Reviewer’s report


Version: 0 Date: 20 Mar 2020

Reviewer: Louca-Mai Brady

Reviewer's report:

A really interesting and well-written paper overall.

The Plain English Summary still involves a lot of complex language and jargon. I would suggest doing some PPI on this, perhaps reviewing with some of the young people (YP) involved in the project or another young people's advisory group (e.g. one of the GenerationR groups) to make it more accessible and easier for lay people to understand.

Background:

While digital technologies do indeed 'create exciting potential' they can also exclude some and this needs to be acknowledged. E.g. P8, l24. Not all 'Young people are avid internet and mobile device users and early adopters of new technology'. The authors need to acknowledge/discuss this & how e-platforms might present access or inclusion issues for some YP, e.g. some disabled YP or YP from disadvantaged backgrounds.

There is no mention of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child in the paper which provides an important rationale for YP's involvement (e.g. they have a right to be involved in matters that affect them, as well as their being benefits to their doing so). There is an increasingly strong body of literature on why YP should be involved in research and the benefits for YP, research, policy and practice in doing so. But the article doesn't reference any of this literature, and only briefly touches some general papers on PPI or very specific ones on young people's involvement in e-health. but I think some reference to the literature on the involvement of CYP, the NIHR INVOLVE top tips and mention of groups such as the GenerationR network would be really helpful (see below). It may also be useful to review the whole article in light of the GRIPP2 (Guidance for Reporting Involvement of Patients and Public) guidance (Staniszewska et al. 2017). Related to this, I'd like to know a bit more about why the authors describe the PPI process as co-design rather than consultation. As I understand it the former implies some kind of on-going process and/or more power-sharing. See for e.g. the INVOLVE guidance on co-production.

Discussion:

Was there any formal feedback/evaluation of YP's views on the PPI process? Similarly, it would be good to include a bit more critical reflection of the PPI process - e.g. was there anything that didn't work or could have been better? What other approaches to PPI could the researchers try in
other projects (e.g. engaging with existing YPAGs, having a group of YP with ongoing involvement)? It would also be good to know if there are any plans for ongoing involvement of YP in the development and/or evaluation of the mood-monitoring e-platform?

Some useful refs:

GenerationR: NIHR young people's advisory groups for clinical research: http://generationr.org.uk/
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