

**Table 2: Selected papers**

Author	Sample size	Study Design	Groups studied	PPI methods	PPI impact
Original research using the recruited research participants to influence the research process					
Cooper et al (1997)	135	RCT	Medical management Vs transcervical resection of endometrium	Patient questionnaire and total number recruited	Recruitment: Acceptability and compliance to medical management greater in those who chose it (rather than randomly allocated): Value of patient preference
Donovan et al (2002)	30	RCT	Radiotherapy Vs Prostate resection Vs Active monitoring	Patient Interviews (face to face) and audio recordings of recruitment	Recruitment: training recruiters increased randomisation rate from 40 to 70%, making a three arm design possible.
Thorstensson et al (2009)	34	RCT	Orthopaedic: Surgery ACL reconstruction Vs conservative management	Patient Interviews – (telephone and face to face)	Recruitment: Motivation to by-pass waiting list. Patients described training as boring and un able to provide sufficient results.

Mills et al (2011)	93	RCT	urology	Audio recorded appointments	Recruitment: recruiters were trained to acknowledge patients initial preference and then explore underlying reasons-perusing consent when they were ambivalent.
Hamilton et al (2013)	?	Feasibility study for RCT	Endoscopic excision Vs Radiotherapy	audio recordings of recruitment appointments	Recruitment: presentation of verbal trial information, agreement between clinicians upon the study protocol, understanding logistical issues hindering recruitment, patients views not always addressed
Original surgical research using non-participant patients and carers to influence the research process					
Welfare et al (2006)	40	Qualitative	Ulcerative colitis	Focus groups and patient interviews (face to face)	Patients identified research topics which created a framework for research priorities with high acceptability.
Bartlett et al (2012)	153	Randomised cross-over	gynaecological, prostate, breast	Patient focus groups, Patient interviews (face to face and telephone), Research	Usability: Web site changes were made i.e. personal log in/chat room. Patients reported this model of care was feasible

				user partnership group, Patient steering group members, Patient survey	and acceptable
PPI within surgical systematic review and meta-analysis					
Whistance et al (2013)	4	Systematic Review	Outcome reporting in colorectal cancer surgery	Patient representative co-author	Impact of PPI not reported

PPI Patient and Public Involvement; RCT Randomised Controlled Trial

DRIVE