

Central Lancashire Online Knowledge (CLoK)

Title	Scoping review of the use of virtual reality in intensive care units
Type	Article
URL	https://clock.uclan.ac.uk/39967/
DOI	https://doi.org/10.1111/nicc.12732
Date	2021
Citation	Hill, James Edward, Twamley, Jacqueline, Breed, Hetty, Kenyon, Roger, Casey, Rob, Zhang, Jennifer and Clegg, Andrew (2021) Scoping review of the use of virtual reality in intensive care units. <i>Nursing in Critical Care</i> . ISSN 1362-1017
Creators	Hill, James Edward, Twamley, Jacqueline, Breed, Hetty, Kenyon, Roger, Casey, Rob, Zhang, Jennifer and Clegg, Andrew

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/nicc.12732>

For information about Research at UCLan please go to <http://www.uclan.ac.uk/research/>

All outputs in CLoK are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including Copyright law. Copyright, IPR and Moral Rights for the works on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the <http://clock.uclan.ac.uk/policies/>

How to structure a report on public involvement in a research project

The following table forms the short version of GRPP2¹ and helps to provide a structure for reporting on public involvement in research projects. The same authors also offer a long version that is designed for use when the subject of the research is public involvement itself.

Advice on co-authoring reports and publications, where a public contributor works alongside an academic to produce the report, is available².

Section and topic	Item	Reported on page number
Aim	Report the aim of PPI in the study	4
Methods	Provide a clear description of the methods used for PPI in the study	4
Study results	Outcomes—Report the results of PPI in the study, including both positive and negative outcomes	25
Discussion and conclusions	Outcomes—Comment on the extent to which PPI influenced the study overall. Describe positive and negative effects	25
Reflections/critical perspective	Comment critically on the study, reflecting on the things that went well and those that did not, so others can learn from this experience	25

¹ See Staniszewska S et al () GRIPP2 reporting checklists: tools to improve reporting of patient and public involvement in research BMJ 2017;358:j3453. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j3453>

² See http://peterbates.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/how_to_involve_the_public_as_co-authors.pdf