

How co-production underpinned the development of a logic model and testing of novel statistical methods for evidence synthesis

Alison O'Mara-Eves^{1*}, Dylan Kneale^{1*}, Sandy Oliver¹, Lizzie Cain³, Niccola

Hutchinson-Pascal³, Jessica Catchpole⁴, Angela Chesworth^{4,5}, Bridget Candy², Katy Sutcliffe¹, James Thomas¹

*Joint leads

¹EPPI-Centre, UCL Social Research Institute, University College London

²Honorary Staff, School of Life & Medical Sciences, University College London

³Co-Production Collective

⁴Independent Patient Advocate

⁵Novo Nordisk DEEP (Disease Experience Expert Panel) member



EPPI Centre
Evidence for
Policy & Practice



**Co-Production
Collective**



WHAT WORKS
GLOBAL SUMMIT 2022

Background

- The CEPHI project: develop and test four methods for synthesizing evidence that better accounted for context than standard statistical meta-analysis approaches.
- We identified co-production as an approach to understand what was important in different contexts.
- Co-production across research elements
 - Theory development: logic model entirely co-produced
 - Methods development: not co-produced but informed by theory and responses of co-producers



Handling Complexity in Evidence from systematic reviews and meta-analyses of **Public Health Interventions** (CEPHI project)

How we incorporated co-production in this project



Worked closely with an Advisory Group

- Co-producers invited because of lived expertise, professional expertise, and/or academic expertise
- Listening was incorporated from the outset – invitations to AG helped identify setting of interest



Workshops to develop logic model

- Co-producers invited because of lived expertise (direct and indirect), professional expertise (teachers, GPs, OTs, public health practitioners), and/or academic expertise



Evaluation of the co-production element

- Reflexive notes
- Feedback from participants
- Discussions during and after the project.

What it was like to do co-production from a non-academic co-producer's point of view?

- Give a safe space to open up
- Feeling that all types of knowledge are valid and valued
- Allowing for the different strengths of team members





What was the impact of engaging contributors?

- Reframed the problem from narrow bio-medical studies to broader socio-political eco-system
- Narrowed context to school-based interventions due to resounding response from teachers at the recruitment stage
- We co-produced theory to guide later stages of synthesis methods development and frame the analyses
- Allowed us to critique and understand body of evidence using a new frame of reference
- Emotional impact – the joys and the discomforts

Discussion

- **Co-production is a powerful way to develop logic models and to inform synthesis methods development, by focusing on what is important to the affected communities**
- **Lessons learned**
 - Involving communities allows prioritising insights of communities over availability of data
 - Training in co-production can help clarify understanding, but skills probably come through life experience of observing people
- **What we would do differently next time**
 - Allow space for emotional reactions, healing, and reengagement
 - Consider bringing co-producers from advisory group to other co-production events so that they could see the bigger picture of the project
 - Involve co-producers more in interpretation/write up
- **Some facilitators for meaningful co-production**
 - Repeated involvement to allow thinking time and debate as ideas developed
 - Interactive technology, e.g., stickie notes. Miro boards allowing more quick iteration with team. Miro allowed us to think bigger and have a larger map – supported upstream thinking

Contact: a.omara-eves@ucl.ac.uk or dylan.kneale@ucl.ac.uk