Reviewer’s report

Title: Patient and Public Involvement in reducing health and care research waste

Version: 0 Date: 16 Nov 2017

Reviewer: Philippa Yeeles

Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting and important topic. Thanks to the research team and others involved in the project. I enjoyed reading the paper but I am left somewhat confused as to what the key messages are.

p2 line 48. (and echoed p7 line 10) I don't understand how 'Being mindful of the potential for wasteful practices is part of the conduct and operation of research studies' can be concluded from the survey results. The aims of the survey are expressed twice and slightly differently. Firstly (p4 l 57) as - 'The aim of the similar survey for patient researchers was to assess their understanding and influence in the area of research waste'. And secondly (p5 118) as - 'The purpose of the survey was to discover the main areas of waste identified by representatives of the PPIE community.' Surely the conclusions of the study need to draw from the findings? As currently written all the statements in the conclusion are true but they don't appear to come from or directly connect with the survey findings. Apols if I am missing the point here!

p3 l23-27. A couple of reflections on what doesn't seem to be included here or elsewhere in the article in relation to how patients and the public are currently involved in avoiding waste in research. Might it be helpful to state if the survey is only focussed on roles as co-applicants, study advisory groups and co-researchers? Patients/public already play in role in research topic identification (such as through James Lind Alliance Priority Setting Partnerships) where there is a process for systematically excluding potential waste and the premise of the partnership between patients/carers and clinicians is to focus on patient/carer benefit. Also the routine involvement by many public and voluntary sector research funders of patients/public in assessing funding applications. Deciding what does and doesn't get funded as a function of avoiding waste. Is the research being proposed needed and likely to be of genuine patient/carer benefit - from the perspective of patients/carers?

p4 l60 and p5 11-9 Would be helpful to have greater clarity here about a few things. How large (numbers of people) are the 3 groups that were surveyed? How many people were surveyed in total? Would be good to know what the response rate was. Looking at Figure 1 it has no numbers or percentages on it. Which I think would be helpful to include. It is also not clear to me if only the patient/carer members of the 3 groups were invited to respond to the survey or all members of those groups (if they include others). Elsewhere - e.g. in aims the survey it talks about 'patient researchers' and the 'PPIE community'.

p6 l26 - Discussion - somewhere in here I would like to see some reflection on the nature of the groups involved - all relatively research and PPI savvy - and the small number surveyed. What
does that mean then in relation to the aims of the survey and the findings? Would also be interested to know the numbers from the management community survey by comparison.

p6 l29-32 - Perhaps relevant to acknowledge the work that research charities and voluntary sector organisations do and have done to raise public awareness of research - mass communication / marketing with reach well beyond publications cited.

p7 l4 - says - 'main areas of waste identified by both respondents in the PPIE and R & D community surveys were prioritisation of research and PPI' but this seems to be contradicted by statement of p6 l46-47 'They identified implementation of research in practice, prioritisation of research, and research taking place to time and target as the most important and valuable areas of waste to address.'
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