  
12 to a lack of expertise in patient engagement among clinical researchers. Clinical researchers  
13 may struggle to find the best way to communicate and involve patients in the design and conduct  
14 of clinical studies (9). Thus, patients may feel left out because priorities for clinical research  
15 are fixed before they are involved (9, 10, 26).

16 Finally, our results demonstrate that stakeholders perceive differences in integrating the patient  
17 perspective in acute versus chronic infectious disease clinical research. Patient participation has  
18 been effectively implemented in the process of decision-making and long term management in  
19 chronic diseases (44). However, less is known about the patient involvement within the domain  
20 of acute infectious diseases. Most research in the infectious diseases has focused on chronic  
21 infections, for example, HIV. Research about HIV has made substantial effort to identify the  
22 barriers and facilitators to patient engagement in HIV research and care (45, 46). These efforts  
23 have particularly concentrated on patient-related factors and the interactions between people  
24 with HIV and physicians (11, 32, 46-49). Research focused on acute infections is limited. We  
25 hypothesize that other interests during the occurrence of an acute infection, such as the focus  
26 on survival instead of quality of life and a lack of patient representativeness, may explain the  
27 absence of patient involvement in clinical research related to acute infectious diseases. Further  
28 research is needed to explore how to integrate the patient perspective in these settings.

29

### 30 **Strengths & Limitations**

31 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to explore the perspectives of various  
32 stakeholders about integrating the patient perspective in clinical research in infectious diseases.  
33 With triangulations with three researchers, we enhanced the credibility, transferability,  
34 dependability, and confirmability of our findings (50). There were also limitations, our

1 qualitative results uncovered themes, issues, perspectives, and ideas of societal significance,  
2 but these findings were not intended to be generalized beyond the study domain (51). Despite  
3 variations in the stakeholders' disciplines, expertise, and backgrounds, the qualitative nature of  
4 our study prevents us from comparing differences among stakeholders.

## 5 **Conclusions**

6 In conclusion, our thematic analysis underlines that despite barriers, such as communication  
7 and expertise, stakeholders recognize the importance of integrating the patient perspective in  
8 clinical research in infectious diseases to improve the quality, relevance, recruitment, and  
9 dissemination. Key opinion leaders may potentially bridge these barriers and serve as  
10 champions for meaningful patient involvement. Further research is needed to address  
11 distinctions between acute and chronic infectious diseases in terms of patient involvement.

## 12 **Author declaration statement**

13 The other authors have no competing interests to disclose.

## 14 **Author contributions**

15 S.M.: Data collection; Data curation; Formal analysis; Project administration; Resources;  
16 Supervision; Validation; Writing – original draft; Writing - review & editing.

17 T.t.D: Conceptualization; Funding acquisition; Formal analysis; Supervision; Validation;  
18 Writing - review & editing.

19 E.S.: Conceptualization; Supervision; Validation; Writing - review & editing.

20 K.A.G.J.R: Conceptualization; Funding acquisition; Data collection; Data curation; Formal  
21 analysis; Investigation; Methodology; Project administration; Resources; Supervision;  
22 Validation; Writing - review & editing.

## 23 **Acknowledgements**

24 The authors gratefully acknowledge Ilona Vriend for her input. In addition, the authors are  
25 grateful for the participants for their time.

## 26 **Funding**

27 The authors gratefully acknowledge UMC Utrecht for funding this research.

## 28 **Ethical approval**

29 The study was approved by the ethics committee of the University Medical Center Utrecht  
30 (UMCU): 23U-0086.

**1 Data availability statement**

- 2 Only the authors have access to the raw data quoted in this study due to confidentiality. Any
- 3 reasonable request for access to material relating to the study can be made directly to the
- 4 corresponding author, who will decide on information sharing on a case-by-case basis.

## 1 **References**

- 2 1. Chalmers I. What do I want from health research and researchers when I am a patient?  
3 *Bmj*. 1995;310(6990):1315-8.
- 4 2. INVOLVE. BRIEFING NOTES FOR RESEARCHERS: INVOLVING THE PUBLIC  
5 IN HS, PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE RESEARCH. Eastleigh: INVOLVE; 2012.
- 6 3. PCORI. Patient-centered outcomes in research 2013 [November 7, 2023:[]
- 7 4. Esmail L, Moore E, Rein A. Evaluating patient and stakeholder engagement in  
8 research: moving from theory to practice. *J Comp Eff Res*. 2015;4(2):133-45.
- 9 5. McCarron TL, Clement F, Rasiah J, Moran C, Moffat K, Gonzalez A, et al. Patients as  
10 partners in health research: A scoping review. *Health Expect*. 2021;24(4):1378-90.
- 11 6. Brett J, Staniszewska S, Mockford C, Herron-Marx S, Hughes J, Tysall C, et al.  
12 Mapping the impact of patient and public involvement on health and social care research: a  
13 systematic review. *Health Expect*. 2014;17(5):637-50.
- 14 7. El Ansari W, Andersson E. Beyond value? Measuring the costs and benefits of public  
15 participation. *Journal of Integrated Care*. 2011;19(6):45-57.
- 16 8. Greene J, Hibbard JH, Sacks R, Overton V, Parrotta CD. When patient activation  
17 levels change, health outcomes and costs change, too. *Health Aff (Millwood)*.  
18 2015;34(3):431-7.
- 19 9. Price A, Albarqouni L, Kirkpatrick J, Clarke M, Liew SM, Roberts N, et al. Patient  
20 and public involvement in the design of clinical trials: An overview of systematic reviews.  
21 *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*. 2018;24(1):240-53.
- 22 10. Schilling I, Behrens H, Hugenschmidt C, Liedtke J, Schmiemann G, Gerhardus A.  
23 Patient involvement in clinical trials: motivation and expectations differ between patients and  
24 researchers involved in a trial on urinary tract infections. *Research Involvement and*  
25 *Engagement*. 2019;5(1):15.
- 26 11. Al-Shahi Salman R, Beller E, Kagan J, Hemminki E, Phillips RS, Savulescu J, et al.  
27 Increasing value and reducing waste in biomedical research regulation and management.  
28 *Lancet*. 2014;383(9912):176-85.
- 29 12. Chalmers I, Glasziou P. Avoidable waste in the production and reporting of research  
30 evidence. *Lancet*. 2009;374(9683):86-9.
- 31 13. Boote J, Baird W, Sutton A. Public involvement in the design and conduct of clinical  
32 trials: a narrative review of case examples. *Trials*. 2011;12(Suppl 1):A82.

- 1 14. Crocker JC, Ricci-Cabello I, Parker A, Hirst JA, Chant A, Petit-Zeman S, et al. Impact  
2 of patient and public involvement on enrolment and retention in clinical trials: systematic  
3 review and meta-analysis. *Bmj*. 2018;363:k4738.
- 4 15. den Houting J, Higgins J, Isaacs K, Mahony J, Pellicano E. From ivory tower to  
5 inclusion: Stakeholders' experiences of community engagement in Australian autism research.  
6 *Front Psychol*. 2022;13:876990.
- 7 16. Domecq JP, Prutsky G, Elraiyah T, Wang Z, Nabhan M, Shippee N, et al. Patient  
8 engagement in research: a systematic review. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2014;14:89.
- 9 17. Forsythe LP, Carman KL, Szydowski V, Fayish L, Davidson L, Hickam DH, et al.  
10 Patient Engagement In Research: Early Findings From The Patient-Centered Outcomes  
11 Research Institute. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2019;38(3):359-67.
- 12 18. Gradinger F, Britten N, Wyatt K, Froggatt K, Gibson A, Jacoby A, et al. Values  
13 associated with public involvement in health and social care research: a narrative review.  
14 *Health Expect*. 2015;18(5):661-75.
- 15 19. Jones EL, Williams-Yesson BA, Hackett RC, Staniszevska SH, Evans D, Francis NK.  
16 Quality of reporting on patient and public involvement within surgical research: a systematic  
17 review. *Ann Surg*. 2015;261(2):243-50.
- 18 20. Lander J, Hainz T, Hirschberg I, Strech D. Current practice of public involvement  
19 activities in biomedical research and innovation: a systematic qualitative review. *PLoS One*.  
20 2014;9(12):e113274.
- 21 21. Oliver S, Clarke-Jones L, Rees R, Milne R, Buchanan P, Gabbay J, et al. Involving  
22 consumers in research and development agenda setting for the NHS: developing an evidence-  
23 based approach. *Health Technol Assess*. 2004;8(15):1-148, III-IV.
- 24 22. Oliver SR, Rees RW, Clarke-Jones L, Milne R, Oakley AR, Gabbay J, et al. A  
25 multidimensional conceptual framework for analysing public involvement in health services  
26 research. *Health Expect*. 2008;11(1):72-84.
- 27 23. Rhodes P, Nocon A, Booth M, Chowdrey MY, Fabian A, Lambert N, et al. A service  
28 users' research advisory group from the perspectives of both service users and researchers.  
29 *Health Soc Care Community*. 2002;10(5):402-9.
- 30 24. Robbins M, Tufte J, Hsu C. Learning to "Swim" with the Experts: Experiences of Two  
31 Patient Co-Investigators for a Project Funded by the Patient-Centered Outcomes Research  
32 Institute. *Perm J*. 2016;20(2):85-8.
- 33 25. Robinson A. Patient and public involvement: in theory and in practice. *J Laryngol*  
34 *Otol*. 2014:1-8.

- 1 26. Selman LE, Clement C, Douglas M, Douglas K, Taylor J, Metcalfe C, et al. Patient  
2 and public involvement in randomised clinical trials: a mixed-methods study of a clinical  
3 trials unit to identify good practice, barriers and facilitators. *Trials*. 2021;22(1):735.
- 4 27. Stewart RJ, Caird J, Oliver K, Oliver S. Patients' and clinicians' research priorities.  
5 *Health Expect*. 2011;14(4):439-48.
- 6 28. Willyard C, Scudellari M, Nordling L. How three research groups are tearing down the  
7 ivory tower. *Nature*. 2018;562(7725):24-8.
- 8 29. Fernandes Agreli H, Murphy M, Creedon S, Ni Bhuachalla C, O'Brien D, Gould D, et  
9 al. Patient involvement in the implementation of infection prevention and control guidelines  
10 and associated interventions: a scoping review. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(3):e025824.
- 11 30. Kemper S, Bongers M, Slok E, Schoonmade LJ, Kupper J, Timen A. Patient and  
12 public engagement in decision-making regarding infectious disease outbreak management: an  
13 integrative review. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2021;6(11).
- 14 31. Mbamalu O, Bonaconsa C, Nampoothiri V, Surendran S, Veepanattu P, Singh S, et al.  
15 Patient understanding of and participation in infection-related care across surgical pathways: a  
16 scoping review. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2021;110:123-34.
- 17 32. Edwards HA, Huang J, Jansky L, Mullins CD. What works when: mapping patient and  
18 stakeholder engagement methods along the ten-step continuum framework. *J Comp Effect*  
19 *Res*. 2021;10(12):999-1017.
- 20 33. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research  
21 (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *Int J Qual Health Care*.  
22 2007;19(6):349-57.
- 23 34. Saunders B, Sim J, Kingstone T, Baker S, Waterfield J, Bartlam B, et al. Saturation in  
24 qualitative research: exploring its conceptualization and operationalization. *Qual Quant*.  
25 2018;52(4):1893-907.
- 26 35. Damschroder LJ, Reardon CM, Widerquist MAO, Lowery J. The updated  
27 Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research based on user feedback.  
28 *Implementation Science*. 2022;17(1):75.
- 29 36. Bowen DJ, Kreuter M, Spring B, Cofta-Woerpel L, Linnan L, Weiner D, et al. How  
30 we design feasibility studies. *Am J Prev Med*. 2009;36(5):452-7.
- 31 37. CFIR Guide. CFIR Domains for interview questions 2023 [Available from:  
32 [https://cfirguide.org/guide/app/#/guide\\_select](https://cfirguide.org/guide/app/#/guide_select).
- 33 38. Guest G, Bunce A, Johnson L. How Many Interviews Are Enough? *Field Methods*.  
34 2016;18(1):59-82.

- 1 39. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in*  
2 *Psychology*. 2006;3(2):77-101.
- 3 40. Sandelowski M, Barroso J. Classifying the findings in qualitative studies. *Qual Health*  
4 *Res*. 2003;13(7):905-23.
- 5 41. QSR International Pty Ltd. Nvivo qualitative data analysis software. Version 20  
6 ed2022.
- 7 42. Tong A, Chando S, Crowe S, Manns B, Winkelmayr WC, Hemmelgarn B, et al.  
8 Research priority setting in kidney disease: a systematic review. *Am J Kidney Dis*.  
9 2015;65(5):674-83.
- 10 43. Rogers EM. *Diffusion of Innovations*, 5th Edition: Free Press; 2003.
- 11 44. Longtin Y, Sax H, Leape LL, Sheridan SE, Donaldson L, Pittet D. Patient  
12 participation: current knowledge and applicability to patient safety. *Mayo Clin Proc*.  
13 2010;85(1):53-62.
- 14 45. Koester KA, Johnson MO, Wood T, Fredericksen R, Neilands TB, Saucedo J, et al.  
15 The influence of the 'good' patient ideal on engagement in HIV care. *PLoS One*.  
16 2019;14(3):e0214636.
- 17 46. Flores D, Leblanc N, Barroso J. Enrolling and retaining human immunodeficiency  
18 virus (HIV) patients in their care: A metasynthesis of qualitative studies. *Int J Nurs Stud*.  
19 2016;62:126-36.
- 20 47. van Hoof M, Chinchilla K, Härmark L, Matos C, Inácio P, van Hunsel F. Factors  
21 Contributing to Best Practices for Patient Involvement in Pharmacovigilance in Europe: A  
22 Stakeholder Analysis. *Drug Safety*. 2022;45(10):1083-98.
- 23 48. Dawson-Rose C, Cuca YP, Webel AR, Solís Báez SS, Holzemer WL, Rivero-Méndez  
24 M, et al. Building Trust and Relationships Between Patients and Providers: An Essential  
25 Complement to Health Literacy in HIV Care. *J Assoc Nurses AIDS Care*. 2016;27(5):574-84.
- 26 49. SHARE - Centre for Resilience in Healthcare. A Guide to Patient and Stakeholder  
27 Involvement (PSI) in Research. 2023.
- 28 50. Nowell LS, Norris JM, White DE, Moules NJ. Thematic Analysis: Striving to Meet  
29 the Trustworthiness Criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*.  
30 2017;16(1):1609406917733847.
- 31 51. Neale J, Miller P, West R. Reporting quantitative information in qualitative research:  
32 guidance for authors and reviewers. *Addiction*. 2014;109(2):175-6.