

Digital Technology for Mental Health: Asking the right questions
#digitalMHQ

Steering Group meeting 9
Tues 17 Oct 2017, 1030 – 1600
Institute of Mental Health, University of Nottingham
Triumph Road, Nottingham, NG7 2TU

Attending (alphabetical order): Leah Bijelic, Katherine Easton, (via telephone for parts of the meeting), Toto Anne Gronlund (Chair), Chris Hollis, Thomas Kabir, Mat Rawsthorne (for items 1-4), Stephanie Sampson, Lucy Simons, Allison Suddeby, Andre Tomlin.

Apologies: Victoria Betton, Debbie Butler, Kate Cavanagh, Kathy Chapman, Rachel Churchill, Sophie Dix, Iris Elliott, Chris Packham, Liz Rye.

Action points

No.	Action point	Who	Due by	Status
65.	Lucy and Andre to produce a short report on the outcomes of the Tweet Chat	LS/AT	by March 2018	ongoing
66.	Lucy and Liz to produce a short report on the format and outcomes of the workshops to gather uncertainties.	LS/LR	by March 2018	ongoing
68.	A plan for how to respond to questions that are already answered and those which are out of scope but useful will need to be developed	LS/ALL	Nov 2017 - March 2018	ongoing
80.	Develop a workshop version of the interim prioritisation survey to return to the previous workshop participants	LS/LR	Nov 2017	complete
81.	To consider options for using social media to engage people in the interim prioritisation process	AT/LS	Sep 2017	complete

94.	Sign off of the final list of indicative questions will be delegated to the data management sub-group with the wider Steering Group having the option to be involved as they can.	DMSG	Nov 2017	complete
95.	All SG members have a look at the example survey and advise Lucy on their preferences for asking participants to rank their own top 10.	All	Nov 2017	complete
96.	Steering Group members to use their contacts and networks to promote the interim survey and encourage participation	All	Nov 2017 - Jan 2018	Ongoing
97.	Steering Group members to think about appropriate incentives for the interim survey	All	Sep 2017	complete
98.	Steering Group members to suggest people to invite to the final workshop (please email Lucy)	All	Nov 2017	complete
101.	Lucy and Steph to continue to categorise the questions and prepare the questions going to the interim prioritisation ready for checking the evidence	LS/SS	Oct - Nov 2017	complete
102.	A paper summarising the key issues covered in questions not going into the interim prioritisation to be drafted	LS/SS/K T	Nov 2017	complete
103.	Mat to have access to the raw suggestions for a corpus linguistics analysis to support his PhD work	MR	Nov 2017	ongoing
104.	Andre to use the COPE database to check for any answered questions before starting the interim prioritisation	AT	Nov 2017	complete
105.	MindTech to consider how to support the ongoing work to maintain the COPE database	CH	March 2018	ongoing
106.	Members of the Steering Group to indicate their interest in future work on developing review papers from the COPE database	All	by March 2018	ongoing
107.	The preferences for ranking at the final workshop to be ratified by a quorate steering group	All	January 2018	complete
108.	The participants for the final workshop to be agreed by the Steering Group	All	January 2018	
109.	Offer to include a telephone call for workshop participants as part of their briefing	LS/SS	February 2018	
110.	Identify a representative from RCUK and invite to the final workshop	LS/CH	January 2018	ongoing
110.	Work on the Innovation Network to be led by MindTech and start in February 2018	CH/JM	February 2018 onwards	

Notes of the discussion

1. Welcome, apologies and introductions

Toto welcomed everyone to the meeting, invited a round of introductions and reminded the group of the ways of working for Steering Group meetings.

2. Notes of last meeting and actions not covered by the agenda

Actions not covered by the agenda:

69 - It was agreed we did not have time and resources to conduct a comparative analysis of the respondents to the first survey with national data. This item to be removed from the action list.

95 - The preference of the Steering Group for the interim prioritisation is for respondents to select their own top 10 questions, with the option to indicate their top 3 if they want to. No-one in the Steering Group had a preference for ranking all 10 questions at this stage.

96 - In the information about the interim prioritisation survey, we need to give people an indication how long it takes to complete. Lucy to ask people to time themselves at the pilot stage.

97 - There was general agreement incentives were a good idea. It was agreed we invite people to enter a prize draw with two prizes: Amazon vouchers and also approach Lisa Marzano about giving free access to the EBMH special issue on digital technology.

All other action points are complete, ongoing or on the agenda for today's meeting.

Notes from the last meeting were accepted as correct.

3. Categorising Questions (paper 2)

Lucy introduced Paper 2 which described the process of data management so far, where the 1,500 'raw' suggestions had been coded and summarised into 421 indicative questions. The paper also set out 4 different categories of questions:

1. Questions asking about specific technologies, treatment approaches, population groups or clinical areas.
2. Questions asking about digital technologies in a very broad or general way
3. Questions asking for information about or access to digital technologies
4. Questions about the quality of digital services, training, guidelines or regulation

She suggested that those questions in category 1 - asking about something specific - are those most relevant to the PSP. These are questions which are actionable by research and would not require extensive revision and re-working beyond the end of the PSP to be turned into research questions. Chris Hollis supported this approach, emphasising that in the interim prioritisation we have to retain the focus on the purpose of the JLA PSP - prioritising suggestions for research. While the other questions are important, they are not necessarily questions that will require the attention of research funders and health researchers. He also acknowledged that many of the general questions would have broad appeal, but again these may not be ones that will be of most value in setting the direction of future research. It is imperative that the project delivers a useful output, therefore we

have to make tough decisions to focus on the smaller number of most useful questions. While it will be challenging, we can still be fair to people who have submitted other types of questions by working with project partners to develop other types of output which make effective use of these questions.

He noted that the published Top 10s vary enormously in terms of style - some are very broad statements where it is tricky to see how they would be used; others are very focused and can be clearly addressed by research. There are options available to us to provide further information about each of the priorities in the top 10, for example, giving a flavour of the range of 'raw' suggestions that have contributed to that question.

Toto emphasised that transparency is key. We need to be clear how we have made the decisions about which questions are included in the interim prioritisation. She urged the group to think about ensuring the questions are clear and there is limited overlap between questions (questions need to be unique) - otherwise it can be difficult for the workshop participants to agree which questions to prioritise into the top 10. An audit trail is required which shows how we have moved from the 'raw' suggestions to the final indicative questions that are included in the interim prioritisation.

The group took part in a participatory exercise where around 150 indicative questions (35% of the total) which had been categorised by Lucy into the four categories were reviewed and discussed. Members indicated their agreement or disagreement with this categorisation and reflected on the usefulness of the categories and definitions/boundaries of them.

Feedback after the exercise

- There was general agreement that questions in categories 3 and 4 should be excluded from the interim prioritisation, but that we needed to think about what other useful outputs can be generated from these questions as they covered important areas.
- Questions which asked which technologies are available for a particular group, condition or setting should be re-worded as questions about the effectiveness of these technologies and included.
- Broad, generic questions should be excluded at this stage, but they needed to be very broad. If there was any mention of a technology type, population group or clinical area/treatment, they should be included. Once the questions are categorised, we need to check if the issues covered in the generic questions are present in the specific questions.
- Questions for inclusion could cover a range of different outcomes, not just symptom reduction, for example, access and adherence are also important outcomes.
- There are a number of key issues represented in the questions that Steering Group members thought needed to include in the interim prioritisation. These included access, blended interventions, digital replacing face to face interventions and digital improving access to services.
- Questions need to be written in accessible, clear language.

Lucy and Steph to continue to work on the question categorisation and supply those for interim prioritisation to Andre for evidence checking (**action point 101**).

Members of the Steering Group to identify other ways in which the excluded questions could form useful outputs. Initially a short summary paper will be produced as a tool to start conversations (**action point 102**). Mat is interested in applying corpus linguistics analysis to the data we have collected (**action point 103**).

Post meeting Note: Iris Elliott at the Mental Health Foundation is planning a series of round table discussions and Delphi exercise on policy for e-mental health as part of the EMEN European project in 2018. These discussions will take place in each of the devolved nations of the UK. The questions for information, access and quality will be a helpful background for these policy discussions and Iris is proposing that they make use of this information and build on it further during this process.

4. Revised project timeline

Lucy tabled the revised project timeline (paper 3). This was discussed and those responsible for the delivery of key projects tasks asked for their view on the feasibility the timeline. The evidence checking is the key requirement before we can proceed with the interim survey (see item 5). The group agreed the new timeline looks good!

Key dates for the project

Mid-November 2017: Sign off of indicative questions list by the SG

Mid-November 2017: launch of the interim prioritisation survey

Mid-January 2018: close the interim prioritisation survey

End of January 2018: Additional Steering Group meeting

Monday 12th March 2018: Final workshop

5. Evidence checking approach and timelines

Andre summarised the work that had been put into the COPE database to date. It includes around 1000 indexed references of systematic reviews and guidelines, with some randomised controlled trials included. The indexing was developed alongside the bespoke framework for organising the raw suggestions, so there is a close relationship between the two. He expects the indexing will work most well for questions where there is a clear intervention or clinical population. Using COPE for other types of questions may require some additional searching and tagging. But this will help to further organise the database and get a sense of the evidence on these key topics.

Andre anticipates that most indicative questions would remain as verified uncertainties because the evidence base for digital technology was still at an early stage. Some groups of questions will have at least one review in the database and the tricky part will appraising the quality of the review and deciding whether this is sufficient to answer the question or not. Toto advised that if there was uncertainty in his mind, then the question remains a verified uncertainty.

Andre thought that some additional searching outside of COPE may be needed, for example, when one large RCT has been carried out it will be useful to check this paper and review the quality of the study and its contribution to the review. However, he is not proposing to do any further searching for primary research because of time and the limitations of resource available to the project. A clear audit trail for decisions can be created as it is possible to annotate the references in Mendeley and highlight the sections where evidence is presented - this will provide a quick link for any verified certainties.

Andre remains optimistic that he can meet the proposed timeline for evidence checking assuming our final list of indicative questions is around 150 and no more (**action point 104**). Andre is meeting with Rachel Churchill on 1st November now she is back from sick leave and she will be able to support this work too. The Steering Group were in agreement with this approach.

In the discussion it was noted that COPE is a very good resource which MindTech can use in different ways, for example, make available as a public database for others to use, maintain it as an up to date resource etc. There is no functionality to automatically update COPE, so a manual search would need to run periodically and the results screened for inclusion and then tagged. It was noted that a database that included all primary research on the subject would be more useful, but that was a significantly bigger task. Chris is keen to explore what resource can be identified within MindTech to keep COPE up to date and made available to others (**action point 105**).

Andre proposed that a range of publications are possible from this database, for example, describing where the majority of evidence is and where the gaps are and he doesn't think this has been done previously. There is clear interest in the group and within MindTech for developing these additional outputs from the PSP (**action point 106**).

6. Final workshop - format and methods

Toto gave overview of the format of how the final workshops are usually run.

Pre-workshop

- the 30 participants are equal numbers of people with personal experience and practitioners
- the 25 (max 30) top ranked questions from the interim prioritisation are included - each presented on a single card, labelled and with supporting information on the reverse
- Participants are asked to rank them personally before the workshop

On the day

- JLA facilitators run the workshop and they pay special attention to ensure each person has a voice in the process
- a member of the Steering Group gives an introduction and overview of the PSP
- Three rounds of small group work in three pre-set, mixed groups
- Introductory group work: each person talks about their top 3 and bottom 3 choices, based on their pre-workshop ranking. The JLA facilitators note these; these are used to roughly clump the questions into top, middle and bottom priority as the basis for the first round of ranking.
- Round 1: the groups reconvene and the rough priorities are reviewed by the group into a ranked order from 1 to 25.
- Round 2: three new groups are convened. The three sets of rankings from each of the original three groups are combined by the JLA facilitators and each new group is asked to work with the collated order to discuss and re-rank as required.
- The rankings from round 2 are combined by the JLA facilitators. The final ranking is carried out as a whole group session. Usually by this stage the focus is on the top 10.

Chris raised two key questions about the methods used in the workshop. First, he queried whether using discussion to achieve consensus was robust enough or whether it is open to bias by dominant voices and second, how useful it is to rank all 25 questions, or if a more categorical approach (questions for the top 10 and the remainder) is better. His concern is whether researchers only look at the most highly ranked question and all others are ignored. He noted that other PSPs had taken a variety of approaches and there did not seem to be consistency.

Consensus by discussion?

Thomas has experience of a couple of final workshops and noted that strength is enabling people to have a voice and each voice is considered equal. He did feel that there is a lot to achieve in one day and it may be that energy levels flag in the afternoon. Toto reflected that the dialogue is the consensus forming action. That is the heart of the approach and it is really interesting to see this develop and the conscientious way workshop participants approach the task.

Post meeting note: Toto supplied the following description of the workshop methods

The final priority setting stage (usually a workshop but other methods may be considered) enables multi-stakeholder dialogue, information exchange and collective decision-making. The JLA process is designed to move people from being individual contributors making decisions based on their own knowledge/experience alone, to being part of a mixed but non-hierarchical community making decisions by consensus. At the survey stage, participants simply submit their own questions. At interim prioritisation, they have an opportunity to see others' questions and make individual decisions about the relative importance of those. The final priority setting stage creates a forum where people can share their views, learn about others' and make decisions as a group informed by each others' perspectives. This is a defining feature and a strength of the JLA decision-making process which takes it beyond being a simple statistical/desktop exercise.

Ranking all 25 questions?

Toto clarified that it is up to each PSP to decide on whether to rank all 25 questions, or just the top 10 or take the more categorical approach Chris suggested. Andre noted how it is much easier to disseminate and create a narrative around a ranked top 10. An order to the list is needed in any case, so if we don't rank, it would not be clear how this order had been chosen. Kat thought that as a researcher, she would be looking at the whole list (25) to see which are aligned most closely to her research interests - she would not focus only on the top ranked question. Given the feedback from Thomas about the amount of work required at the final workshop, there was limited support for ranking the questions that fell outside of the top 10.

After discussion it was suggested that the preferred approach would be to rank the top 10 questions, and order the remainder by the rankings they achieved in the interim prioritisation survey. This decision to be ratified by a quorate steering group (**action point 107**).

The cards used at the workshop would include information on how the question had been ranked in the interim prioritisation and this would be shown by people with lived experience and practitioners separately. We would also include some example raw suggestions to give an indication of where the question was rooted.

Participants for the workshop would be found through a two main methods:

- Steering Group members to send nominations to Lucy (**action point 98**).
- participants of the first workshop would be invited to apply for a place.

As we are aiming to achieve a diversity of perspectives, the final attendee list would be confirmed with the Steering Group (**action point 108**).

A briefing pack will be prepared and sent to participants in advance. It will include information on what will happen on the day and instructions for pre-ranking the questions. It was also suggested that we call people beforehand as part of this briefing with the aim of encouraging them prepare, clarify any areas of uncertainty and helping to get the most out of the day (**action point 109**).

7. Post top 10 dissemination

Jen Martin, MindTech's Programme Manager joined the meeting for this item. Jen and Chris have been awarded a small grant (£5K) from the Institute of Mental Health for an Innovation Network to actively disseminate the outputs from the PSP. This award starts in December 2017 and runs until March 2020. The aim is to grow the network of people and organisations already involved with the PSP, to include research funders, policy makers and key research groups with the aim to influence future research funding around the priorities. Proposed activities include workshops and funding publication of the results from the PSP in an open access journal. Jen noted that as well as NIHR, a key funder to influence will be the Research Councils. For example Research Councils UK (RCUK) have published a position paper on mental health a few weeks ago and is putting out a call for new networks. The Economic and Social Research Council and Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council are increasingly funding things around mental health. These links would be a good way into broader research community. We could consider inviting a representative from RCUK to the final workshop along with the NIHR observer (**action point 110**).

Toto was very pleased to see this was being developed as for many PSPs the activity stopped once the top 10 had been identified. There are new members of staff coming to MindTech in the coming months and one of these will be asked to pick up on this work with Jen and Chris' supervision. Work can start once we have the top 25 questions after the interim prioritisation (**action point 111**).

8. AOB

No other business was raised.

Steering Group schedule 2017-18

The next meeting will be a face to face on Wednesday 31st January 2018 in Nottingham.

Meeting type	Date	Location
Face to face	Wednesday 31st January 2018	NOTTINGHAM
Final prioritisation workshop	Monday 12th March 2018	McPin Foundation, London