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Reviewer’s report:

I think that this is an interesting and topical topic and well worth researching. I think it could have been written up in a way that was more engaging and easier to follow.

I found the extent of the waste 85% shocking. Is the information available to break the 85% down into constituent parts? (failure to publish research, unclear reporting of research that is published, and the failure of new research studies to systematically review previous research in the same topic area, poor study design and conduct)

I found how the information was organised a little confusing - why were the findings from the R & D management group survey written up under discussion and not alongside the findings from the service user and carer survey.

The surveys had different aims. The aim of the NHS R & D management survey was 'to identify their influence in ensuring research provided value and better outcomes for patients' whereas the aim of the similar survey for patient researchers was 'to assess their understanding and influence in the area of research waste'. The NHS R & D management group identified 'implementation of research in practice' as their top priority in keeping with ensuring research provided value and better outcomes for patients followed by prioritisation of research, and research taking place to time and target.

According to how I read the material the two groups were completing the same (or similar both words were used) surveys but with different aims? This jarred with me and made me question whether the research was comparing like with like?

The patients researchers identified 'prioritisation of research' the most important research waste to address with the other categories being given even weight. Then in answer to the secondary question about what categories of waste that would add most value to the research process if addressed they again identified 'prioritisation of research' adding 'patient and public involvement' the rest of the waste categories being about even.

The list of barriers to involvement were all too familiar:

- Being taken seriously; tokenism;
- The low status of PPIE;
• Power imbalances;

• Lack of clarity of PPIE role;

• PPIE members' lack of knowledge of aspects of the research process and the NHS;

• Dynamics of academic institutions.

I found that there was an interesting interplay with both groups reaching out for meaningful involvement and this made me wonder what the barriers are to achieving this? It seemed like a hand and glove in search of each other and it made me wonder what was stopping them working together 'hand in glove'? I thought that the responses from the PPEI group and the R&D group in regard to PPEI and the dissatisfactions of the two groups could have been related to each other.

I wondered who the audience for this research was? In trying to understand the issues and background I used Google and landed on this website:
http://www.futurefocusedfinance.nhs.uk/close-partnering/reducingwaste

The Following is an extract: "The aim of this work stream is to facilitate and engender clinical, finance and citizen engagement in reducing waste and delivering high value care by:

Actively working with professional groups to build awareness, mobilise knowledge and to identify specific areas of focus.

Engaging in discussions with those delivering the efficiency programme, Right Care, the new nursing strategy, Choosing Wisely, the NIHR, and identifying and taking up opportunities for shared working.

Learning from national and international experience and developing a directory or manual of good practice examples.

Harnessing the value maker community to share messages and good practice in the finance community.

Building a culture of responsibility amongst professional staff groups by including information about adding value and reducing waste in finance and clinical educator training.

Building citizen awareness.

Working with the NIHR and the NHS RD Forum in the reduction of waste in research and the delivery of the Adding Value Project."

I was pleased when I found this web page because it contextualised the research for me and helped me grasp its importance and significance.
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