

Modified GRIPP2 Form and Guidance on PA Coauthorship for Principle Investigators and researchers ARC NWC

Author: Selina Wallis (Public Involvement Manager), Hayley Lowther

Date: 24.08.2023

The ARC NWC is committed to not only involve members of the public but to coproduce research. We embed public involvement and health equity in all our work, from idea generation to implementing findings. To evidence this we need to publish with public advisers and member organizations as coauthors and describe our methods and impact via the 'Guidance for Reporting Involvement of Patients and Public' (GRIPP2) reporting checklist (Staniszewska et al., 2017).

GRIPP2

We need to gather evidence of the impact of this coproduction and reflect on what works, difficulties and benefits to research and those taking part. Coproduction and public involvement methods and impact are rarely reported in research publications (Fergusson et al., 2018). Clearer reporting in research manuscripts will enable researchers and research organisations to better understand the impact of involvement within different contexts (Brett et al., 2017). In 2015, the British Medical Journal (BMJ) was the first major journal to request that authors include a 'Patient and Public Involvement (PPI) statement' within the methods section of their papers in all research articles. The journal advises authors to consider the GRIPP2 reporting checklist. Checklists have been developed to improve the quality and transparency and consistency of consumer involvement reporting. GRIPP2 provides a framework to report on public involvement (Staniszewska et al., 2017);

- **GRIPP2 long form** – for use where consumer involvement is the primary focus of the study
- **GRIPP2 short form** – for use in any study where consumer involvement is a secondary or tertiary focus

The guidance and checklists were developed using EQUATOR methods (international evidence based and consensus informed) and can be accessed from the EQUATOR Network website. (or see <https://researchinvolvement.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s40900-017-0062-2/tables/2>)

Modified GRIPP2

As part of a research project, ARC NWC researcher Hayley Lowther, modified the GRIPP2 short form to reflect the multi-stakeholder involvement (e.g. members of the public, health organisations, local authorities, voluntary organisations) practices in a working group as this was thought to better describe the collaborative nature of the ARC and this modified form, with guidance notes is used in our guidance for ARC NWC researchers See paper using modified GRIPP2 here <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12940-022-00896-2>

Guidance for use of the Modified GRIPP2 in ARC NWC

Researchers: There should be a Modified GRIPP2 form (see Table 1) completed and uploaded to your project file for each research project you are involved with, and these forms then published in any academic papers you produce (either in the main text or an appendix). Please cite modified ARC GRIPP2 form from this paper:

Citation: Ward, F., Lowther-Payne, H.J., Halliday, E.C. et al. Engaging communities in addressing air quality: a scoping review. *Environ Health* 21, 89 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12940-022-00896-2> Use the GRIPP2 form (either this modified form or the original form as needed) to record detail from meetings that involve public advisers and/or members/wider stakeholders including both activities and changes/impact that occur due to those activities. These impacts may be relating to the research (e.g. research instruments, outcome measures, data collection, design and delivery, time and cost) or to the people involved (e.g. members of the public involved in research, academic researchers, members, wider stakeholders and funders). Impacts may be simple and seen in the short term (e.g., readability of patient information documents, research prioritisation) or may be more complex and be seen in the long term (e.g., patient recruitment/retention, health outcomes, capacity building of public advisers/members, culture change). This information needs capturing to evidence the impact of coproduction and collaboration in ARC NWC projects.

Don't leave this till after research is completed. Recording and transcribing some meetings could provide a role in capturing the impacts that occur in a discussion between working group members (public advisers, communities third-sector, wider stakeholders) and researchers but are difficult to capture afterwards. Report both positive and negative impacts (Worsley et al., 2021). Consider how you/your research manager and theme can routinely capture this data as it can be used to help provide regular feedback to group members about the impact of their input.

Theme managers: Please collate Modified GRIPP2 forms (either completed or in progress) and upload to the ARC Wider Teams GRIPP2 folder. Please add in the name of the journal you plan to submit your form to and whether it will be in the main text or an appendix. Also information on c-authorship if applicable.

Table 1. Modified GRIPP2 reporting checklist – short form (amended to reflect multi-stakeholder involvement through a working group) developed for the ARC NWC Air Quality Working Group

Section and topic	Details
1: Aim of the stakeholder involvement (SI)	Report the aim of SI in the study.
2: Methods used for SI	Provide a clear description of the methods used for SI in the study. Detail on who was recruited, how, from where, how the group worked.
3: Results of the SI	Outcomes—Report the results of SI in the study, including both positive and negative outcomes. Detail not just what tasks the group worked on but what changed because of their input.
4: Discussion and conclusions of the SI	Outcomes—Comment on the extent to which SI influenced the study overall. Describe positive and negative effects. Include reflection on joint learning, less tangible impacts, culture change.
5: Reflections/critical perspective of the SI	Comment critically on the study, reflecting on the things that went well and those that did not, so others can learn from this experience.

When preparing a research paper for publication, consider co-producing the final modified GRIPP2 information summary with group members – use this opportunity to reflect on what has gone well or been difficult about coproduction and the impact on the research. Both researchers and working group members can discuss what has been learnt. Construct feedback forms for review group members – this can feed into the modified GRIPP2 form. Suggested questions include:

- 1) What was your overall experience of being part of the research team?
- 2) What influence do you feel you were able to have on the review? Can you describe any particular examples?
- 3) What influence do you feel being involved in the working group has had on you and/or your work?
- 4) Was there anything about the working group you feel could have been improved, and if so what?

Coauthorship

A recent study (Oliver et al., 2022) found that even when members of the public were coauthors they were invisible. Identifying patient-authored publications is often challenging and time-consuming.

This is only possible to identify if patient authors include a standard metatag, (e.g. Patient/Public Author) as one of their listed affiliations, combined with other affiliations as appropriate. All ARC projects should encourage and support public advisers to act as co-authors on related research publications and when possible, describe them as public adviser co-authors in the journal author affiliation lists. Member co-author affiliations and organisations should also be clearly listed and accessible.

Further Reading

Brett, J., et al. Reaching consensus on reporting patient and public involvement (PPI) in research: methods and lessons learned from the development of reporting guidelines. *BMJ Open* 2017;7:e016948. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2017-016948>

Fergusson, D., et al. The prevalence of patient engagement in published trials: a systematic review. *Research Involvement and Engagement* 2018;4(1):1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40900-018-0099-x>

Oliver, J., et al. Hidden in plain sight? Identifying patient-authored publications. *Research Involvement and Engagement* 2022;8(1):1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40900-022-00346-w>

Staniszewska, S., et al. GRIPP2 reporting checklists: tools to improve reporting of patient and public involvement in research. *BMJ* 2017;358:j3453. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j3453>

Worsley, J.D., et al. A qualitative evaluation of coproduction of research: 'If you do it properly, you will get turbulence'. *Health Expectations* 2021;00:1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.13261>

Useful Links

ARC West – A map of resources for co-producing research in health and social care. Available from <https://arc-w.nihr.ac.uk/publications/a-map-of-resources-for-co-producing-research-in-health-and-social-care/>

Blog – How do you report your PPI in dementia research? Meet GRIPP2. Available from <https://www.dementiaresearcher.nihr.ac.uk/guest-blog-how-do-you-report-your-ppi-in-dementia-research-meet-gripp2/>

Cochrane Training – Consumer involvement in reviews. Available from <https://training.cochrane.org/online-learning/consumer-involvement>

East Midlands AHSN. Available from <https://peterbates.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/howtoreviewtheextentofpublicinvolvementinaresearchstudy.pdf>

EQUATOR Network - Reporting Guidelines. Available from <https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/>

Public Involvement Impact Assessment Framework (PiiAF). Available from <http://piiaf.org.uk/documents/piiaf-guidance-jan14.pdf>