

1

2

3

4 **A review of reviews exploring patient and public involvement in**
5 **population health research**

6

7 Soo Vinnicombe¹, Jane Noyes^{1*}

8 ¹School of Medical and Health Sciences, Bangor University, Bangor, UK

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 *Corresponding author

17 Email: Jane.Noyes@bangor.ac.uk

18

19

20

21 **Abstract**

22

23 **Introduction:** Patient and public involvement (PPI) is increasingly seen as something that is integral
24 to research and of importance to research funders. There is general recognition that PPI is the right
25 thing to do for both moral and practical reasons. The aim of this review of reviews is to examine how
26 PPI can be done ‘properly’ by looking at the evidence that exists from published reviews and
27 assessing it against the UK Standards for Public Involvement in Research, as well as examining the
28 specific features of population health research that can make PPI more challenging.

29 **Methods:** A review of reviews was carried out following the 5-stage Framework Synthesis method.

30 **Results:** In total 31 reviews were included. There is a lack of current research or clarity around
31 Governance and Impact when findings are mapped against UK Standards for Public Involvement in
32 Research. It was also clear that there is little knowledge around PPI with under-represented groups.
33 There are gaps in knowledge about how to ensure key specific attributes of population health research
34 are addressed for PPI team members – particularly around how to deal with complexity and the data-
35 driven nature of the research. Two tools were produced for researchers and PPI members to further
36 improve their PPI activity within population health research and health research more generally: A
37 framework of recommended actions to address PPI in population health research, and guidance on
38 integrating PPI based on the UK Standards for Public Involvement in Research.

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

43 **Keywords**

44 Public and patient involvement, involvement, PPI, population health research, review of reviews.

45 **Introduction**

46

47 The focus of this review of reviews is on Public and Patient involvement (PPI) in population health

48 research. PPI is increasingly seen as something that is integral to research and of importance to

49 research funders. For our purposes, PPI is defined as:

50 ‘Public involvement in research means research that is done ‘with’ or ‘by’ the public, not ‘to’, ‘about’

51 or ‘for’ them. It means that patients or other people with relevant experience contribute to how

52 research is designed, conducted and disseminated. It does not refer to research participants taking part

53 in a study. Public involvement is also different from public engagement, which is when information

54 and knowledge about research is shared with the public (1). There is however sometimes confusion

55 between what constitutes public engagement compared with involvement. In some countries, such as

56 Canada, it is also common to use ‘public engagement’ to refer to public involvement (2). Similarly,

57 the lines between stakeholder representation and public or patient representation can sometimes be

58 blurred.

59

60 **Population health research**

61

62 ‘Population health’ is associated with several definitions and nuances and there is overlap with public

63 health and aspects of more general health research. The King’s Fund describes population health as:

64

65 ‘An approach aimed at improving the health of an entire population. It is about improving the physical

66 and mental health outcomes and wellbeing of people within and across a defined local, regional or

67 national population, while reducing health inequalities. It includes action to reduce the occurrence of

68 ill health, action to deliver appropriate health and care services and action on the wider determinants

69 of health. It requires working with communities and partner agencies (3).

70 Public health, by comparison, can be defined as:

71

72 ‘Activities to strengthen public health capacities and service aim to provide conditions under which
73 people can maintain to be healthy, improve their health and wellbeing, or prevent the deterioration of
74 their health. Public health focuses on the entire spectrum of health and wellbeing, not only the
75 eradication of particular diseases (4).

76

77 Some refer to Public Health (note the capitalisation) as specifically about activities and interventions
78 carried out by government agencies, health professionals, or other centralised bodies whereas
79 population health includes other, non-health related, influences such as housing, transport and
80 education. In reality, these various definitions can oversimplify our understanding and a rigid
81 adherence to a perceived difference between the terms may serve to disguise relevant information
82 about successful PPI activity. As Diez-Roux argues, ‘Much of this is a semantic discussion. What
83 really matters are the questions we pose regarding the health of the public, the answers we obtain, and
84 the actions we take in response. Whether we call this approach public health or population health is, in
85 all honesty, irrelevant (5).

86

87 **Specific challenges of integrating PPI in population health** 88 **research**

89

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

- 93 • Duration. Population health research often looks at health variables across a long period of
94 time. This makes recruiting and retaining suitable PPI representation across the length of the
95 project more challenging. Changes in personnel, in all parts of the research team and
96 partners, can be expected in any project.
- 97 • Complexity. Population health is often multi-disciplinary and looks at health as the product
98 of multiple determinants (such as biology, genetics, behaviours, social and environmental
99 aspects) as well as looking at their interactions among individuals and groups and across time

100 and generations. With all these different variants involved it can be difficult for a lay person
101 to understand the complexity – or, to put it another way, for the researchers to explain the
102 research in a way that a lay person can understand. It may often be the case that a different
103 skill set, and therefore potentially a different person, is necessary at different stages of the
104 research or for different workstreams – something that applies to researchers as well as to PPI
105 representatives.

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

112 • Representation. Population health research often addresses large and diverse
113 population groups within the populations being researched, which raises issues about the PPI
114 being representative. Even within disease-specific studies it is often difficult, if not practically
115 impossible, to recruit someone who truly represents the breadth of people with a certain
116 condition. Once that issue is expanded out to wider populations, the issue of true
117 representation is multiplied many times. Representation becomes particularly difficult with
118 certain demographic groups which may be grouped together for convenience, but which
119 might hide a variety of differences. A prime example of this is the involvement of Black,
120 Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) individuals – recruiting a single person of BAME
121 background risks subsuming important differences according to specific cultural, genetic,
122 class, education and other factors. There is also an ongoing debate about terminology such as
123 ‘hard to reach’, ‘under-represented’, ‘seldom heard’ and ‘under-served’ which often have
124 problematic resonances (6). One way to think of this is that ‘[t]he key idea here is that the
125 definition of ‘under-served’ is highly context-specific; it will depend on the population, the
126 condition under study, the question being asked by research teams, and the intervention being
127 tested. No single, simple definition can encompass all under-served groups (7).

128 **The need for a review of reviews**

129

130 As described above, population health presents specific challenges for researchers and there is a lack
131 of guidance on doing PPI well in population health research. Scoping searches identified a number of
132 reviews of PPI involvement covering population health, public health as well as other more general
133 reviews that included population and public health studies of interest. None of the published reviews
134 had a specific focus on what worked to deliver optimal PPI in population health research. We
135 therefore decided to undertake a review of reviews to explore the challenges and solutions to carrying
136 out PPI well in population health research. Findings were then developed into two tools for
137 researchers and PPI members to further improve the quality of PPI activities in population health
138 research.

139

140 **Materials and methods**

141

142 This review of reviews assembled and interpreted the evidence on PPI involvement in population
143 health research. Question formulation was underpinned by the ECLIPSE (**E**xpectation, **C**lient Group,
144 **L**ocation, **P**rofessionals and **S**ervice) framework that is acknowledged to be most suitable for
145 searching for health policy or health management information (8).

146

147 We developed the following question: What evidence exists concerning the successful development,
148 implementation and evaluation of patient and public involvement activity or models in population
149 health research in the UK and equivalent health systems?

150

151 **Inclusion criteria**

152

- 153 • Type of study: systematic and other reviews that focus on the concept of, or approaches to,
154 PPI and/or PPE (patient and public engagement) across population health, public health,
155 health and social care. Limited to systematic reviews, narrative reviews, literature reviews,
156 bibliometric reviews, scoping reviews and meta-analyses. Quantitative, qualitative and
157 mixed-methods reviews were of interest.
- 158 • Setting: any organisational setting that includes population health, public health, health or
159 social care aspects (e.g., primary care, mental health, hospital, tertiary care, voluntary, etc.).
- 160 • Type of involvement: not just being part of the research as a participant but being involved in
161 part or all of the following stages – research development, research monitoring, research
162 analysis and dissemination.
- 163

164 **Exclusion Criteria**

- 165
- 166 • Articles not in English.
- 167 • Reviews published before 2010. However, the timeframes for the primary studies included in
168 the reviews vary and can go back to the inception of various databases. This timeframe was
169 considered appropriate as public and patient involvement is something that has been
170 developing rapidly in recent years and was not really established as a well-recognised term
171 before then.
- 172

173 **Search Strategy**

174

175 An information scientist undertook the initial search of the Medline and PubMed databases. The full
176 search strategy is included in Supporting Information 1. The Involve Evidence Library was searched
177 for ‘systematic reviews’. Note that this library currently (September 2021) only includes references
178 up to 2015.

179 The original search was done in May 2020 with a follow up search (stages 2 and 3) carried out early
180 in September 2021 to pick up new reviews up to end of August 2021.

181 **Screening**

182

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

186

187 **Quality appraisal**

188

189 Originally the AMSTAR2 (9), method was trialled on six reviews but as most of the included reviews
190 were qualitative rather than quantitative many of the AMSTAR2 domains did not apply so we
191 switched to using CASP for systematic reviews (10). Included reviews were quality appraised by SV
192 and independently checked by JN (Supporting Information 2). Reviews were not excluded at this
193 stage on methodological grounds as the focus was on PPI processes reported in the review.

194

195 **Data extraction and synthesis**

196

197 Studies included in source reviews were mapped for duplication and this was taken account of in the
198 analysis and synthesis. As this review of reviews did not require a transformative method of data
199 synthesis to better understand the descriptive accounts of PPI in the source reviews, we selected the
200 aggregative 5-stage framework synthesis method for integrating evidence of interest from diverse
201 review designs.

202 It is a matrix-based method involving the construction of a priori thematic categories into which data
203 can be coded. The five stages are:

- 204 • Familiarisation
- 205 • Identifying a thematic framework
- 206 • Indexing
- 207 • Charting

208 • Mapping and interpretation (11)

209 Initial data extraction was carried out against a framework designed by the authors based on close

210 examination of background literature and initial review readings (Table 1).

211 **Table 1. Initial framework: headings and details**

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

212

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

214 the UK Standards for Public Involvement.

215 **Table 2. Secondary framework: thematic mapping**

Challenges			Solutions		
Study id	Problem	Consequence	Study id	Solution	Details

216

217 The UK Standards for Public Involvement are:

- 218 • Inclusive Opportunities - Offer public involvement opportunities that are accessible and that
219 reach people and groups according to research needs.
- 220 • Working Together - Work together in a way that values all contributions, and that builds and
221 sustains mutually respectful and productive relationships.
- 222 • Support and Learning - We offer and promote support and learning that builds confidence and
223 skills for public involvement in research.
- 224 • Governance - Involve the public in research management, regulation, leadership and decision
225 making.
- 226 • Communications - Use plain language for well-timed and relevant communications, as part of
227 involvement plans and activities.
- 228 • Impact - Seek improvement by identifying and sharing the difference that public involvement
229 makes to research (12).

230

231 **Public and patient involvement**

232 This review of reviews was discussed with the Centre for Population Health Patient and Public
233 Involvement Advisory Group, which meets quarterly to help set the strategic direction for PPI within
234 the Centre. The draft review was read and commented on several times throughout its development
235 by two PPI advisory group members.

236

237 **Results**

238 Thirty-one reviews were included covering around one thousand individual studies, which were
239 mainly based in the UK or USA. We took note of any duplication of studies across reviews to ensure
240 that we were not double counting the evidence.

241 The studies covered a range of settings and subject areas (Supporting Information 3). Reviews varied
242 in quality (Supporting Information 2) but as the review methods and findings were not the primary
243 phenomenon of interest we did not place a lot of emphasis on the quality of the source reviews when
244 interpreting findings.

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

247 **Representation** was extensively discussed in the studies reviewed. It is an aspect of PPI that does not
248 have a simple solution for any type of research project. For population health projects that tend to be
249 longer in duration, it may be that different people need to take part in different periods of the project
250 and, for complex projects, that different people need to be involved in different work streams. Boote
251 (13) notes that there is a concern that PPI representatives taking part in research over time may
252 become ‘professionalised’ and come to see things from the point of view of the research team rather
253 than as a member of the public or patient demographic.

254 **Complexity** was also discussed when talking about support and learning requirements for PPI
255 members. Population health projects are often highly complex but, given the right support and
256 training, that is not a sufficient reason to exclude PPI activity.

257 The **data-driven** aspect was touched upon mainly in terms of ensuring that project specific training
258 and support was available. Many population health projects include aspects of Big Data which can
259 add a layer of difficulty to PPI activity, but which can also be addressed by considering tailored
260 training and support. Having non-data experts involved in such projects may help when designing

261 dissemination and communication activities around the project so that they can eventually be more
262 accessible to a wider audience.

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

267 **Common issues across PPI activity in population and other types of health research**

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

270 **Challenges**

271 Just over half of the reviews (18 out of 31 (14-31)) noted a range of potential challenges with PPI that
272 were reported to stand in the way of the successful development, implementation and evaluation of
273 patient and public involvement activity or models in health research in the UK and equivalent health
274 systems.

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

277

278 **Table 3. Full list of challenges identified**

Heading	Sub-heading	Reviews
Resources	Lack of budget	14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 25, 27, 28
	Lack of time	14, 16, 18, 19, 20, 25, 27
	Emotional burden on PPI members	14, 20, 21, 25
	Complicated logistics/ infrastructure	16, 19
	Workload too high (on all sides)	20, 23
	Lack of incentives	16
	Lack of preparation	14
	Lack of staff continuity	16
	Lack of support for PPI members	24

	Scope creep ¹	26
Conflict and control	Allowing power to be shared with PPI	14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 25
	Expectations (from all sides)	14, 16, 20, 21, 27, 29
	Conflicting perspectives	15, 16, 19, 23, 24
	A culture of researchers vs PPI members	14, 16, 20
	Ethical concerns	24, 25
	Challenging the establishment	14
	Differences within communities	14
	Accepting the legitimacy of PPI	19
	Prioritising personal experience	18
	Scepticism (from all sides)	14
	Unresolved conflict	31
Knowledge	Processes	14, 16, 19, 25, 27
	Language/ jargon	14, 15, 18, 19, 27
	Lack of skills or training	14, 19, 23, 24, 25
	Administration issues	17
	Working practices	14
Representation	Reflecting the diversity of affected populations	14, 17, 18, 19, 23, 25, 27, 30
	Tokenism of PPI (aka box-ticking)	22, 24, 26
	Getting early-stage involvement	17, 22
	Involving children	19
	Protecting anonymity	25
Communication	Accessibility (venues)	28
	Lack of meaningful and timely communication leading to disenfranchisement	14, 17, 21
	Difficulty reporting impact of PPI	15, 24, 25
	Building relationships to sustain involvement	16, 19
	Transparency of research process	23
	Building trust (on all sides)	16
	Different values within team	27

279

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

¹ When a project outgrows its original remit without any additional resources being available.

284 **Solutions**

285 Nearly three quarters of the studies (23 out of 31) (2, 16-18, 20-38) noted a range of potential
286 solutions for ensuring that PPI was more likely to be successful.

287 These proposed solutions have been collated, consolidated and sorted according to the UK Standards
288 for Involvement in Research as follows:

289 **Inclusive Opportunities**

290 Solution: Offer public involvement opportunities that are accessible and that reach people and groups
291 according to research needs. Research also needs to be informed by a diversity of public experience
292 and insight, so that it leads to treatments and services which reflect these needs.

293 Eleven reviews mentioned inclusion (17-18, 20-21, 24, 29, 33-34, 36-38). Key themes emerged from
294 these studies and these are outlined in Table 4 below and explicitly addressed the problem area of
295 Representation.

296

297 **Table 4. Solutions – Inclusive opportunities**

Attribute	Study/Studies	Examples of reasoning
Representation and/or diversity	15, 19, 28, 31-33	Use variety of methods (37) and partners (24) to recruit a range of participants, understand different motivations (20) and gain insight into the community (33), view differing perspectives as valuable (36), recognise and address issues concerning diversity (36), avoid tokenism (20)
Community consultation	18, 24, 30, 33-34, 37	To fit better with wider community context (33), include relevant stakeholders and agencies (33) also clinicians, charities, specialist support services (37) plus patient and advocacy groups (24), be proactive and go out and get involved, don't expect people to come to you (34), build more meaningful relationships with target population (30)
Accessibility	20-21, 34, 37	Venues should be located for the ease of the participants (20), accessible and meetings should be timed appropriately (37) and include communication aids, breaks and refreshments as appropriate (21) for individual and collective needs (34)
Methods of	17, 21, 37	Online could assist people to be included e.g. illness, time, caring (17), especially working with disabled children and

engagement		young people be flexible for different abilities and ages and offer choice (21), use variety of methods (37)
Recruit well	20, 37-38	Fit skills and experiences to the project as well (20), recruit through a variety of ways (37), need to be not just representative but also collaborative (38)
Safe environment	21	Consider whether a trusted adult or facilitator is useful (21)

298

299 **Working Together**

300 Solution: Work together in a way that values all contributions, and that builds and sustains mutually
 301 respectful and productive relationships. Public involvement in research is better when people work
 302 together towards a common purpose, and different perspectives are respected.

303 Twenty-one reviews (2, 16-18, 20-21, 23-29, 31-38) discussed aspects of this standard. The main
 304 areas of discussion are outlined in Table 5 below and explicitly addresses the problem area of Conflict
 305 and Control.

306 **Table 5. Solutions – Working Together**

Attribute	Study/Studies	Examples of reasoning
Relationships	2, 16, 18, 20-21, 24-29, 31-36, 38	Manage conflict (28, 33, 38), Take time to build partnerships built on joint ownership, trust, respect and transparency (2, 16, 18, 21, 24-27, 29, 31-36, 38), Empower PPI members by sharing power and knowledge (21, 32, 34-36), Explore risks together (24), Consider capacity of PPI members (24-25)
Resources	2, 18, 20-21, 24-28, 32, 34, 37	Budget/ funding (18, 20-21, 25, 27-28, 32, 34), Time to build relationships, communicate etc. (2, 18, 20-21, 25-27, 32, 34), Use existing PPI resources where available (37), Plan into proposals (24-25), Tailor to project (34)
Engagement	2, 16-18, 20, 23-24, 29, 38	Early on (2, 17-18, 23, 38), Multiple and varied opportunities (16, 29, 38), Appropriate (20, 24), Acknowledge contributions (17, 24, 38)
Clarity	2, 16, 18, 25-26, 29, 36, 38	Roles (2, 16, 18, 25, 36, 38), Expectations (16, 26, 29, 36), Structures (2)
Flexibility	17, 20-21, 24-25	Confidence, personal circumstances and capacity may change over time (17, 21, 25), Keep tasks flexible and include time for training and questions (24), In attitude and approaches to the project (25)

307

308 **Support and Learning**

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

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

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

312 The following seventeen reviews mentioned various aspects of support and learning (2, 16, 18, 21-22,

313 24-25, 27-29, 32-38). The results are shown in Table 6 below. The table is split into two sections to

314 reflect differences between support and learning methods, and explicitly addresses the problem area

315 of Knowledge.

316 **Table 6. Solutions – Support and learning**

SUPPORT - Attribute	Study/Studies	Examples of reasoning
Emotional support	2, 13, 19, 24, 28-29, 31-32	Recognise that experiences may be upsetting (18), Provide safe spaces (33), Provide consistent feedback and support (24), Consider how to deal with anxiety (29)
Practical support	24, 34-36	Think about details e.g. childcare, food, location, transport, compensation, timings (35), Have strategies for when people are ill/ can't take part (24)
Structural support	16, 25, 36	Make sure key project individuals support PPI (16), Provide structures that support PPI (36), Include relevant institutions such as charities, volunteer groups etc. (25)
Specific support	29, 33	Ensure support specific to topic area (29) and to their individual involvement (33).
LEARNING - Attribute	Study/Studies	Examples of reasoning
As appropriate	2, 18, 27, 32-33, 36-38	Make learning relevant to the specific context of the research (2, 27, 33) and at the appropriate level for the PPI member (33) to allow full participation (38) and to build participant capacity (18)
Formal knowledge	16, 25, 32, 34	Formal development of knowledge and skills (16), supporting participants to be informed and make informed decisions (25) and to understand specific parts of the research process and/or context (32)
Research methods	22, 32, 37-38	Training in research components to give confidence in their involvement (32) and to explain 'rules' and constraints of

		research (22)
Variety of learning methods	24, 29, 34-35	Use a variety of methods such as supervision, mentoring, formal, workshops and team based (35), include everyone on the team if possible (24, 34)
Share knowledge	32-33	Acknowledge that knowledge and experience flow both ways and make ways to facilitate that flow (33)
General	21, 25, 28, 34	Provide, support and fund training and learning opportunities (25).

317

318 **Governance**

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

320 Public involvement in research governance can help research be more transparent and gain public
 321 trust. This section explicitly addresses the problem area of Conflict and Control. Only three of the
 322 reviews mentioned governance (2, 24, 35). They discuss the need for shared decision making (at
 323 every level), power and leadership, in order to lead to a culture of deeper involvement. As limited
 324 suggestions were reported there is no table for this section.

325 **Communications**

326 Solution: Use plain language for well-timed and relevant communications, as part of involvement
 327 plans and activities. Communicate with a wider audience about public involvement and research,
 328 using a broad range of approaches that are accessible and appealing.

329 Nine of the reviews discussed communication as being important to ensure PPI activity is successful
 330 (2, 20, 24-25, 27, 32, 34-35, 37). Various attributes of good communication are discussed with the
 331 main points as in Table 7 below, and explicitly addresses the problem area of Communications.

332 Table 7. Solutions - Communications

Attribute	Study/Studies	Examples of reasoning
Listen, act and feed back	24, 27, 34-35	Helps address issues such as power (35), let people know what you are doing with their suggestions and why (24), ensures accountability (27)
Ongoing/ regular updates	25, 32, 37	Contribute to motivation and engagement, and

		to foster satisfying partnerships (32)
Creating space to voice concern/ open communication climate	20, 24, 32	Contribute to motivation and engagement, and to foster satisfying partnerships (32)
Avoid/ translate jargon	24-25, 32	Ensuring everyone understood and felt comfortable and confident to engage in meaningful dialogue (32)
Use different materials (not just written reports etc)	32, 34, 37	Ensure people with different levels of literacy can participate (32)
Sharing information, experiences and knowledge	2, 34	Across all groups involved (2)
Clarifying and agree expectations upfront	24, 32	Could avoid conflicts, demotivation, dissolution of partnerships, or frustration in situations where stakeholders could perceive a lack of concrete actions (32), patients are 'partners' not 'are involved' (24)
Have stakeholders lead groups	32	But be careful they include all groups in the discussion (32)

333 **Impact**

334 Solution: Seek improvement by identifying and sharing the difference that public involvement makes
335 to research. Understand the changes, benefits and learning gained from the insights and experiences of
336 patients, carers and the public.

337 Seven of the reviews discussed impact (2, 20, 24, 32, 34-35, 38). The general theme was that impact
338 needs to be better evaluated throughout the whole research lifecycle. It was noted that this is an area
339 where the existing literature is scant and current working practices are perceived to be lacking in
340 terms of rigour.

341 Evaluating impact through continuous assessment and feedback was seen to be important in order to
342 ensure ongoing involvement, to identify best practice and areas for improvement, and to make sure
343 that the experience is working for everyone involved.

344 In addition to evaluating the process of PPI within health research, it was also noted that the impact of
345 findings that are translated to real world setting, and ideally the contribution of PPI activity to that
346 impact, should also be evaluated.

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

350 **Other issues**

351 Interestingly considering the topic of the reviews, the use of PPI members in the reviews was not
352 universal.

- 353 • 9 reviews described PPI throughout the review process
- 354 • 3 reviews took their findings to PPI members for discussion
- 355 • 3 reviews made use of external panels or organisations
- 356 • Single reviews reported utilising PPI at specific stages:
 - 357 ○ To identify research questions
 - 358 ○ Reviewing protocol
 - 359 ○ During execution and translation
 - 360 ○ Reviewing the process
 - 361 ○ Feedback from stakeholder but stage not stated
- 362 • 2 reviews mentioned that there had not been any PPI in the review
- 363 • 9 reviews did not mention PPI in their own review process at all.

364 Few of the reviews detailed the studies discussed within them in terms of types of PPI or in terms of
365 stages of research although most included some discussion of these areas in general terms. Dawson et
366 al (39) is one exception where the studies are clearly detailed in terms of what PPI groups or
367 individuals were involved in various tasks.

368 There was no consistent terminology used for either types of PPI or stages of research. There has
369 been some attempt to categorise these at a national level. For example, in the UK, INVOLVE
370 distinguished between three PPI approaches: consultation, collaboration and user-led; while Health
371 Canada divides PPI into five stages: inform or educate, gather information, discuss, engage and
372 partner (Pii)(40).

373 Crocker et al (41) describes the types of involvement covered in the studies to range ‘from one person
374 to many people or whole patient organisations, from one-off involvement in a particular aspect of the
375 trial (for example, reviewing draft information for patients or recruiting participants from their
376 communities) to involvement throughout the trial (for example, as members of a trial steering
377 committee), and from involvement with no decision making power (for example, as advisers) to
378 involvement in decision making as equal partners’.

379 Some examples of stages of research where PPI could be included were described as below in Table
380 8.

381 **Table 8. Examples of stages of research**

Wilsher (23)	Domecq (26)	Pii (40)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify/prioritise• Design• Grant development• Undertake/Manage• Analysing/interpret• Dissemination• Monitoring/evaluation	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Preparatory phase (agenda setting, prioritization of research topics and funding).2) Execution phase (study design & procedures, study recruitment, data collection, and data analysis).3) Translation phase (dissemination, implementation, and evaluation).	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Development of research focus<ul style="list-style-type: none">Research definitionResearch prioritization2. Development of research design<ul style="list-style-type: none">Method developmentStudy design development3. Recruitment<ul style="list-style-type: none">Recruitment strategyRecruitment4. Data generation5. Data processing/ Analysis6. Research dissemination<ul style="list-style-type: none">DisseminationDissemination strategy

382

383 **Discussion**

384

385 **Population Health**

386 This review of reviews set out to see what evidence there was concerning optimising patient and
387 public involvement specific to population health research. The novelty in this review of reviews is
388 twofold: firstly, that the findings have been framed by the UK Standards and secondly, that the
389 challenges have been matched against potential solutions. Most reviews were about PPI activity in
390 specific thematic healthcare areas or in general health and social care research but the details of the

391 studies included in the reviews makes it clear that many studies included were of direct relevance to
392 population health research. The findings are, therefore, both generic across health and social care
393 research as well as providing useful evidence-based suggestions as to what works in PPI in population
394 health research.

395 **Comparing findings with recently published primary studies**

396 Looking at recently published primary studies we found several of interest, mainly around data-driven
397 population health research. The principles that emerge from these studies fit well with the findings of
398 the review of reviews, but also suggest that there are a variety of approaches through which PPI can
399 be addressed and improved. We summarise recent primary studies in Table 9.

400

401 **Table 9. Specific population health primary studies addressing PPI.**

Population Health Specific PPI Challenge Area	Study	Aspects of note
Data-driven	Johnson et al (42)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is little guidance on how to meaningfully involve the public in big data research.• Involvement in big data research is significantly limited in comparison with other study designs.• May be because common approaches to public involvement adopted in primary data research are not appropriate within big data analysis studies.• The highly data driven discussions that underline this type of research can present a barrier to public involvement.• There is now growing recognition that public involvement in big data research requires special considerations.
Data-driven	Hobbs et al (43)	<p>Enhance public forum members' personal development in data-intensive health research through a personal development portfolio:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Personal Profile - Personal details including education, qualifications and employment• Relevant Experience - Volunteering and personal experience• Training Record - Training events attended and events where been trainer or facilitator• Personal statement - Overall description of skills and

		<p>experience they may have gained from involvement activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement activities - Summary of each activity, skills and experience gained, evidence such as certificates or feedback and personal reflections on their involvement in this activity • References - Details of relevant individuals and how known to the public contributor.
Data-driven	'Consensus Statement on Public Involvement and Engagement with Data Intensive Health Research' ⁴⁴	<p>Key Principles for Public Involvement and Engagement in Data-Intensive Health Research –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Have institutional buy-in 2. Have clarity of purpose 3. Be transparent 4. Have two-way communication 5. Be inclusive and accessible to broad publics 6. Be ongoing 7. Be designed to produce impact 8. Be evaluated.
Complexity	Van Voorn et al (45)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involving patients in health economic research will require a serious investment of time and money for patients to get to a level at which they can contribute. • Patients need to be able to 'rise above' their condition - to find an interest in the material itself and have an objective view. • Proper selection procedures will have to be developed.
Representation & data-driven	Jewell et al (46)	<p>Report on the setting up of a service user and carer advisory group supporting data linkage in mental health research.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general public feel that the complexities of data linkage research may be difficult to explain in lay terms and that patients and the public have limited knowledge about data, anonymisation, aggregation, and the regulations surrounding these. • Training sessions were set up for all new group members. Training sought to provide members with information about data linkage, including the information governance procedures in place to protect the personal data of service users.

402

403 The specific aspect of longer-term duration that is often typical of population health studies is best
 404 illustrated through the examination of existing longitudinal studies. Longitudinal studies involve
 405 repeated observations of the same subjects, allowing researchers to analyse change at the individual
 406 level. Such studies typically last decades, such as the 1970 British Cohort Study (47) or the Medical
 407 Research Council National Survey of Health and Development (48) which started in 1946.

408 Considering involvement in longitudinal studies, one approach is that used by the ALSPAC study
409 (49). Based at the University of Bristol, the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children
410 (ALSPAC), also known as Children of the 90s, is a world-leading birth cohort study. One of the
411 governance aspects of the study is the original cohort advisory panel (OCAP) which is made up of
412 more than 30 study participants who meet bi-monthly to provide insights and advice on study design,
413 methodology and acceptability for participants. The group has been running since 2006.

414 The main aims of the OCAP group are:

- 415 • To represent the cohort of original study children
- 416 • To review study documentation and provide feedback to CO90s staff
- 417 • To represent and convey participants' opinions about planned research exercises.

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

422 **UK Standards**

423 The UK Standards proved to be a coherent framework for capturing solutions and no solution was
424 offered that did not fit in to one of the six categories. It was, however, notable that two standards were
425 less discussed than others: Governance and Impact. Capturing, measuring and illustrating the impact
426 of PPI within the entire lifespan of a project is an issue that has not yet been resolved but is currently
427 being addressed by various organisations. The absence of Governance may be a result of language
428 use, as some attributes of Working Together were relevant in terms of this standard but were not
429 couched in terms of Governance specifically. It was also interesting to see that Communications is a
430 UK Standard separate from Working Together, as it was something that could be seen to be an
431 integral part of Working Together.

432 **What is missing?**

433 The solutions were matched against the problems identified as population health challenges. Not all
 434 challenges were matched by solutions as shown in the table below (Table 10). Challenges not
 435 matched to solutions are in bold and have been allocated to an appropriate UK Standard. By
 436 combining the additional challenges to those matched against solutions we can anticipate producing a
 437 more comprehensive list of things to address to help ensure that PPI within a project is both more
 438 effective in itself, and also helps to achieve better outcomes for the research.

439 **Table 10. Challenges of facilitating good PPI in health research matched against solutions**

Challenges		Solutions	
Heading	Sub-heading	Attribute	UK Standard
Resources	Lack of budget	Resources	Working Together
	Lack of time	Resources	Working Together
	Emotional burden	Emotional support	Support and Learning
	Complicated logistics/ infrastructure	Structural support	Support and Learning
	Workload too high	-	Working Together
	Lack of incentives	-	Inclusive Opportunities
	Lack of preparation	-	Working Together
	Lack of staff continuity	-	Working Together
	Lack of support for PPI members	Various	Support and Learning
	Scope creep	-	Working Together
Conflict and control	Allowing power to be shared with PPI	Relationships	Working Together
	Expectations (from all sides)	Clarity	Working Together
	Conflicting perspectives	Relationships	Working Together
	A culture of researchers vs PPI	Relationships	Working Together
	Ethical concerns	-	Working Together
	Challenging the establishment	-	Working Together
	Differences within communities	Community consultation	Inclusive Opportunities
	Accepting the legitimacy of PPI	Clarity	Working Together
	Prioritising personal experience	-	Communications
	Scepticism (from all sides)	-	Communications
Knowledge	Unresolved conflict	Relationships	Working Together
	Processes	Structural support	Support and Learning
	Language/ jargon	Avoid jargon	Communications
	Lack of skills or training	As appropriate	Support and Learning
	Administration issues	Structural support	Support and Learning
	Working practices	Structural support	Support and Learning

Representation	Reflecting the diversity of affected populations	Representation and/ or diversity	Inclusive Opportunities
	Tokenism of PPI (aka box-ticking)	Representation and/ or diversity	Inclusive Opportunities
	Getting early-stage involvement	Engagement	Working Together
	Involving children	Methods of engagement	Inclusive Opportunities
	Protecting anonymity	-	Inclusive Opportunities
	Accessibility (venues)	Accessibility	Inclusive Opportunities
Communication	Lack of meaningful and timely communication leading to disenfranchisement	Ongoing/ regular updates	Communications
	Difficulty reporting impact of PPI	Evaluation	Impact
	Building relationships to sustain involvement	Relationships	Working Together
	Transparency of research process	Relationships	Working Together
	Building trust (on all sides)	Relationships	Working Together
	Different values within the team	Relationships	Working Together

440

441 **Impact - Evaluation of PPI**

442 Most studies focused on the impact of PPI activity on participants, researchers or the research itself –
 443 rather than setting out to formally assess what works to make PPI activity successful. For example,
 444 the Public and Patient Engagement Evaluation Tool (PPEET), developed by McMaster University in
 445 Canada, provides three questionnaires that examine involvement from the point of view of the
 446 participant, the project or the organisation (50). Although there are some tools to assess impact in PPI
 447 they tend to focus on certain aspects, for example the GRIPP2 tool assesses reporting of PPI (51).
 448 This relative lack of scrutiny makes it difficult to assess actions that a project could or should
 449 undertake to help ensure best practice in PPI.

450 The evaluation guidance provided on the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) website
 451 suggests the following categories of evaluation:

- 452 • Impact log – a simple method of recording outcomes
- 453 • ‘Cube’ framework – used to evaluate the process or quality of involvement
- 454 • Public Involvement Impact Assessment Framework (PiiAF) – more comprehensive method
 455 consisting of two parts 1) planning involvement in a research project, 2) designing a plan to
 456 evaluate the impact of involvement

457 • Realist evaluation – identifies what works for whom in what circumstances and what respects,
458 and how (52).

459 Moreover, there is much still to be decided about what impact may be reasonably expected to be seen.
460 Brett et al (53) notes particularly the lack of any evidence of any financial analysis and Jones et al (54)
461 suggests that the use of contemporaneous real time data concerning PPI within surgical trials,
462 currently lacking, could be made use of. Furthermore, ‘[T]he impact of involvement will always be
463 somewhat unpredictable, because at the start of any project researchers ‘don’t know what they don’t
464 know’—they do not know precisely what problems they might anticipate, until the patients/public tell
465 them.... One of the most important contextual factors that influence the outcome of involvement is
466 the researchers themselves, in particular the skills, knowledge, values and assumptions they start with.
467 They are often the ‘subjects’ who experience the impact of involvement. For this reason, the answer
468 to the question ‘Is involvement worth doing?’ will always be ‘It depends’ (55).

469 One further point of consideration is that it could be considered that the aspirational end point of PPI
470 would be that any involvement would become so integral to the project that it would be difficult to
471 unpick whose contribution had led to an impact or outcome not originally anticipated.

472 Developing new tools for use in population health research

473 Based the synthesis of reviews, a guidance framework for use in health research projects including
474 PPI and based on the UK Standards was developed (Supporting Information 4). It combines the
475 solutions and outstanding challenges taken from the review of reviews and aims to provide a useful
476 tool for researchers to enhance and improve their PPI activity within population health and general
477 health research.

478 From this framework, and with additional information taken from the studies detailed in Table 9, the
479 following table (Table 11) has been developed which looks specifically at actions which could help
480 mitigate the key challenges of PPI in population health research.

481

482 **Table 11. Recommended actions to address PPI in population health research**

Representation:

- Use a variety of methods and partners to recruit a range of PPI members with different knowledge, skills and experience at relevant points in the project lifecycle.
- To fit better with wider community context, include relevant stakeholders and agencies also clinicians, charities, specialist support services plus patient and advocacy groups, be proactive and go out and get involved, don't expect people to come to you, build more meaningful relationships with the target population.

Complexity & Data-Driven:

- Allow for the formal development of knowledge and skills, supporting PPI team members to be informed and make informed decisions and to understand specific parts of the research process and/or context.
- Make learning relevant to the specific context of the research and at the appropriate level for the PPI team member to allow full participation and to build participant capacity.
- Provide training in research components to give PPI team members confidence in their involvement and to explain 'rules' and constraints of research.
- Use a variety of methods such as supervision, mentoring, formal training, workshops and team-based sessions, include everyone on the team if possible.

Duration:

All of the aspects above are important and need to be considered dynamically throughout the duration of the project.

Generally, researchers should plan for an evolving and varied PPI contribution over time with different PPIs being brought into the project to meet the specific requirements at the time. It may however be useful to maintain a continuous thread of a core group of PPI team members to ensure continuity.

Additional key components regarding the typically longer duration of population health projects are:

- Communication – clear, accessible and timely communications using different methods as appropriate
- Governance – clarity of roles and structures to support the project throughout its life
- Relationship building – take time to build strong, meaningful relationships to improve PPI retention and understanding
- Resources – ensure sufficient time, financial and practical resources are available for the duration of the project including lead in and post-project activity
- Staff continuity – mitigating for changes in personnel, whether principal investigator, key researchers or PPI members
- Flexibility – recognising that projects and external drivers do need to adapt to changes in a measured and managed way
- Continuous evaluation and feedback – particularly important in longer projects to ensure that everything stays on track and to ensure that any issues are picked up sufficiently early to allow change.

483

484 What these tools (Table 11 and Supporting Information 4) do not provide is:

- 485
- A comprehensive tick list style approach

486 • Everything you could possibly consider – only what is in the reviews

487 • An indication of which actions are more important than others.

488

489 Research projects are different enough from each other that generic instructions will never suit every
490 project. These tools therefore aim to provide pointers on important areas to consider without being
491 directive about how that might look in a particular project.

492

493

494 **Strengths and limitations of the review of reviews**

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

498 • The number of studies reported in each review varied from 4 (37) to 251 (35)

499 • Years searched ranged from time periods defined by the previous decade (40) to those that
500 searched back to the inception of the databases searched (26)

501 • Geography also varied but, of those reviews which gave details of geographical settings, the
502 vast majority of the studies were from the UK (n = 292), followed by the USA (n = 95) and
503 then other areas: Canada (n = 38), Europe (n = 29), Australia (n = 25), and other countries or
504 multiple site studies (n = 17).

505 The reviews covered a range of diagnostic areas ranging from generic health and social care (14) or
506 clinical trials (41) to condition specific areas such as diabetes (33) or palliative care (17).

507 Interestingly there were few reviews based on demographic groups who are generally acknowledged
508 to be under-represented in healthcare decision making:

509 • There was one review for Black and Asian Minority Ethnic communities (15) and the
510 geography of the studies included were mainly in the United States.

- 511 • There was one review for Older People (20) which covered nine qualitative articles.
512 Arguably studies around dementia and palliative care may be relevant to this
513 demographic but that cannot be assumed.
- 514 • There were three reviews for Children and Young People – all of which had a specific
515 focus rather than looking at the involvement of Children and Young People in PPI
516 more generally:
- 517 ▪ Children and Families in Pediatric Health Research (19)
 - 518 ▪ Disabled children (21)
 - 519 ▪ Paediatric Intensive Care (37).

520 On the positive side, Malterud et al (56) however noted the usefulness of ‘two articles [which]
521 describe in detail how individuals with limited literacy abilities can be supported to analyse and
522 communicate such processes’.

523

524 **Conclusions**

525 There are several important areas of PPI activity that require further research. With regards to
526 Population Health research, there remain gaps in knowledge about how to ensure key specific
527 attributes of this type of research are addressed for PPI team members – particularly around how to
528 deal with complexity and the data-driven nature of the research. Looking at the UK Standards when
529 mapped against the findings, it is clear that there is a lack of current research or clarity around
530 Governance and Impact. There could also be more research done about PPI with under-represented
531 groups. The new tools produced from the synthesis are designed to help population health
532 researchers to facilitate better PPI and in turn to conduct better research.

533

534 **Acknowledgements**

535 This review of reviews was discussed with the Centre for Population Health Patient and Public
536 Involvement Advisory Group which meets quarterly to help set the strategic direction for PPI within

537 the Centre. The draft review was read and commented on several times throughout its development
538 by Dr. Helen Davies and Sarah Peddle – two of the PPI advisory group members. The authors would
539 like to thank the group, and particularly Helen and Sarah, for their valuable input. The authors would
540 also like to thank Kiara Jackson for providing input to the quality assessment section and Dr. Mayara
541 Silveira Bianchim for input in the final version.

542

543 **Abbreviations**

544 ALSPAC Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children
545 CO90s Children of the 90s
546 CPH National **Centre for Population Health** and Wellbeing Research
547 HCRW Health and Care Research Wales
548 HE Health Economics
549 HTA Health Technology Assessment
550 IKT Integrated knowledge translation
551 OCAP Original Cohort Advisory Panel
552 PPEET Public and Patient Engagement Evaluation Tool
553 PPE Patient and Public Engagement/ Public and Patient Engagement
554 PPI Patient and Public Involvement / Public and Patient Involvement

555 **Declarations**

556 **Competing interests**

557 The authors declare that they have no competing interests

558 **Funding**

559 This evidence synthesis was funded by the National **Centre for Population Health** and Wellbeing
560 Research (CPH). Within the Centre for Population Health our aim is to develop research and

561 interventions to ‘support people’s health and well-being throughout life, with our work exploring and
562 tackling some of today’s most difficult health and social challenges.’

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

564 **Authors' contributions**

565 JN and SV designed the review of reviews. SV undertook data processing and JN provided advice,
566 oversight and checked data processing and validity. Both authors developed the manuscript and
567 approved the final version.

568

569 **References**

- 570 1. What is public involvement in research? Health Research Authority. 2020 Dec 16 [cited 2021
571 April 15]. Available from: [https://www.hra.nhs.uk/planning-and-improving-research/best-](https://www.hra.nhs.uk/planning-and-improving-research/best-practice/public-involvement/)
572 [practice/public-involvement/](https://www.hra.nhs.uk/planning-and-improving-research/best-practice/public-involvement/)
- 573 2. Manafo E, Petermann L, Mason-Lai P, Vandall-Walker V. Patient engagement in Canada: a
574 scoping review of the 'how' and 'what' of patient engagement in health research. *Health Res*
575 *Policy Syst.* 2018 Mar 14;16(1):24. doi: 10.1186/s12961-018-0296-y.
- 576 3. Holmes J. What does improving population health really mean? The King’s Fund. 2022 July
577 21 [cited 2022 July 21]. Available from: [https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/publications/what-](https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/publications/what-does-improving-population-health-mean)
578 [does-improving-population-health-mean](https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/publications/what-does-improving-population-health-mean)
- 579 4. WHO. Public Health Services [cited 2021 September 09]. Available from:
580 <https://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/Health-systems/public-health-services>
- 581 5. Diez-Roux AV. On the Distinction—or Lack of Distinction—Between Population Health and
582 Public Health. *Am J Public Health.* 2016 April; 106(4): 619–620. doi:
583 10.2105/AJPH.2016.303097
- 584 6. Ali H. I am not 'hard to reach'. UpRising. 2020 April 9 [cited 2021 November 7]. Available
585 from: <https://www.uprising.org.uk/news/i-am-not-hard-reach>
- 586 7. Improving inclusion of under-served groups in clinical research: Guidance from INCLUDE
587 project. National Institute for Health and Care Research, 2020 August 7 [cited 2021

- 588 November 7]. Available from: <https://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/improving-inclusion-of->
589 [under-served-groups-in-clinical-research-guidance-from-include-project/25435](https://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/improving-inclusion-of-under-served-groups-in-clinical-research-guidance-from-include-project/25435)
- 590 8. Wildridge, V & Bell, L 2002, 'How clip became eclipse: A mnemonic to assist in searching
591 for health policy/management information', *Health Information & Libraries Journal*, vol. 19,
592 no. 2, pp. 113-115.
- 593 9. AMSTAR 2 – The new and improved AMSTAR. AMSTAR. 2021 [cited 2021 April 15].
594 Available from: <https://amstar.ca/Amstar-2.php>
- 595 10. CASP Checklists. CASP [cited April 15]. Available from: <https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools->
596 [checklists/](https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/)
- 597 11. Iliffe S, Wilcock J, Drennan V, et al. Changing practice in dementia care in the community:
598 developing and testing evidence-based interventions, from timely diagnosis to end of life
599 (EVIDEM). Southampton (UK): NIHR Journals Library; 2015 Apr. (Programme Grants for
600 Applied Research, No. 3.3.) Appendix 65, Chapter 5: Five main stages in framework
601 analysis. [cited December 12]. Available from:
602 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK286110/>
- 603 12. The UK Standards: Setting the scene. UK Standards for Public Involvement. [cited 2021
604 April 09]. Available from: <https://sites.google.com/nihr.ac.uk/pi-standards/standards/setting->
605 [the-scene](https://sites.google.com/nihr.ac.uk/pi-standards/standards/setting-the-scene)
- 606 13. Boote J, Telford R, Cooper C. Consumer involvement in health research: a review and
607 research agenda. *Health Policy*. 2002 Aug;61(2):213-36. doi: 10.1016/s0168-8510(01)00214-
608 7. PMID: 12088893.
- 609 14. Brett J, Staniszewska S, Mockford C, Herron-Marx S, Hughes J, et al. A systematic review of
610 the impact of patient and public involvement on service users, researchers and communities.
611 *Patient*. 2014;7(4):387-95. doi: 10.1007/s40271-014-0065-0. PMID: 25034612.
- 612 15. Dawson S, Campbell SM, Giles SJ, Morris RL, Cheraghi-Sohi S. Black and minority ethnic
613 group involvement in health and social care research: A systematic review. *Health Expect*.
614 2018 Feb;21(1):3-22. doi: 10.1111/hex.12597. Epub 2017 Aug 15. PMID: 28812330;
615 PMCID: PMC5750731.

- 616 16. Zych MM, Berta WB, Gagliardi AR. Conceptualising the initiation of researcher and research
617 user partnerships: a meta-narrative review. *Health Res Policy Sys* 18, 24 (2020).
618 doi.org/10.1186/s12961-020-0536-9
- 619 17. Scholz B, Bevan A, Georgousopoulou E, Collier A, Mitchell I. Consumer and carer
620 leadership in palliative care academia and practice: A systematic review with narrative
621 synthesis. *Palliat Med.* 2019 Sep;33(8):959-968. doi: 10.1177/0269216319854012. Epub
622 2019 Jun 14. PMID: 31199194.
- 623 18. Pii KH, Schou LH, Piil K, Jarden M. Current trends in patient and public involvement in
624 cancer research: A systematic review. *Health Expect.* 2019 Feb;22(1):3-20. doi:
625 10.1111/hex.12841. Epub 2018 Oct 30. PMID: 30378234; PMCID: PMC6351419.
- 626 19. Flynn R, Walton S, Scott SD. Engaging children and families in pediatric Health Research: a
627 scoping review. *Res Involv Engagem* 5, 32 (2019). doi.org/10.1186/s40900-019-0168-9
- 628 20. Baldwin JN, Napier S, Neville S, Wright-St Clair VA. Impacts of older people's patient and
629 public involvement in health and social care research: a systematic review. *Age Ageing.* 2018
630 Nov 1;47(6):801-809. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afy092. PMID: 29939208.
- 631 21. Bailey S, Boddy K, Briscoe S, Morris C. Involving disabled children and young people as
632 partners in research: a systematic review. *Child Care Health Dev.* 2015 Jul;41(4):505-14. doi:
633 10.1111/cch.12197. Epub 2014 Oct 16. PMID: 25323964.
- 634 22. Brett J, Staniszewska S, Mockford C, Herron-Marx S, Hughes J, et al. Mapping the impact of
635 patient and public involvement on health and social care research: a systematic review. *Health*
636 *Expect.* 2014 Oct;17(5):637-50. doi: 10.1111/j.1369-7625.2012.00795.x. Epub 2012 Jul 19.
637 PMID: 22809132; PMCID: PMC5060910.
- 638 23. Howard WS, Brainard J, Loke Y. et al. Patient and public involvement in health literacy
639 interventions: a mapping review. *Res Involv Engagem* 3, 31 (2017). [doi.org/10.1186/s40900-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s40900-017-0081-z)
640 [017-0081-z](https://doi.org/10.1186/s40900-017-0081-z)
- 641 24. Price A, Albarqouni L, Kirkpatrick J, Clarke M, Liew SM, Roberts N, et al. Patient and public
642 involvement in the design of clinical trials: An overview of systematic reviews. *J Eval Clin*
643 *Pract.* 2018 Feb;24(1):240-253. doi: 10.1111/jep.12805. Epub 2017 Oct 27. PMID: 29076631.

- 644 25. Bethell J, Commisso E, Rostad HM, Puts M, Babineau J, Grinbergs-Saull A, et al. Patient
645 engagement in research related to dementia: A scoping review. *Dementia (London)*. 2018
646 Nov;17(8):944-975. doi: 10.1177/1471301218789292. PMID: 30373460.
- 647 26. Domecq JP, Prutsky G, Elraiyah T, et al. Patient engagement in research: a systematic review.
648 *BMC Health Serv Res* 14, 89 (2014). doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-14-89
- 649 27. Boote J, Baird W, Beecroft C. Public involvement at the design stage of primary health
650 research: a narrative review of case examples. *Health Policy*. 2010 Apr;95(1):10-23. doi:
651 10.1016/j.healthpol.2009.11.007. Epub 2009 Dec 5. PMID: 19963299.
- 652 28. Nunn JS, Tiller J, Fransquet P, Lacaze P. (2019). Public Involvement in Global Genomics
653 Research: A Scoping Review. *Frontiers in public health*, 7, 79.
654 doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2019.00079
- 655 29. Sangill C, Buus N, Hybholt L, Berring LL. (2019). Service user's actual involvement in
656 mental health research practices: A scoping review. *International Journal of Mental Health
657 Nursing*, 28(4), 798–815. doi.org/10.1111/inm.12594
- 658 30. Fergusson D, Monfaredi Z, Pussegoda K, et al. The prevalence of patient engagement in
659 published trials: a systematic review. *Res Involv Engagem* 4, 17 (2018).
660 doi.org/10.1186/s40900-018-0099-x
- 661 31. Jagosh J, Macaulay AC, Pluye P, Salsberg J, Bush PL, Henderson J, et al. Uncovering the
662 benefits of participatory research: implications of a realist review for health research and
663 practice. *Milbank Q*. 2012 Jun;90(2):311-46. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0009.2012.00665.x. PMID:
664 22709390; PMCID: PMC3460206.
- 665 32. Camden C, Shikako-Thomas K, Nguyen T, Graham E, Thomas A, Sprung J, et al. Engaging
666 stakeholders in rehabilitation research: a scoping review of strategies used in partnerships and
667 evaluation of impacts. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2015;37(15):1390-400. doi:
668 10.3109/09638288.2014.963705. Epub 2014 Sep 22. PMID: 25243763.
- 669 33. Harris J, Haltbakk J, Dunning T, et al. How patient and community involvement in diabetes
670 research influences health outcomes: A realist review. *Health Expect*. 2019;22(5):907-920.
671 doi:10.1111/hex.12935

- 672 34. Baines RL, Regan de Bere S. Optimizing patient and public involvement (PPI): Identifying its
673 "essential" and "desirable" principles using a systematic review and modified Delphi
674 methodology. *Health Expect*. 2018 Feb;21(1):327-335. doi: 10.1111/hex.12618. Epub 2017
675 Sep 19. PMID: 28929554; PMCID: PMC5750770.
- 676 35. Vaughn LM, Whetstone C, Boards A, Busch MD, Magnusson M, Määttä S. Partnering with
677 insiders: A review of peer models across community-engaged research, education and social
678 care. *Health Soc Care Community*. 2018 Nov;26(6):769-786. doi: 10.1111/hsc.12562. Epub
679 2018 Mar 7. PMID: 29512217.
- 680 36. Chambers E, Gardiner C, Thompson J, Seymour J. Patient and carer involvement in palliative
681 care research: An integrative qualitative evidence synthesis review. *Palliat Med*. 2019
682 Sep;33(8):969-984. doi: 10.1177/0269216319858247. Epub 2019 Jun 28. PMID: 31250702;
683 PMCID: PMC6691598.
- 684 37. Menzies JC, Morris KP, Duncan HP. et al. Patient and public involvement in Paediatric
685 Intensive Care research: considerations, challenges and facilitating factors. *Res Involv*
686 *Engagem* 2, 32 (2016). doi.org/10.1186/s40900-016-0046-7
- 687 38. Shippee ND, Domecq GJP, Prutsky LGJ, Wang Z, Elraiyah TA, Nabhan M, et al. Patient and
688 service user engagement in research: a systematic review and synthesized framework. *Health*
689 *Expect*. 2015 Oct;18(5):1151-66. doi: 10.1111/hex.12090. Epub 2013 Jun 3. PMID:
690 23731468; PMCID: PMC5060820.
- 691 39. Dawson S, Campbell SM, Giles SJ, Morris RL, Cheraghi-Sohi S. Black and minority ethnic
692 group involvement in health and social care research: A systematic review. *Health Expect*.
693 2018 Feb;21(1):3-22. doi: 10.1111/hex.12597. Epub 2017 Aug 15. PMID: 28812330;
694 PMCID: PMC5750731.
- 695 40. Pii KH, Schou LH, Piil K, Jarden M. Current trends in patient and public involvement in
696 cancer research: A systematic review. *Health Expect*. 2019 Feb;22(1):3-20. doi:
697 10.1111/hex.12841. Epub 2018 Oct 30. PMID: 30378234; PMCID: PMC6351419.

- 698 41. Crocker JC, Ricci-Cabello I, Parker A, Hirst JA, Chant A, Petit-Zeman S, et al. Impact of
699 patient and public involvement on enrolment and retention in clinical trials: systematic review
700 and meta-analysis BMJ 2018; 363 :k4738 doi:10.1136/bmj.k4738
- 701 42. Johnson H, Davies JM, Leniz J, Chukwusa E, Markham S, Sleeman KE. Opportunities for
702 public involvement in big data research in palliative and end-of-life care. Palliative Medicine.
703 2021;35(9):1724-1726. doi:10.1177/02692163211002101
- 704 43. Hobbs G, Tully MP. Realist evaluation of public engagement and involvement in data-
705 intensive health research. Res Involv Engagem 6, 37 (2020). doi.org/10.1186/s40900-020-
706 00215-4
- 707 44. Aitken M, Tully MP, Porteous C, Denegri S, Cunningham-Burley S, Banner N, et al. (2020)
708 “Consensus Statement on Public Involvement and Engagement with Data-Intensive Health
709 Research”, International Journal of Population Data Science, 4(1). doi:
710 10.23889/ijpds.v4i1.586.
- 711 45. van Voorn GA, Vemer P, Hamerlijck D, et al. The Missing Stakeholder Group: Why
712 Patients Should be Involved in Health Economic Modelling. Appl Health Econ Health Policy.
713 2016;14(2):129-133. doi:10.1007/s40258-015-0200-7
- 714 46. Jewell A, Pritchard M, Barret, K. et al. The Maudsley Biomedical Research Centre (BRC)
715 data linkage service user and carer advisory group: creating and sustaining a successful
716 patient and public involvement group to guide research in a complex area. Res Involv
717 Engagem 5, 20 (2019). doi.org/10.1186/s40900-019-0152-4
- 718 47. 1970 British Cohort Study. Centre for Longitudinal Studies. [cited 2021 November 7].
719 Available from: <https://cls.ucl.ac.uk/cls-studies/1970-british-cohort-study/>
- 720 48. National Survey of Health and Development. Medical Research Council. [cited 2021
721 November 7]. Available from: <https://www.nshd.mrc.ac.uk/>
- 722 49. Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. University of Bristol. [cited 2021
723 November 7]. Available from: <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/alspac/about/>

- 724 50. Public and Patient Engagement Evaluation Tool. Faculty of Health Sciences. [cited 2021
725 November 25]. Available from: [https://ppe.mcmaster.ca/our-products/public-patient-](https://ppe.mcmaster.ca/our-products/public-patient-engagement-evaluation-tool)
726 [engagement-evaluation-tool](https://ppe.mcmaster.ca/our-products/public-patient-engagement-evaluation-tool)
- 727 51. Staniszewska S, Brett J, Simera I, Seers K, Mockford C, Goodlad S et al. GRIPP2 reporting
728 checklists: tools to improve reporting of patient and public involvement in research *BMJ*
729 2017; 358 :j3453 doi:10.1136/bmj.j3453
- 730 52. Kok M (2018) Guidance Document: Evaluating public involvement in research. UWE Bristol.
731 [UWE Bristol e-prints repository]
- 732 53. Brett J, Staniszewska S, Mockford C, Seers K, Herron-Marx S, Bayliss H. The PIRICOM
733 study: a systematic review of the conceptualisation, measurement, impact and outcomes of
734 patients and public involvement in health and social care research: University of Warwick;
735 2010.
- 736 54. Jones EL, Williams-Yesson BA, Hackett RC, Staniszewska SH, Evans D, Francis NK.
737 Quality of reporting on patient and public involvement within surgical research: a systematic
738 review. *Ann Surg*. 2015 Feb;261(2):243-50. doi: 10.1097/SLA.0000000000000768. PMID:
739 24950279.
- 740 55. Staley, K. 'Is it worth doing?' Measuring the impact of patient and public involvement in
741 research. *Res Involv Engagem* 1, 6 (2015). doi.org/10.1186/s40900-015-0008-5
- 742 56. Malterud K, Elvbakken KT. Patients participating as co-researchers in health research: A
743 systematic review of outcomes and experiences. *Scand J Public Health*. 2020 Aug;48(6):617-
744 628. doi: 10.1177/1403494819863514. Epub 2019 Jul 18. PMID: 31319762.
- 745 57. Jenkins M. Evaluation of methodological search filters--a review. *Health Info Libr J*. 2004
746 Sep;21(3):148-63. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-1842.2004.00511.x.
- 747 58. Manafò E, Petermann L, Vandall-Walker V, Mason-Lai P (2018) Patient and public
748 engagement in priority setting: A systematic rapid review of the literature. *PLoS ONE*
749 13(3):e0193579. doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0193579.
- 750 59. Ocloo J, Garfield S, Dawson S, et al. Exploring the theory, barriers and enablers for patient
751 and public involvement across health, social care and patient safety: a protocol for a

752 systematic review of reviews. *BMJ Open* 2017;7:e018426. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2017-
753 018426

754 60. Rogers M, Bethel A, Boddy K. Development and testing of a MEDLINE search filter for
755 identifying patient and public involvement in health research. *Health Information & Libraries*
756 *Journal*, 34, pp. 125–133

757

758 **Supporting Information**

759 **S1 File. Search Strategy.** Full search strategy used.


760 **S2 Table. Quality Assessments.** Results of the quality Assessment.

761 **S3 Table. Full list of included studies.** A description of all included studies is provided as a
762 table.

763 **S4 Table. PPI Guidance Framework.** Full PPI Guidance Framework.

764

Figure 1 – PRISMA Flow Diagram



PRISMA Flow Diagram

* This number is incomplete due to missing information on some papers. Duplicates have been removed (original n = 1222).