

1 **Title Page**

2 **The Development of a Brain Injury Survivor Patient and Public**

3 **Involvement Group by a Brain Injury Survivor.**

4 James Piercy^a, Colin Hamilton^b, Robert Runcie^a, Christi Deaton^c and Alexis J
5 Joannides^a

6 *^aNIHR Brain Injury Medtech Cooperative, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.*

7 *^bDepartment of Physiotherapy, Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust,*
8 *Cambridge, UK.*

9 *^cPrimary Care Unit, Department of Public Health & Primary Care, University of Cambridge*
10 *Cambridge CB2 0SR, UK*

11

12 *Corresponding Author:

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

27 Abstract

28 Background:

29 Patient and public involvement (PPI) in research is seen as key to ensuring applicability
30 and impact. Undertaking PPI in people after brain injury has long been seen to be a
31 challenge. In 2020 The NIHR Brain Injury MedTech Cooperative developed a
32 programme with the aim of improving PPI involvement, impact and diversity in this
33 population.

34 Methods:

35 Through a process of iterative development, a PPI programme was created. It built on
36 an existing underutilised database of people after brain injury and their carers who were
37 interested in engaging with PPI and utilised video-calling software. It was led by a
38 Brain injury Survivor acting as Facilitator with admin support from the MedTech
39 Cooperative.

40 Results:

41 To date 14 PPI sessions were completed supporting a total of 17 projects. The diversity
42 of the panel members was comparable to that of the population at large. However,
43 further work is needed, especially in engaging people experiencing homelessness,
44 people living outside of England and those with communication impairments.
45 Feedback from researchers was positive and specific impacts are stated.

46 Conclusion:

47 Through the leadership of a facilitator who has an understanding of the lived
48 experience of brain injury a PPI programme has been developed. The use of a video-
49 calling platform enabled a wider representation than a face-to-face group would have
50 and techniques such as shortened sessions and single project presentations ensured
51 engagement and impact.

52 Keywords

53 PPI, outreach, diversity, online

54

55

56

57 **The Development of a Brain Injury Survivor Patient and Public**

58 **Involvement Group by a Brain Injury Survivor.**

59 **Background**

60 Patient and public involvement (PPI) is acknowledged to be central to good research
61 practice(Brett et al., 2014). However, enacting it in practice is a challenge(Brett et al., 2014).
62 This can be particularly true in populations who may experience disability, with researchers
63 finding it difficult to engage with these patients and their carers(Brett et al., 2014). These
64 challenges can lead to inequities in access to PPI opportunities.

65 Populations who have limited access or particular difficulties to engaging with research are
66 less likely to benefit from the improvements in care that research can bring(McDonald &
67 Keys, 2008). Research is also likely to be less applicable and wasteful if rigorous PPI with
68 disadvantaged groups is not conducted (Brett et al., 2014). Due to the emphasis that funders
69 now place on PPI, research projects without robust PPI with relevant groups may find
70 accessing funding more challenging, leading to further health inequalities in such
71 populations.

72 **Main Text**

73 Brain injury is a leading cause of death and disability worldwide(Dewan et al., 2019). With
74 sequelae including physical impairments, cognitive deficits, and communication
75 challenges(Turkstra, Politis, & Forsyth, 2015) brain injury survivors face many barriers to
76 actively participating in PPI. Caring responsibilities may limit the ability for their family and
77 carers to engage(Aitken et al., 2009). Therefore, finding effective methods of engaging with
78 and facilitating research involvement among brain injury survivors are key to ensuring that
79 research is relevant to this population(Whitehouse et al., 2021).

80 The NIHR Brain Injury MedTech Co-operative (Brain Injury MIC) works with patients,
81 carers, NHS, charities, academia, inventors, small and medium sized enterprises (SME) and
82 potential investors to support the development of new medical devices and healthcare
83 technologies improving the effectiveness and quality of healthcare services. Since its
84 inception the Brain Injury MIC has established a patient advisory group (PAG). This group is
85 formed of those who have suffered a brain injury and carers of people who have had a brain
86 injury. The PAG provides a governance role to the Brain Injury MIC as well as contributing
87 to strategic direction. It has been key in a push to develop an effective PPI strategy. In this
88 paper we describe the development of the Brain Injury MIC's PPI programme, initiated by
89 Brain Injury Survivors, led by a Brain Injury Survivor and contributed to by Brain Injury
90 Survivors.

91 **Previous PPI Offering and Identification of Gap**

92 Until 2020 PPI in research supported by the Brain Injury MIC was dealt with by the
93 individual research teams with only informal help from the MIC administrative team. This
94 support entailed advertising projects to members of the Register for Healthcare Involvement
95 and Technology Evaluation (RHITE) database (www.brainmic.nihr.ac.uk/RHITE). RHITE
96 was developed in 2012 by a previous version of the Brain Injury MIC and is a database of
97 people with brain injury and their families/cares who were potentially interested in supporting
98 research. While the RHITE could be a means of connecting researchers to interested parties it
99 was underused.

100 Following discussion, the PAG and Brain Injury MIC administration agreed that this under-
101 use of the RHITE resource was making it difficult to achieve meaningful and timely patient
102 involvement in line with the UK standards for Public Involvement (Partnership, 2019). A
103 more focussed support programme for PPI was needed, especially to assist researchers at

104 application stage to improve their research questions in discussion with brain injury survivors
105 and to demonstrate early commitment to PPI.

106 An outreach programme was proposed by the Brain Injury MIC with support of the PAG to
107 make connections between those with lived experience of brain injury on the RHITE
108 database and research groups developing new interventions on the acquired brain injury
109 pathway.

110 **Aims:**

111 The aims of the outreach programme were:

- 112 • To increase involvement of brain injury survivors and their family or carers in the
113 development of brain injury research
- 114 • To widen the diversity of involved members to be more representative of the
115 population as a whole. This to include but not be limited to geography, gender, age,
116 ethnic group and educational background.

117 **Iterative Development**

118 The outreach programme was developed through a process of discussion and consensus
119 building with the Brain Injury MIC and the PAG. It was led by a brain injury survivor active
120 in public engagement who took the role of Facilitator. Administrative and financial support
121 was provided by the Brain injury MIC. The Outreach Programme adopted a model of
122 iterative evaluation and review after initial launch and subsequent sessions.

123 The initial meeting between the Brain Injury MIC and the Facilitator was undertaken in Nov
124 2020 to set expectations for the programme and format. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic the
125 meeting participants agreed that an online platform was needed to protect patients, carers and

126 researchers. The participants also discussed their expectations of what the programme in the
127 first year should deliver:

- 128 • A series of online events suitable for patients and carers, in which they can hear about
129 research being supported by the Brain Injury MIC and discuss with the principal
130 investigator.
- 131 • A supporting document for people joining the sessions, with links to the Brain Injury
132 MIC, its research programmes and ways to get involved in research.
- 133 • Three outreach sessions within 6 months
- 134 • A review of the outreach programme after the first three sessions

135 ***Pilot stage: (Month 0-3)***

136 A survey was sent to the investigators of all supported research projects to gather
137 information about the researchers' requirements for involvement and participation of patients,
138 carers and the public in their projects, for example, review of documents or serving on an
139 advisory committee (appendix 1). Each group was asked to provide a lay summary of their
140 project. Six completed forms were initially received and from these 3 were chosen to be
141 featured in the outreach session.

142 A pilot event was set up to test the effectiveness of the model on attendance rates of PPI
143 Panel Members and impacts on projects. It was run using the GoTo Meeting™ web platform.
144 Potential Panel Members were identified through the RHITE database and by contact with
145 the local Headway (www.headway.org.uk) group which offers support and signposting for
146 brain injury survivors and their families. Invitations were sent to those registered on the
147 RHITE database and through Headway to its contact list. The event was set to run for 90
148 minutes and featured an introduction to the Brain Injury MIC followed by a presentation on

149 the difference between engagement, involvement and participation.

150 Examples of current projects were discussed by the Brain Injury MIC to demonstrate the
151 differences between engagement, involvement and participation as well as highlight
152 opportunities to be engaged. Panel Members were invited to register their interest in specific
153 projects by contacting the programme manager or to register a more general interest in
154 research by joining the RHITE database.

155 In line with best practice and following the guidelines from the Centre for Engagement and
156 Dissemination(NIHR, 2022) participants were offered reimbursement in the form of a £25
157 voucher. Time was allowed for questions and comments, with participants invited to share
158 their own experiences of involvement in research. After the session all delegates were sent a
159 copy of the outreach brochure (Appendix 2) and reminded of the links to join RHITE.

160 Contact information was provided to give feedback and ask further questions.

161 ***Stage 1: (Month 4-7)***

162 Following the pilot session, a team discussion took place incorporating comments from Panel
163 Members and reflection from the Facilitator. The following changes were made:

- 164 • Reduced duration
- 165 • Switch to Zoom. The platform was felt to be more versatile, and attendees were more
166 familiar with using it.
- 167 • Shorter introduction. The overview of the Brain Injury MIC activity was reduced to a
168 very short introduction.
- 169 • Less time given to education on the distinctions between participation, involvement
170 and engagement.

- 171 • Guest speaker. An aim was set to invite a researcher to each outreach session to speak
172 personally about their project.
- 173 • Improved web visibility. The Brain Injury MIC website was updated to include
174 information about the programme, engagement, involvement and participation and
175 how to access the RHITE database.

176 Three research projects were featured in each of the 4 online workshops in stage 1. One of
177 these was given prominence with the inclusion of a presentation from the research team, but
178 due to time constraints the other two were presented by the Facilitator. The researchers could
179 ask the group direct questions about their research question, methodology and recruitment
180 strategy. With consent from the Panel members, sessions were recorded and shared with the
181 research team after the event.

182 ***Stage 2: (Month 8-20)***

183 Feedback from researchers and Panel Members indicated that whilst featuring a number of
184 research projects allowed for variety and wider interest, a more focussed approach might
185 yield greater impact. Delegates told the team that duration should be limited to 1 hour and
186 that morning slots were easier to handle. Delegates emphasised that the cognitive fatigue
187 experienced by many brain injury survivors made sustained attention difficult.

188 In the most recent iteration, a single project was featured presented by a member of the
189 research team. The sessions were facilitated by the Facilitator. Key questions and issues
190 which could be informed by the lived experience of brain injury survivors and their carers
191 were agreed before the focus groups and time was allotted to cover these.

192 Greater attention was paid to recruitment of PPI Panel Members with efforts made to match
193 people with direct experience of the topic under discussion and to improve the geographic,

194 gender, age and ethnic diversity of the group. As well as existing contacts the events were
195 publicised through the People in Research website (<https://www.peopleinresearch.org>). Interested
196 parties were invited to apply and their suitability explored with simple questions about the
197 nature of their direct experience, location and ethnic background.

198 To gain an understanding of progress against the stated aims of this project (Increasing
199 involvement in PPI and increasing the diversity of PPI Panel Members) numbers of Panel
200 Members attending each session were recorded and a demographic questionnaire was sent out
201 to gain an understanding of the makeup of the group. To assess impacts of the PPI group on
202 each research study presented, feedback forms were issued to all investigators of projects that
203 were supported by the outreach programme. The forms were based on the Centre for
204 Research in Public Health and Community Care Guidance for Researchers: Feedback
205 document (Mathie, 2018).

206

207 **Results**

208 Since the start of the PPI group 17 projects have been presented. This included 3 from Small
209 and Medium Sized Enterprises (SME). Eight were featured in the initial outreach document
210 and presented in stage 1, a further nine presented by researchers in the sessions held during
211 stage 2 (including the 3 projects from SMEs). A timeline and attendance at the outreach
212 sessions are presented in Table 1.

213

214

215

216

217

218 Table 1: Number of Delegates Attending Each PPI session.

	Month since start of project	Delegates Registered	Delegates Attending
Pilot session	Month 3	16	11
Stage 1 sessions	Month 4	18	10
	Month 5	10	6
	Month 6	5	0
	Month 7	8	8
Stage 2 sessions	Month 11	15	13
	Month 12	9	9
	Month 13	19	12
	Month 14	9	7
	Month 16	27	22
	Month 17	14	9
	Month 18	11	11
	Month 18	13	13
	Month 20	10	7

219

220

221 The demographic makeup of the overall group can be found in Table 2 with geographical

222 location in Figure 1.

223 Table 2. Demographics of the PPI Group

	Male	Female	Non-Binary
--	------	--------	------------

Gender		31		21		1		
Ethnic Group	Asian or Asian British	Black, African, Caribbean, or Black British	Mixed or Multiple Ethnicity	White	Any Other Ethnic Group			
	4	15	1	31	2			
Decade Born	1950-1959	1960-1969	1970-1979	1980-1989	1990-1999	2000-2009		
	10	11	11	2	17	1		
Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual/straight	Gay/Lesbian	Bisexual	Self-described: Asexual	Self-described: Fluid			
	45	2	3	1	1			
Disability		Yes			No			
		38			14			
Experience of Brain Injury		None	Patient	Family Member or Friend		Caregiver		
		2	37	9		4		
Highest Level of Educational Attainment	No Formal Qualifications	Secondary Education	Further Education	Undergraduate Degree or equivalent	Higher degree or equivalent			
	3	0	11	27	12			

225 Figure 1. Geographical Distribution of PPI Group Members by County

226 **Table 3: Feedback from Researchers**

	Very Helpful	Quite Helpful	Not Helpful	
Overall, how helpful were the comments from the PPI group?	4	2	0	
	Yes		No	
Has the review informed or influenced the project?	4		2	
	Yes	No	Not Sure	Missing
Would you recommend the group to colleagues?	5	0	0	2
	Comments			
Any changes made	<p>‘The user interface..... was modified’</p> <p>‘we modified the patient requirements specification for our product, adding references to making the device as unthreatening as possible given that patients may be in a scary situation during use.’</p> <p>‘Helped to shape control group intervention. Pragmatics of intervention delivery. Shaped content of outcome measurement battery.’</p>			

	<p>We received useful feedback from patients and their loved ones during the workshop on their experience of the NPH pathway at CUH. Patients told us they would prefer to minimise hospital appointments so we adjusted our pathway to include a one-stop assessment clinic, saving time and transport costs.</p>
<p>Reason for not making changes</p>	<p>‘The discussion was centred around the accessing of the personal information to create a dataset to derive a clinical prediction rule. The study applied for CAG approval and the PAG was approached to discuss how the data were to be collected, handled, shared and subsequently destroyed. Best practice approaches were proposed and the PAG was in agreement in how the study was designed in this respect.’</p> <p>‘offered correspondence with a patient but unfortunately we were not at a stage in the project to involve the individual at that time’</p>
<p>Overall comments</p>	<p>‘We were very grateful to have been invited to present to the Brain MIC PPIE group.’</p> <p>‘Our major difficulties have been in accessing clinical colleagues to complete our project, mainly as a result of the huge pressures in the NHS, the pandemic but also due to changes in personnel. Through our research panels we are able to contact patients for PPI (and we have over the past year done this on a number of projects) but our issue remains engaging clinicians.’</p>

	<p>‘We discussed repeating this workshop format as our project progresses so we can continually get feedback from patients and their family members ‘</p> <p>‘We have continued involvement with some of the group participants to continually get their feedback on the project’s outputs. Some participants were invited to our project closing event where they could speak about their experiences in front of clinicians and researchers.’</p>
--	---

227

228

229 Out of the 17 projects supported only investigators from seven projects provided feedback
230 when requested. Results can be found in table 3. While numbers are small all projects found
231 the group “Very Helpful” or “Quite Helpful” and all investigators that responded to the
232 question (n=6) would recommend the group to colleagues. In two projects no changes were
233 made with one discussing that concerns were raised by the PPI group about data collection,
234 but further clarification was sought, and no changes were needed. While not a change, this
235 may have strengthened the proposal and confirmed that the approach taken was acceptable.
236 Comments were received on the facilitation of the session which helped with its
237 development and improvement.

238 “We had a very positive experience in part because we were able to send private messages
239 to the facilitator during the session to keep the conversation on track. The facilitator said

240 they would adopt this for future sessions. This worked particularly well with it being a virtual
241 format as it would be harder to communicate privately in person and not disrupt the
242 conversation.”

243 **Discussion**

244

245 The development of meaningful PPI is often stated as a challenge within research(Ocloo,
246 Garfield, Franklin, & Dawson, 2021). Various methods and models have been described in
247 the literature(South et al., 2016) however this example emphasises the flexibility advocated
248 by Buck et al (Buck et al., 2014). From the start the team adopted a process driven by the
249 PPI Panel Members of iterative evaluation, reviewing the format and potential impact after
250 each session to deliver the aims of the project. Overall, the programme was successful in the
251 stated aims of facilitating a diverse group of people after brain injury to participate in
252 impactful PPI activities. However, work remains to be done. Key points are presented below.
253

254 ***Understanding the Population:***

255 Brain Injury can cause a wide range of issues and understanding the challenges faced by
256 survivors and their families or carers was key to the development of this project. From the
257 initial idea the PAG, formed of people who have suffered brain injuries and their carers, has
258 been key in ensuring the project was of importance to this population. This was further
259 developed by the Facilitator who is a survivor of severe brain injury and whose direct
260 experience helped inform this process and was key to the success.
261

262 ***Ensuring Impact***

263 The aim of the outreach project was to have real involvement from Panel Members, listening
264 to their thoughts and responses to issues more than disseminating information about projects.

265 It aimed to have useful input from lived experience at all stages of the research cycle.

266 Informing preapplication strategy, focussing research questions and modifying delivery of
267 research projects which fit well with the NIHR UK Standards for Public Involvement (7).

268 The importance of being able to meaningfully input on research projects has been described
269 before (11) and is seen to be a key element of PPI. Through the iterative development the

270 Panel moved from aiming to influence a larger number of projects with less input from

271 researchers to intensely inputting on one in each session. This enabled active input rather than
272 a light touch approach, which the group found to be key in ensuring impact.

273

274 The role of an active and experienced Facilitator was found to be vital in ensuring that

275 messages were understood and that the purpose of the session was clear to participants. Prior

276 to each session the facilitator reviewed the researchers' presentations to check for clarity, and

277 in a pre-meeting, identified key questions or areas for discussion with the research team. The

278 use of plain English was mandatory at all points. In the Panel Meeting the facilitator directed

279 the questions and ensured Panel Members understanding and supported their participation to

280 maximise impact.

281 ***Maximising Accessibility:***

282 **FIGURE 2 Ice-Breakers for Online Groups**

283 By understanding the population, a focus on accessibility was acknowledged to be central in

284 order to optimise participation. While the choice of an online process was initially driven by

285 the COVID pandemic, which made face-to face sessions impossible, the need to engage with

286 vulnerable people meant that in-person group meetings were not feasible. The online format
287 has worked well as a means of engaging patients and the public with research projects,
288 allowing people from across the UK to take part in the process and, whilst there is still work
289 to do, it appears to have widened the diversity of participants. The use of the Zoom platform
290 to host the events was driven by the familiarity of the system to users. The pandemic also
291 meant that potential participants were likely to be familiar with the technology and able to
292 engage without prolonged instruction. The widespread use of online platforms in PPI is a
293 relatively new phenomenon (12) and the advantages and disadvantages are still being
294 evaluated. It must be acknowledged, however, that there are groups that find accessing
295 technology more difficult and by using this platform certain groups are may have been
296 disadvantaged(Das & Gonzalez, 2020).

297 There are particular issues of importance for engaging people in PPIE after brain injury.
298 Brain injury survivors commonly live with issues caused by cognitive fatigue and screen-
299 based activity has been shown to be more likely to cause these issues (Bailenson, 2021),
300 which can limit participation. In response to these concerns sessions have been time limited
301 to 1 hour and following feedback from participants have been scheduled before lunch rather
302 than in the afternoon when people are more likely to be tired. The group format also means
303 that people with severe communication impairment are more likely to find the sessions
304 difficult to engage with(Paterson & Carpenter, 2015). The team is looking into offering
305 bespoke sessions in these cases (Palmer & Paterson, 2013).

306 Researchers found the inbuilt ability in the Zoom platform to record and review the session at
307 a later date valuable. This allowed follow up questions to be directed to participants and a
308 good understanding of contentious areas in discussion. The use of ‘chat’ functions allowed
309 participants to note questions as they think of them, rather than having to remember them and

310 finding a time to raise them later, which in view of the high incidence of memory difficulties
311 in this population(Paterno, Folweiler, & Cohen, 2017) can be a particular challenge. The
312 facilitators also found that these questions could be used to restart conversations or to redirect
313 conversation which may have become fixed on a minor point.

314 It is well acknowledged that PPI group members should be reimbursed for their time and
315 discussion(Manikandan et al., 2022). Legislation around HMRC IR35 can make it
316 problematic for public bodies to make direct payments to individuals so provision of
317 vouchers for payment was selected, which has been found to be effective
318 previously(Manikandan et al., 2022). Contributors reported being happy with this model.
319 Research programmes at application stage do not have funding to support PPI but the
320 Research Design Service public involvement fund was able to cover the cost of these initial
321 sessions.

322

323 ***Ensuring Representation:***

324 Diversity in PPI is an acknowledged issue (INVOLVE, (2012)). The project aimed to
325 improve the geographic, ethnic and socio-economic diversity of the group and the final
326 results showed some success. An initial challenge of the team was not having previous data
327 on the diversity of the initial participants in the RHITE database. The group so far is England
328 centric with a concentration in London which does limit range of views. With other factors,
329 however the group was more representative of the country with 10% of the PPI group
330 identifying as LGBT+ in comparison with 10.6% in the most recent census(Statistics, 2022).
331 With 28% of the group describing themselves as Black, African, Caribbean, or Black British
332 this group is a higher proportion than in the wider population (4% (Statistics, 2022)). One
333 person stated that they were “homeless” which is often seen to be one of the most challenging

334 populations to engage with PPI work (Dawes, Barron, & Lee, 2022). People experiencing
335 homelessness however are at significantly higher risk for ill health and brain injury with
336 53.1% suffering a traumatic brain injury across their lifetime(Stubbs et al., 2020) and
337 expanding input from this population is likely to provide significant new insights for the
338 group.

339

340 The wide ranges of presentations that people have after Brain Injury (Turkstra et al., 2015)
341 also make ensuring appropriate representation difficult. At present no attempt is made to
342 understand diversity of impairment within the group but is seen to be a key future
343 development.

344

345 ***Moving forward:***

346 The latest review of the programme has identified areas where the outreach session could be
347 improved further.

- 348 • More effort needs to be made to improve the diversity of those attending the sessions.
349 Identifying third sector organisations and support groups for communities of ABI
350 survivors with specific types of injuries or conditions might be one way of doing this.
351 In particular, geographical diversity will need to be further addressed.
- 352 • A related project to develop a patient portal is underway. This will improve public
353 access to information about research projects, allowing greater transparency of the
354 work of the Brain Injury MIC and act as a forum to recruit study participants and
355 Panel Members.

- 356 • Currently the PPI group has been focused on early-stage projects. As the supported
357 projects continue and move to stages such as dissemination the PPI group will have
358 input and impact on these aspects.
- 359 • Further focussing on increasing awareness of the use of the PPI programme with
360 SMEs and supporting them to develop solutions and products to address problems
361 faced by Brain Injury Survivors.

362 **Conclusion:**

363 We have illustrated the development of an outreach programme, led by a Brain Injury
364 Survivor that engages brain injury survivors and their families or carers in learning about and
365 providing input to research being conducted by the Brain Injury MIC. The programme has
366 grown and been able to engage relevant and increasingly diverse participants across much of
367 the UK. More researchers in brain injury are engaging with the programme and finding it
368 useful for their research. While the Brain Injury MIC team started as novices in this area,
369 through an iterative process a purposeful and useful programme was formed which has had
370 an impact on research within an area that is often challenging in which to obtain patient and
371 carer input. Key learning from this programme includes ensuring measurement of diversity,
372 supporting access through the use of online platforms, maximising impact through
373 preparation of researchers ahead of the sessions, and a knowledgeable and empathetic
374 facilitator.

375

376 **List of abbreviations**

377 **ABI** Acquired Brain Injury

378 **MIC** Med tech cooperative

379 **PAG** Patient advisory group

380 **PPI** Patient public involvement

381 **PPIE** Patient public involvement and engagement

382 **SME** Small and medium enterprise

383

384 **Declarations**

385 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

386 Not applicable

387 **Consent for publication**

388 All authors consent to publication

389 **Availability of data and materials**

390 All material is owned by the authors and available on request

391 **Funding**

392 The NIHR brain injury med tech cooperative was funded by the National Institute of health

393 and care research

394 Award ref MIC-2016-009

395 **Acknowledgements:**

396 The Authors wish to thank the members of the Brain Injury MIC PAG as well members of

397 RHITE and all those who have attended as a PPI Panel member.

398 The research was supported by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR)

399 Brain Injury MedTech Co-operative based at Cambridge University Hospitals NHS

400 Foundation Trust and University of Cambridge. The views expressed are those of the

401 author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health and

402 Social Care.

403 **Declaration of Interest Statement:**

404 The Authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

405 **Declarations**

406 **Acknowledgements**

407 The authors would like to thank all of the patients and carers for their contribution to then
408 outreach project and ongoing support of research

409

410 **References**

411

412 Aitken, M. E., McCarthy, M. L., Slomine, B. S., Ding, R., Durbin, D. R., Jaffe, K. M.,
413 Mackenzie, E. J. (2009). Family burden after traumatic brain injury in children.
414 *Pediatrics*, 123(1), 199-206. doi:10.1542/peds.2008-0607

415

416 Bailenson, J. N. (2021). Nonverbal overload: A theoretical argument for the causes of
417 Zoom fatigue. *Technology, Mind, and Behavior*, 2(1). doi:10.1037/tmb0000030

418

419 Brett, J., Staniszewska, S., Mockford, C., Herron-Marx, S., Hughes, J., Tysall, C., &
420 Suleman, R. (2014). Mapping the impact of patient and public involvement on health
421 and social care research: a systematic review. *Health Expectations*, 17(5), 637-650.
422 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1369-7625.2012.00795.x>

423

424 Buck, D., Gamble, C., Dudley, L., Preston, J., Hanley, B., Williamson, P. R., & Young, B.
425 (2014). From plans to actions in patient and public involvement: qualitative study of
426 documented plans and the accounts of researchers and patients sampled from a
427 cohort of clinical trials. *BMJ Open*, 4(12), e006400. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2014-
428 006400

429

430 Das, L. T., & Gonzalez, C. J. (2020). Preparing Telemedicine for the Frontlines of
431 Healthcare Equity. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 35(8), 2443-2444.
432 doi:10.1007/s11606-020-05941-9

433

434 Dawes, J., Barron, D. S., & Lee, L. E. (2022). Capturing learning from public
435 involvement with people experiencing homelessness to help shape new
436 physiotherapy research: Utilizing a reflective model with an under-served, vulnerable
437 population. *Health Expectations*, 25(5), 2203-2212.

438 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.13397>

439

440 Dewan, M. C., Rattani, A., Gupta, S., Baticulon, R. E., Hung, Y.-C., Punchak, M., Park,
441 K. B. (2019). Estimating the global incidence of traumatic brain injury. *Journal of*
442 *Neurosurgery*, 130(4), 1080-1097. doi:10.3171/2017.10.jns17352

443

- 444 INVOLVE. (2012). *Strategies for diversity and inclusion in public involvement:*
445 *Supplement to the briefing notes for researchers*. INVOLVE, Eastleigh. Retrieved from
446 [https://www.invo.org.uk/wp-](https://www.invo.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/INVOLVEInclusionSupplement1.pdf)
447 [content/uploads/2012/06/INVOLVEInclusionSupplement1.pdf](https://www.invo.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/INVOLVEInclusionSupplement1.pdf)
448
- 449 Manikandan, M., Foley, K., Gough, J., Harrington, S., Wall, É., Weldon, F., Fortune, J.
450 (2022). Public and Patient Involvement in Doctoral Research During the COVID-19
451 Pandemic: Reflections on the Process, Challenges, Impact and Experiences From the
452 Perspectives of Adults With Cerebral Palsy and the Doctoral Researcher. *Frontiers in*
453 *Rehabilitation Sciences*, 3. doi:10.3389/fresc.2022.874012
454
- 455 Mathie, E. (2018). *Guidance for Researchers: Feedback*. Retrieved from
456 [https://www.clahrc-oe.nihr.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Guidance-for-](https://www.clahrc-oe.nihr.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Guidance-for-Researchers-PPI-Feedback_2018.pdf)
457 [Researchers-PPI-Feedback_2018.pdf:](https://www.clahrc-oe.nihr.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Guidance-for-Researchers-PPI-Feedback_2018.pdf)
458
- 459 McDonald, K. E., & Keys, C. B. (2008). How the powerful decide: access to research
460 participation by those at the margins. *Am J Community Psychol*, 42(1-2), 79-93.
461 doi:10.1007/s10464-008-9192-x
462
- 463 NIHR. (2022). *Payment guidance for researchers and professionals*. Retrieved from
464 [www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/payment-guidance-for-researchers-and-](http://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/payment-guidance-for-researchers-and-professionals/27392)
465 [professionals/27392](http://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/payment-guidance-for-researchers-and-professionals/27392)
466
- 467 Ocloo, J., Garfield, S., Franklin, B. D., & Dawson, S. (2021). Exploring the theory,
468 barriers and enablers for patient and public involvement across health, social care
469 and patient safety: a systematic review of reviews. *Health Research Policy and*
470 *Systems*, 19(1), 8. doi:10.1186/s12961-020-00644-3
471
- 472 Palmer, R., & Paterson, G. (2013). To what extent can people with communication
473 difficulties contribute to health research? *Nurse Res*, 20(3), 12-16.
474 doi:10.7748/nr2013.01.20.3.12.c9491
475
- 476 UK Public Involvement Standards Development Partnership (2019) *UK Standards for*
477 *Public Involvement*. Retrieved From www.nihr.ac.uk/pi-standards/standards
478
- 479 Paterno, R., Folweiler, K. A., & Cohen, A. S. (2017). Pathophysiology and Treatment
480 of Memory Dysfunction After Traumatic Brain Injury. *Curr Neurol Neurosci Rep*,
481 17(7), 52. doi:10.1007/s11910-017-0762-x
482
- 483 Paterson, H., & Carpenter, C. (2015). Using different methods to communicate: how
484 adults with severe acquired communication difficulties make decisions about the
485 communication methods they use and how they experience them. *Disability and*
486 *Rehabilitation*, 37(17), 1522-1530. doi:10.3109/09638288.2015.1052575
487
- 488 South, A., Hanley, B., Gafos, M., Cromarty, B., Stephens, R., Sturgeon, K., Vale, C. L.
489 (2016). Models and impact of patient and public involvement in studies carried out

490 by the Medical Research Council Clinical Trials Unit at University College London:
491 findings from ten case studies. *Trials*, 17, 376. doi:10.1186/s13063-016-1488-9

492
493 UK Census (2021). Office of National Statistics, Available at
494 <https://census.gov.uk/census-2021-results>

495
496 Stubbs, J. L., Thornton, A. E., Sevick, J. M., Silverberg, N. D., Barr, A. M., Honer, W. G.,
497 & Panenka, W. J. (2020). Traumatic brain injury in homeless and marginally housed
498 individuals: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Public Health*, 5(1),
499 e19-e32. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(19)30188-4

500
501 Turkstra, L. S., Politis, A. M., & Forsyth, R. (2015). Cognitive–communication
502 disorders in children with traumatic brain injury. *Developmental Medicine & Child*
503 *Neurology*, 57(3), 217-222. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/dmcn.12600>

504
505 Whitehouse, D., Piffer, F., Becker, T., Gravett, K., Stewart, A., Basi, K., Newcombe, V.
506 (2021). Challenges, approaches and opportunities for Patient and Public Involvement
507 (PPI) in Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) research. *Br J Neurosurg*, 35(5), 651-652.
508 doi:10.1080/02688697.2021.1922605

509

Figure 1. Geographical Distribution of PPI Group Members by County




Figure 2. Ice-Breakers for Online Groups

What is your favourite biscuit?

Joining a video conference with a group you have not met before can be intimidating for some. To improve the chance of everybody engaging in the process it is helpful to adopt a conversational, informal tone and to break hierarchies between facilitator, researcher and public member of the group. Starting the session with an off-topic subject is one way to do this. Using the rename function of the platform and ask each participant to change their name to a piece of information is a simple way of doing this. You can gather useful information about geographical location by asking for place, or level of experience, by asking if they have been involved in research before. For a real leveller try asking about the weather or even their favourite biscuit.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.04.14.24305787>; this version posted April 16, 2024. 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 4.0 International license](#).