

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Conceptualising, operationalising, and measuring trust in participatory health research networks: a scoping review protocol
AUTHORS	Gilfoyle, Meghan; Macfarlane, Anne; Salsberg, Jon

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Clement Nhunzvi Lecturer & PhD Candidate (UCT) University of Zimbabwe College of Health Sciences Department of Rehabilitation Zimbabwe
REVIEW RETURNED	26-Apr-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review this protocol. It is an important topic in the growing area of PAR. The rationale for a scoping review is clearly articulated with supporting literature. Well done.</p> <p>I have a few minor comments/questions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. In the methods and analysis section of the abstract, include a line about including grey literature.2. On strengths and limitations. Clarify your position regarding non-English articles with available English translations, in some cases upon reasonable request.3. Clearly spell out how the triangulation of scoping review frameworks was done, how the three complement each other.4. In the introduction/background section - include a review of literature on the importance of trust as a function of ethics in PAR.5. Table 1 is very informative - well done.6. Stage 1: You need to demonstrate how the research question was informed by community problems and engagements, to be true to tenets of CBPR.7. Was there any involvement of a subject librarian in database selection and development of the search strategy? Exploring how the typical articles are indexed can help build a succinct search strategy.8. Page 8, line15, you can list at least two grey literature databases you will target, e.g. Open Grey.8.1. In the article screening stage, how will the agreement between raters be reported? i.e. Kappa?9. Page 10, line 30. ...template form not from.10. Stage 5: Specify the thematic analysis to be done.
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Elena Wilson La Trobe University, Australia
-----------------	--

REVIEW RETURNED	03-May-2020
------------------------	-------------

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The scoping review described in this protocol seeks to review and synthesize the literature that explores how trust is conceptualised, operationalised, and measured in CBPR and social networks. A synthesis of this type could be a useful resource for researchers employing the CBPR approach and hence a worthy endeavour. The following are my comments and suggestions for authors to consider, with a view to strengthening the manuscript.</p> <p>Page 6 Line 15 states that “CBPR stakeholder partnership can be seen as a social network, which is defined as connections among people, organisations or other social actors”. As an approach to research, CBPR is more than connection. As this link is not clear from the information provided could the authors expand on the explanation for how these connections are comparable to CBPR? Social networks are a part of research partnerships formed within a CBPR approach and to a great extent CBPR relies on social networks for its success. It may be an option, therefore to steer the review towards a focus on exploring trust in CBPR as stated on Page 6 Line 8.</p> <p>A useful clarification for the reader would be around whether authors intend to investigate social networks or studies utilising social network analysis.</p> <p>Page 7 Line 31 The Levac et al framework does indeed extend on the widely cited Arksey and O’Malley framework. Although the 6 stages of the Arksey and O’Malley framework are listed here, what could be added to explain how the Levac et al framework extends each stage? In keeping with the Levac et al framework, do authors intend to consider the implications of study findings to policy, practice, or research?</p> <p>Authors may wish to review the collation and summarising strategy to ensure that it does not pre-empt the findings of the scoping review.</p> <p>Appendix A It is unclear how the search terms identified in Appendix A will yield literature that conceptualises trust in CBPR. How will authors manage the superfluous results in the literature that may focus on, for example, public and patient involvement in, say, health service quality improvement?</p>
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1	
Comments	Notes and changes made to address comment (changes made in purple)
1. In the methods and analysis section of the abstract, include a line about including grey literature.	Added: “Grey literature such as theses/dissertations and reports will be included.” (pg. 3, line 26)

<p>2. On strengths and limitations. Clarify your position regarding non-English articles with available English translations, in some cases upon reasonable request.</p>	<p>Added: “For feasibility purposes, our scoping review will be limited to English rather than non-English articles or translation of non-English articles” (pg. 3, lines 52-53)</p>
<p>3. Clearly spell out how the triangulation of scoping review frameworks was done, how the three complement each other.</p>	<p>Added: “Social networks have been used to explore trust in diverse fields, such as in health¹³ or education.¹⁴ They have also been used to explore dynamics within CBPR.^{15,16} However, social networks have never been used to explore the dynamics of trust within CBPR. Given that trust has been explored in both social networks and CBPR contexts, and both involve relational dimensions, we expect the two concepts may complement each other well. Therefore, CBPR, social networks and trust (figure 1) constitute a conceptual triad that may allow us to better understand how partnership function leads to better research outcomes.” (pg. 5, lines 35-37)</p>
<p>4. In the introduction/background section - include a review of literature on the importance of trust as a function of ethics in PAR.</p>	<p>Comment to reviewer: Thank-you very much for your comment. We agree there is a fundamental ethical stance inherent in PAR and one of the main drivers for taking a PAR approach to research is in addressing ethical issues. Therefore, if we are proposing that trust is a fundamental aspect of PAR, as we are, then it is certainly bound up with PAR’s ethical dimensions – among all its other dimensions as well. With that being said, although we agree trust is a function of ethics in PAR, it is also a function of other PAR dimensions; so we feel that specifically including a review of literature on the importance of trust as a function of ethics would focus too much on that single dimension at the expense of others.</p>
<p>6. Stage 1: You need to demonstrate how the research question was informed by community problems and engagements, to be true to tenets of CBPR.</p>	<p>Added: “Literature from the community perspective includes various accounts of community problems of engagement and trust. For example, Jagosh et al⁹ identify instances where contextual factors such as history of oppression or research abuse have triggered mistrust in the community, impacting positive outcomes, such as partnership synergy.” (pg. 5, lines 5-8)</p>

<p>7. Was there any involvement of a subject librarian in database selection and development of the search strategy? Exploring how the typical articles are indexed can help build a succinct search strategy.</p>	<p>Added: “A faculty librarian has also provided suggestions and verifications regarding the appropriate syntax and the adaptation of search strategies across databases.” (pg. 9, lines 39-40)</p>
<p>8. Page 8, line15, you can list at least two grey literature databases you will target, e.g. Open Grey.</p>	<p>Added: “We will also include grey literature such as theses/dissertations and reports from Google Scholar and Open Grey.” (pg. 7, line 25)</p>
<p>8.1. In the article screening stage, how will the agreement between raters be reported? i.e. Kappa?</p>	<p>Added: “The pair of reviewers will meet at multiple stages throughout the reviewing process to discuss any discrepancies that may have emerged. Inter-rater agreement will be calculated using the Kappa statistic. If there are any discrepancies regarding which articles to include or exclude and/or why, a third reviewer will be consulted to make the final decision.” (pg. 9, lines 53-54)</p>
<p>9. Page 10, line 30. ...template form not from.</p>	<p>Edited to ‘form’ (pg. 10, line 3)</p>
<p>10. Stage 5: Specify the thematic analysis to be done.</p>	<p>Added: “In addition to this descriptive narrative summary, we will also present a thematic analysis of the literature, as suggested by Levac et al,²³ using qualitative description²⁹ following the guidance of Braun and Clarke.³⁰” (pg. 11, line 43)</p>

Reviewer 2	
Comments	Notes and changes made to address comment (changes in purple)
<p>Page 6 Line 15 states that “CBPR stakeholder partnership can be seen as a social network, which is defined as connections among people, organisations or other social actors”. As an approach to research, CBPR is more than connection. As this link is not clear from the information provided could the authors expand on the explanation for how these connections are comparable to CBPR? Social networks are a part of research partnerships formed within a CBPR approach and to a great extent CBPR relies on social networks for its success. It may be an option, therefore to steer the review towards a focus on exploring trust in CBPR as stated on Page 6 Line 8.</p>	<p>Comment to reviewer: We would like to thank the reviewer for this comment, and agree that CBPR, as an approach to research, is more than just connections. All we are proposing is that the CBPR ‘stakeholder partnership’, which is one aspect of the overall CBPR approach, constitutes a social network and therefore is susceptible to social network analysis. We have adjusted the text to make this clearer.</p> <p>Added: “If trust is a key mechanism of how partnerships function,^{8,9} and is an identified component of the CBPR conceptual model,⁷ then it is important to find a way to describe and measure trust among and between research</p>

<p>A useful clarification for the reader would be around whether authors intend to investigate social networks or studies utilising social network analysis.</p>	<p>partners within CBPR. A CBPR stakeholder partnership can be seen as a social network. A social network describes the relationships among people, organisations or other social actors.¹⁰ (pg. 5, lines 21-23)</p>
<p>Page 7 Line 31 The Levac et al framework does indeed extend on the widely cited Arksey and O'Malley framework. Although the 6 stages of the Arksey and O'Malley framework are listed here, what could be added to explain how the Levac et al framework extends each stage? In keeping with the Levac et al framework, do authors intend to consider the implications of study findings to policy, practice, or research?</p>	<p>Added: "Stage 5: Collating, and summarizing reporting the result In line with recommendations from Levac et al²³ we will extend stage 5 of Arksey and O'Malley's²⁴ framework into three distinct steps: Step 1: Collating, and summarizing the results As suggested by the JBI Reviewer's Manual,²² a narrative summary will be included to complement the tabular results, and we will directly discuss how the findings relate to the research question and objectives. In addition to this descriptive narrative summary, we will also present a thematic analysis of the literature, as suggested by Levac et al,²³ using qualitative description following the guidance of Braun and Clarke.²⁹ Step 2: Reporting the results Findings will therefore be organised into thematic categories such as aims, methodological design, key findings, and gaps in the literature, but also by categories that specifically highlight theoretical and operational linkages such as context, conceptual and operational features, and measurements used. Step 3: Research implications for future research, practice and policy By understanding how trust is conceptualised, operationalised and measured within CBPR and social networks, we expect findings from this scoping review will inform specific new research questions, aimed at understanding and sustaining CBPR partnerships." (pg. 11, lines 31-46, and pg. 11-12, lines 50 - 7)</p>
<p>Authors may wish to review the collation and summarising strategy to ensure that it does not pre-empt the findings of the scoping review.</p>	<p>Added: "We understand the importance of not pre-empting the findings of the scoping review and will therefore employ strategies from Braun and Clarke^{30,31} such as "A15-point checklist of criteria for good thematic analysis"^{30,31} to ensure rigour in</p>

	collating and summarizing the results.” (pg. 11, lines 43-46)
Appendix A It is unclear how the search terms identified in Appendix A will yield literature that conceptualises trust in CBPR. How will authors manage the superfluous results in the literature that may focus on, for example, public and patient involvement in, say, health service quality improvement?	Comment to reviewer: Thank you for the comment. We understand the reviewer to be asking how we will parse out concepts that although participatory might be found in settings other than community, such as health services improvement that might be hospital based. However, at this scoping stage we don't want to preclude processes that may be found in setting other than community. As we state in the introduction, “the use of CBPR in this protocol encompasses a broad range of terms used (e.g., public and patient involvement, participatory health research, participatory action research), which embrace shared core philosophies and values.”

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Clement Nhunzvi Lecturer and PhD Candidate (UCT) Department of Rehabilitation College of Health Sciences University of Zimbabwe Zimbabwe
REVIEW RETURNED	26-Aug-2020

GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for the opportunity to review this important manuscript. The authors have satisfactorily addressed all my review comments, well done. Here are some minor issues to attend to: 1. Abstract. Methods and analysis - Add a line on planned analysis 2. In dissemination plans, add the lay community consumers as part of the target audience. 3. Page 6 line 43 - Purpose of conducting the scoping review not 'literature review' 4. page 7 line 5&6 - Review for clarity. Thank you
-------------------------	---

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Dear reviewer 1:

Thank-you very much for taking the time to provide comments to this scoping review protocol. We have addressed all of your comments below.

Reviewer: 1

Please leave your comments for the authors below

Thank you for the opportunity to review this important manuscript. The authors have satisfactorily addressed all my review comments, well done. Here are some minor issues to attend to:

1. Abstract. Methods and analysis - Add a line on planned analysis

Added – “We plan to incorporate a thematic analysis.” (pg 3, line 30)

2. In dissemination plans, add the lay community consumers as part of the target audience.

Added – “lay audiences” in dissemination plans (pg 12, line 28)

3. Page 6 line 43 - Purpose of conducting the scoping review not 'literature review'

Revised – changed to scoping review (pg 5, line 42)

4. page 7 line 5&6 - Review for clarity.

Revised – changed to future tense (pg 6, lines 6 and 7)