

1 **Title: Citizen involvement in research on technological innovations for health,**
2 **care or well-being: a scoping review**

3 **Short title: Citizen involvement on technological innovations for health**

4 Catharina M. van Leersum¹, Christina Jaschinski², Marloes Bults² & Johan van der Zwart¹

5

6 1. Department of Science, Technology, and Policy Studies, Faculty of Behavioural, Management, and
7 Social Sciences, University of Twente, Enschede, the Netherlands

8 2. Technology, Health, and Care Research Group, Saxion University of Applied Sciences, Enschede, the
9 Netherlands

10

11 Corresponding author

12 Catharina M. van Leersum

13 c.m.vanleersum@utwente.nl

15 **Abstract**

16 Citizen science can be a powerful approach to foster the successful implementation of technological
17 innovations in health, care or well-being. Involving experience experts as co-researchers or co-
18 designers of technological innovations facilitates mutual learning, community building, and
19 empowerment. By utilizing the expert knowledge of the intended users, innovations have a better
20 chance to get adopted and solve complex health-related problems. As citizen science is still a relatively
21 new practice for health and well-being, little is known about effective methods and guidelines for
22 successful collaboration. This scoping review aims to provide insight in 1) the levels of citizen
23 involvement in current research on technological innovations for health, care or well-being, 2) the used
24 participatory methodologies, and 3) lesson's learned by the researchers.

25 The search was performed in SCOPUS in January 2021 and included peer-reviewed journal and
26 conference papers published between 2016 and 2020. The final selection (N=83) was limited to
27 empirical studies that had a clear focus on technological innovations for health, care or well-being and
28 involved citizens at the level of collaboration or higher. Our results show a growing interest in citizens
29 science as an inclusive research approach. Citizens are predominantly involved in the design phase of
30 innovations and less in the preparation, data-analyses or reporting phase. Eight records had citizens in
31 the lead in one of the research phases.

32 Researcher use different terms to describe their methodological approach including participatory
33 design, co-design, community based participatory research, co-creation, public and patient
34 involvement, participatory action research, user-centered design and citizen science. Our selection of
35 cases shows that succesfull citizen science projects develop a structural and longtidutinal partnership
36 with their collaborators, use a situated and adaptive research approach, and have researchers that are
37 willing to give-up tradional power dynamics and engage in a mutual learning experience.

38

39

40 **Background**

41 Many technologies are developed to address health, care or well-being related challenges, such as
42 mental health, manage health at home, or coping with an understaffed healthcare sector [1]. These
43 technologies can include new diagnostic or therapeutic methods and devices, ambient assisted living
44 technologies, and eHealth such as monitoring, regulatory, or advisory apps. There is a lot of research
45 into the design, development, implementation, and evaluation of new technologies. However, the
46 scoping review of Krick et al. [2019] showed that implementation of new technologies remains a
47 challenge due to lack of in-depth knowledge about the care environment or users [2].

48 Citizen science, or the use of scientific principles and methods by non-professional scientists,
49 may be a powerful method to improve public participation in research as well as public health and is
50 regarded as a promising research approach to improve implementation and adoption of technological
51 developments in health, care or well-being by collaborating with the intended users as experience
52 experts [3]. The initial drivers to develop citizen science methods were the increase of research
53 capacity [4], and the possibility to respond more effectively on complex societal problems due to the
54 addition of lay, local or traditional knowledge to scientific knowledge [5, 6]. Besides the positive
55 contributions of citizen science to the scientific processes or knowledge, it has potential advantages
56 for lay people being co-researchers of a project. In health related research as co-researcher could result
57 in a broader understanding of their own health and well-being and acquisition of knowledge about a
58 healthy lifestyle [7]. A list of 10 benefits for co-researchers was developed by Haywood [2013] [8].
59 These benefits include enhancing science knowledge and literacy, enhancing understanding of
60 scientific methods, improving access to scientific information, increasing scientific thinking, improving
61 interpretation skills, diminishing the gap between science and people, strengthening connections
62 between people and environment, empowering co-researchers, increasing community-building,
63 changing attitudes, influencing policy, and gaining access to broader networks [8]. King et al. [2016]
64 showed similar benefits in several citizen science case studies, where the main benefits concerned
65 scientific literacy [9].

66 Currently, there is no uniform/ broadly accepted definition of citizen science. So far there is no
67 consensus, and it is even discussed whether a definition is necessary [10, 11]. This non-existence of a
68 definition is accepted and allows stakeholders working in citizen science to use different terms and
69 methodologies [12]. In this paper we define citizen science as research (partly) executed by non-
70 professional scientists, volunteers, citizen scientists or co-researchers. Often the citizen scientists work
71 together or are guided by academic researchers or governmental organisations. Thus, a citizen should
72 be taking active part in any of the research activities and ideally collaborate with professional
73 researchers. We take a similar perspective as Heigl et al. [2019] and exclude projects from our
74 definition that use participants only at as providers and resources of knowledge without any active
75 involvement in scientific activities [11].

76 Citizen science is an approach which comprises a range of participatory approaches that are
77 embraced as collaborative practices and show promising results [3]. Although citizen science in the
78 healthcare domain is a relatively new and rare phenomenon, it is already an established approach in
79 research fields such as ecology, conservation, and biology [5, 13]. Projects with citizen science
80 approaches attract hundreds of thousands of participants, who are involved in different tasks varying
81 in complexity [14]. The inclusion of citizens is valuable for science [15], for example, when the expertise
82 of the general public or a specific population of citizens is needed to understand and solve a problem
83 [16]. The collective intelligence of the citizens has led to scientific discoveries such as protein folding
84 [17] and air pollution [18]. However, citizens science projects also deal with challenges when it comes
85 to the selection of participating citizens, the needed and available competences of citizens, and the
86 credibility of knowledge gathered by or with the citizens [5, 19].

87 TOPFIT Citizenlab is a three-year research and innovation program aiming at increasing citizen
88 involvement and participation in researching, testing, modifying and implementing technological
89 innovations for prevention and health promotion. One of the objectives withing Citizenlab is to explore
90 and understand useful methodologies of citizen science in health and well-being research. There is
91 limited knowledge on the benefits of citizen science, and the normative assumptions are often taken

92 for granted [20, 21]. Examples of citizen science do not show a thorough analysis of successes and
93 failures, therefore, little is understood about the advantages or pitfalls [21]. In the field of citizen
94 science, to our knowledge nine literature reviews are performed by Carpini et al. [2004], Irvin and
95 Stansbury [2004], McGuire [2006], Conrad and Hilchey [2011], Garau [2012], Kimura and Kinchy [2016],
96 Kullenberg and Kasperowski [2016], Peter et al. [2019], and Ianiello et al. [2019] [13, 21-28]. These
97 reviews focus on the use of citizen science to encourage public discourse, public decision-making,
98 public management, or environmental research. To our knowledge, there were two literature reviews
99 on citizen science with a focus on health, care or well-being published by Domecq et al. [2014] and
100 Malterud and Elvbakken [2020] [29, 30]. These review focus on patient engagement in healthcare
101 research and show that it is used in many settings. Often the research methods are adapted to make
102 engagement possible for the citizens, and patient engagement is low during the data collection phases
103 or rather tokenistic. Authors of both reviews argue that further research is needed to determine which
104 valuable collaborative methods can achieve more active involvement of patients and define ideas and
105 strategies for citizen science in health research [29, 30].

106 In our scoping review we will analyse the citizen science methodologies applied in technology
107 development for health, care or well-being. We are specifically interested in which innovation phases
108 citizens were involved, and in the level of citizen involvement. The aim was to provide insight in 1) the
109 levels of citizen involvement in current research on technological innovations for health, care or well-
110 being, 2) the used participatory methodologies, and 3) lesson's learned by the researchers.

111

112 **Research phases and citizen involvement**

113 To answer these questions first, we distinguished three research phases, namely: 1) preparation of
114 research, which included the design of a research, the recruitment process, and design of materials
115 such as interview guides, 2) data collection, which included all (iterative) steps of technology design,
116 data collection and use of feedback throughout these iterations, and 3) data analysis and evaluation,
117 which included methods of analysis as well as reporting of research data and outcome. With this

118 distinction it is possible that one record might describe one, two or three phases in which citizens were
119 involved.

120 Second, we assessed the level of citizen involvement. We proposed levels of citizen
121 involvement based on the participation ladder of Arnstein [1969] and citizen science terminology
122 defined by Hakley [2013] [31, 32]. Arnstein's participation ladder is more used in citizen science
123 research to discuss the methodology and possibilities of citizen involvement, for example by van
124 Leersum et al. [2020] about the involvement of citizens in the need of long-term care during the
125 development of a tool for self-assessment, and by Kotus [2013] to explore the level of participation of
126 citizens in the urban policy making of a Polish city [33, 34]. The ladder consists of eight steps including
127 manipulation, therapy, informing, consultation, placation, partnership, delegated power, and citizen
128 control [31]. Each step on the ladder characterizes the role of the participant and the researcher. The
129 higher participants are placed on the ladder, the more influence they will have. This ladder
130 configuration shows that one level is building on the previous level, but there is no logical progression
131 from one to another [35]. The steps manipulation and therapy are considered non-participation. The
132 steps of informing, consultation, and placation are considered tokenism, in which the citizens have
133 superficial involvement. From the informing step in which the citizens are informing the researchers
134 about their personal situation or experiences, towards the placation step in which citizens advise the
135 researchers about needed adjustment, research or innovations. The highest steps of partnership,
136 delegated power, and citizen control are called citizen power, in which the citizens have more and
137 more in-depth control and influence. In partnership the relation and tasks of the citizens and
138 researchers are equal, and with citizen control, the citizens lead the research and researchers are
139 available to support [31].

140 Hakley [2013] uses four different terms to distinguish involvement in citizen science research
141 [32]. First, crowdsourcing, in which cognitive abilities of citizens are not needed and the citizens use
142 digital devices to collect data that are automatically send and analysed by researchers at a later stage.
143 Second, distributed intelligence, in which the citizens get a certain task such as interpretation or

144 classification of data. Third, participatory science, in which citizens are formulating research questions
145 or problems, and are participating in data collection, but analysis is often done by the researchers.
146 Fourth and last, collaborative science, also referred to extreme citizen science, in which a project is
147 carried out by citizens without researchers being actively involved [32]. Although it might seem from
148 terminology and categorisations of citizen involvement that the higher the level of involvement the
149 better, we will not make this argument in this scoping review. All forms of citizen science could be
150 valuable and often citizen science research could not be defined to one level alone [32, 36]. It should
151 be up to the team “to determine the best design specifications for their own unique context, enabling
152 citizen science to achieve its full potential” [10]. Also, as Ferro and Molinari [2009] argue, researchers
153 need to be aware of the complexity of citizens [37]. There is a considerable variation across the
154 population of citizens who might be interested to be involved in different forms. This variation could
155 be in terms of interest as well as educational level or technological skills. For some citizens, these
156 differences make it more difficult or less desirable to participate on higher steps of the ladder.
157 Researchers should be more aware of the variation and should know when to make a step towards the
158 citizens rather than to expect the citizens to move towards them [37].

159 In our analysis we combine the terminology as used by Arnstein (1969) and Hakley (2013) and
160 define four levels of citizen involvement [31, 32]. The first level is the level of *non-involvement*, this
161 level includes manipulation, therapy, and crowdsourcing. The second level is *sharing knowledge*,
162 including informing, consultation, placation, and distributed intelligence. The third level is
163 *collaboration*, which includes partnership, delegated power, and participatory science, and the fourth
164 level is *citizens in the lead*, including citizen control, and collaborative science. These four levels of
165 citizen involvement will be considered in view of the different research phases (Table 1). Based on the
166 scoping review, we will highlight five cases, and further explore the variation in citizens, how they are
167 involved, and what worked well or what was experienced problematic.

168

169 *Table 1. The table used to review the records obtained after the screening of titles and abstracts as part of the scoping review.*
 170 *The levels of citizen involvement (first column) are based on the participation ladder of Arnstein (1969) and citizen science*
 171 *terminology of Hakley (2013) [31, 32]. The phases of research are given in the first row.*

	PREPARATION OF RESEARCH	DATA COLLECTION	DATA ANALYSIS & EVALUATION
NON-INVOLVEMENT			
SHARING KNOWLEDGE			
COLLABORATION			
CITIZENS IN THE LEAD			

172

173 **Method**

174 **Methodological approach**

175 A scoping review was performed to examine how citizens are involved in conducted research in the
 176 field of health, care or well-being [38]. Scoping review is a reviewing method to map a research area
 177 and identify all relevant literature regardless of the study design. This approach is developed to
 178 contextualize knowledge and identify the current state of understanding of a specific topic, and to
 179 assists in identifying the aspects which are investigated and the aspects which are less or not
 180 investigated [39]. A scoping review was chosen due to the broad topic of citizen science and the
 181 application of many different study designs within this topic [39]. We investigated citizen science
 182 methodologies applied in innovation processes for health, care or well-being. In this article we provide
 183 insight in 1) the levels of citizen involvement in current research on technological innovations for
 184 health, care or well-being, 2) the used participatory methodologies, and 3) lesson’s learned by the
 185 researchers as described in identified records.

186

187 **Search strategy**

188 First, we developed a search string that included many combinations of search terms within four
 189 research fields: ‘how’, ‘why’, ‘what’, and ‘who’ (Table 2). *How* considers the involvement of citizens,
 190 *why* is health, care or well-being related, *what* contains the technological innovations, and *who* are the
 191 citizens. For each of these fields specific search terms were defined. For example, the search string for
 192 how:

193 TITLE-ABS-KEY ("citizen science" OR "participatory research" OR "user involvement" OR "citizen engagement" OR
 194 "citizen knowledge" OR "patient and public involvement" OR "community-based participatory research" OR
 195 "community engagement" OR "community participation" OR "citizen participation" OR "user-centred design" OR
 196 "co-creation" OR "co-design" OR "participatory design" OR "co-production")

197 As proposed by Jackson and Waters [2005], different combinations of search terms were tested and
 198 discussed by the research team and an information specialist [40]. The records acquired with each
 199 combination were compared and based on the included and excluded records by addition or removal
 200 of search terms, the final search terms were chosen. The final search string was formed by using AND
 201 in between the how, why, what, and who, and the terms within each part were connected using OR.
 202 To conduct the search, the final search string was entered in January 2021 into the database Scopus.

203

204 *Table 1. The main fields of the search string, considering 'how' (involvement), 'why' (health, care or well-being), 'what'*
 205 *(technology innovation), and 'who' (citizens).*

HOW INVOLVEMENT

	Citizen science; Participatory research; User involvement; Citizen engagement; Citizen knowledge; Patient and public involvement; Community-based participatory research; Community engagement; Community participation; Citizen participation; Co-creation; Co-design; Participatory design; Co-production; User-centred design
WHY	HEALTH AND WELL-BEING
	Health; Healthcare; Care; Wellbeing; Well-being; Lifestyle; Healthy

WHAT	TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION
	Innovation; Technology; App; Digital; Robotics; Robots; Smart; Gaming; Web based; Games; Game design; Tool; Computer-based; Ehealth, E-health; Telehealth; M-health; Mhealth; Mobile health; E-therapy; Digital health
WHO	CITIZENS
	Citizen; Public; Community; Patients; Clients; Elderly; Seniors; Caregivers; Neighbours; Family; Children; Parents; Adults

206

207 **Selection of records**

208 For the selection of the records several inclusion criteria and restrictions were chosen. The inclusion
209 criteria were 1) empirical studies, 2) studies describing a method in which citizens were actively
210 involved, 3) health related topics, and 4) technological innovation. Published records were not eligible
211 if:

212 1) The record did not present the execution of an empirical study. Records describing exclusively
213 the methodology, lessons learned, study design, or reviews are excluded.

214 2) The used method did not actively involve citizens. Citizens had to be involved to a larger extent
215 than 'just' as subjects. Citizens could be professionals if they are the end-users of the
216 technological innovation.

217 3) The study did not aim to improve health, care or wellbeing.

218 4) Technological innovation was not part of the record. We used the definition of Behney [1989]
219 *“Medical technologies include the drugs, devices, and medical and surgical procedures used in*
220 *medical care, and the organizational and supportive systems within which such care is*
221 *provided” [41].*

222 Furthermore, we restricted our search to records that were published in the last five years, were peer
223 reviewed or conference papers, and published in English. There were no restrictions on type of
224 research or study design.

225 The first 200 titles and abstracts were screened by the four researchers. The exclusion criteria
226 for the first screening consisted of no citizen involvement, no health, no technology, and not empirical.
227 The four researchers discussed the differences of inclusion after screening the first 100 records. Then
228 repeated the process for the next 100 records. The remaining records were split and both sets were
229 screened by two researchers, each researcher couple discussed their differences. In case of doubt, the
230 titles and abstracts were also discussed with the other researcher couple.

231

232 **Ranking citizen involvement**

233 To classify the used methodologies of the included records, we developed a matrix to rank the citizen
234 involvement within the described research phases (Table 1). The citizen involvement levels were based
235 on the participation ladder of Arnstein [1969] and the citizen science terminology of Hakley [2013] [31,
236 32]. We defined four levels:

- 237 1. Non-involvement: there is no active involvement of citizens.
- 238 2. Sharing knowledge: the citizen receives information from the researcher, the citizen provides
239 (advisory) information to the researcher, there is a dialogue in which decisions were made by
240 the researcher.
- 241 3. Collaboration: the citizen and researcher are partners, equal in dialogue and equal in taking
242 decisions, the researcher assists in all research activities.
- 243 4. Citizens in the lead: the citizen is leading and taking decisions, very minimal assistance of the
244 researcher is provided, only on request of the citizen.

245 The methods sections of the full text records were screened and ranked on research phase and level
246 of citizen involvement. The first 20 full text rankings were performed by four researchers. A record was
247 directly excluded when it did not fit anywhere in the matrix. The four researchers discussed the
248 differences of inclusion and ranking after reading the first 20 full texts. Then repeated this process for
249 the next 10. The remaining records were divided among the researchers. In case of doubt, another
250 researcher read the full text as well to align the analysis.

251

252 **Data analysis**

253 The research phases and the level of citizen involvement was screened. The analysis was based on the
254 descriptions of the methodology in the records. We decided to take only records ranked on the levels
255 of collaboration or citizens in the lead in the final steps of the analysis. The following information was
256 extracted from the records: authors, year of publication, country of research, used methodology,
257 health, care or well-being research topic, technological innovation, number and characteristics of
258 involved citizens, and level of citizen involvement. Besides these details, five records were described
259 in more detail as example cases.

260

261 **Results**

262 **Selection and characteristics of records**

263 In total 3846 records were retrieved (Figure 1), no duplicates were found. After screening the titles
264 and abstracts of the records, 2983 records were removed based on the inclusion criteria: empirical
265 study, citizen involvement, focus on health, care or well-being, and technological innovation. Full texts
266 were obtained, and the methods sections of the remaining 861 records were screened and ranked.
267 During methods screening and full text reading 667 records were removed due to no citizen
268 involvement. From the 194 remaining record, 110 records were put-aside based on citizen involvement
269 solely on the levels of sharing knowledge or non-involvement. A total of 83 records were included for
270 further analysis and are presented in table 3. For each record table 3 shows the year of publication,
271 country in which the study was performed, terminology used for the research design, topic of health,
272 care or well-being, technological innovation, involved citizens, and the level of involvement during the
273 different research phases.

274 Table 3. All 83 included records in alphabetical order. Author, year of publication, country of research, used methodology, health or well-being research topic, technological innovation, number
 275 of involved citizens, and the level of citizen involvement in each research phase is distilled from the full texts.

Authors	Year of publication	Country	Used terminology to describe Method	Health, care or well-being topic	Technological innovation	Involved citizens	Level of involvement in preparation	Level of involvement in data collection	Level of involvement in evaluation
Abbass-Dick et al. [42]	2018	Canada	Participatory design	Breastfeeding	eHealth	11 Indigenous mothers, 9 care providers	Non-involvement	Collaboration	Non-involvement
Abbass-Dick et al. [43]	2020	Canada	Co-creation	Breastfeeding	eHealth	12 young mothers, 8 health care providers	Non-involvement	Collaboration	Non-involvement
Ahmed et al. [44]	2019	United States	Participatory design	Cardiac resynchronization therapy	Electronic health data	24 adult patients	Collaboration	Collaboration	Non-involvement
Allin et al. [45]	2018	Canada	Participatory design	Spinal cord injury	Online self-management tool	9 persons with SCI; co-designers; key informants	Collaboration	Collaboration	Sharing knowledge
Arevian et al. [46]	2018	United States	Co-creation	Community resilience	Mobile application	30 people from the community; co-leadership	Sharing knowledge	Collaboration	Collaboration
Arevian et al. [47]	2020	United States	Usability study	Obsessive compulsive disorder	Mobile texting apps	28 patients, 4 care providers	Non-involvement	Collaboration	Sharing knowledge
Cesar et al. [48]	2017	United States	Community based	Community based health	mHealth technology	159 people from African	Collaboration	Collaboration	Collaboration

			participatory research			American communities			
De Cocker et al. [49]	2019	Belgium	Citizen Science	Public health guidelines	Online survey	6246 adults	Sharing knowledge	Collaboration	Sharing knowledge
DeRenzi et al. [50]	2017	India	Participatory design	Community health	Web- and voice-based system	71 community health workers	Non-involvement	Sharing knowledge	Collaboration
Dewa et al. [51]	2020	United Kingdom	Co-production	Mental health difficulties	Technology to detect mental health deterioration	7 young people; co-researchers; advisory group	Collaboration	Collaboration	Collaboration
Doty et al. [52]	2020	United States	Community based participatory research	Parenting programmes for Latinx families	Mobile app/mHealth	115 Latinx parents Latinx-serving organisations Latinx community facilitators	Collaboration	Collaboration	Collaboration
Edwards et al. [53]	2020	United States & Ireland	Community based participatory research	Home-based spirometry in pulmonary fibrosis	Mobile app/mHealth	36 patients	Collaboration	Non-involvement	Non-involvement
Elk et al. [54]	2020	United States	Community based participatory research	Palliative care	Telehealth	14 community members with different ethnicities	Collaboration	Collaboration	Collaboration
Erlingsdóttir et al. [55]	2019	Sweden	Co-design	Support for home care staff	eHealth services	16 home care staff from 4 municipalities	Non-involvement	Collaboration	Collaboration

Evans et al. [56]	2016	United Kingdom	Community based participatory research	HIV testing	mHealth	12 community members	Collaboration	Collaboration	Collaboration
Ferguson et al. [57]	2018	United Kingdom	Participatory design	Educational programme for hearing aid users	Interactive video tutorials	3 hearing aid users and 1 charity advocate people with hearing loss, panel of 11 audiologists	Non-involvement	Collaboration	Sharing knowledge
Ferri et al. [58]	2020	Italy	Co-creation	Cyber bullying	Massive open online course (MOOC)	30 children, 2 teachers; co-creators	Non-involvement	Collaboration	Sharing knowledge
Fletcher and Mullett [59]	2016	Canada	Participatory action research	Healthy lifestyle	Digital stories	230 younger adults, 14 older adults; development team	Collaboration	Citizens in the lead	Collaboration
Franco et al. [60]	2016	United States	Co-design	Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder	mHealth/ Mobile app	32 veterans (peer mentors and mentees)	Collaboration	Collaboration	Collaboration
Frauenberger et al. [61]	2020	Austria	Participatory design	Social Play for mixed groups of neurodivergent and neurotypical children	Social Play Technologies	16 neurodivergent and neurotypical children aged 7 to 12, 1 teacher	Collaboration	Citizens in the lead	Sharing knowledge

Garcia et al. [62]	2019	Brazil	Co-creation	Alcohol and drugs rehabilitation	Digital games	10 adults with alcohol/drug addiction, 2 healthcare professionals	Sharing knowledge	Citizens in the lead	Collaboration
Gardsten [63]	2017	Sweden	Participatory design	Self-management of Type 2 diabetes	ICT self-management service	5 adults with type 2 diabetes, 2 diabetes nurses	Collaboration	Collaboration	Sharing knowledge
Garmendia et al. [64]	2019	Spain	Co-design	Oncology follow-up	Visualization tool	2 oncologists and 2 nurses	Non-involvement	Collaboration	Non-involvement
Giroux et al. [65]	2019	Canada	Co-design	Supporting caregivers of older adults in home care	eHealth	74 caregivers, community workers, health and social service professionals	Sharing knowledge	Collaboration	Non-involvement
Gobl et al. [66]	2019	Austria	Participatory design	Social media literacy	Serious game	71 adolescents	Sharing knowledge	Collaboration	Non-involvement
Grant et al. [67]	2020	United Kingdom	Co-design, Public and Patient Involvement	Mental health	mHealth	26 young people	Non-involvement	Collaboration	Collaboration
Haufe et al. [68]	2019	Netherlands	Participatory action research	Independent living	Gerontechnologies	19 seniors, 2 technology consultants and 3 municipal community builders	Collaboration	Collaboration	Collaboration

Hernández et al. [69]	2018	Canada	Participatory design	Force Resistance Training in Hand Grasp and Arm Therapy	Video game	3 occupational therapists, 1 paediatrician, 12 children	Non-involvement	Collaboration	Non-involvement
Hill et al. [70]	2017	Canada	Community based participatory research	Stroke education	Educational DVD	26 indigenous healthcare providers, 108 children	Collaboration	Collaboration	Collaboration
Hiratsuka et al. [71]	2019	United States	Community-based participatory research	Posttraumatic stress disorder	Website	6 members of a native community, 5 clinical providers	Collaboration	Collaboration	Collaboration
Hong et al. [72]	2018	United States	Co-Design	Symptom communication in chronic illness	Digital tracking tool	13 pairs of chronically ill children and their parents, 11 clinicians	Non-involvement	Collaboration	Non-involvement
Jarke et al. [73]	2019	Germany	Co-creation	Digital neighbourhood guide	Digital neighbourhood guide	12 older adults; co-creators	Sharing knowledge	Collaboration	Sharing knowledge
Jessen et al. [74]	2020	Norway	Participatory design	Personal strengths	mHealth app	12 patients, 15 care providers, 6 designers, 2 researchers; development team	Collaboration	Collaboration	Collaboration

Jessen et al. [75]	2018	Norway	Co-design	Self-management of chronic conditions	mHealth self-management app	22 patients with chronic conditions	Collaboration	Collaboration	Collaboration
Jo et al. [76]	2020	United States	Co-design	Stress management and mental well-being	mobile self-tracking platform	5 Korean mothers in the United States	Collaboration	Collaboration	Collaboration
Jørgensen et al. [77]	2018	Denmark	Participatory design	Rheumatic diseases	e-Device for disease management	14 patients, 9 care providers	Collaboration	Collaboration	Non-involvement
Kanstrup and Bertelsen [78]	2016	Denmark	Participatory design	Exercise technology	Exercise technology	18 young adults with depression or anxiety	Collaboration	Collaboration	Collaboration
Kearns et al. [79]	2020	Ireland	Public patient involvement	Aphasia rehabilitation	Online user feedback questionnaire	6 patients with aphasia	Sharing knowledge	Collaboration	Collaboration
Kenning and Treadaway [80]	2018	United Kingdom	Participatory design	Dementia	Sensory textiles	13 patients	Sharing knowledge	Collaboration	Sharing knowledge
Kildea et al. [81]	2019	Canada	Co-design	Patient portal	smartphone app	445 stakeholders; co-leadership	Collaboration	Collaboration	Collaboration
Kim et al. [82]	2019	Korea	Participatory design	Autism	Digital self-tracker platform	5 patients with autism and their partners	Non-involvement	Collaboration	Collaboration

LaMonica et al. [83]	2020	Australia	Participatory design	Mental health services	Web-based platform	49 veterans	Non-involvement	Collaboration	Sharing knowledge
Lan Hing Ting et al. [84]	2020	France	Human-centred participatory design	Fall prevention	Balance assessment tool	5 elderly people	Collaboration	Collaboration	Collaboration
Larsen et al. [85]	2016	Denmark	Participatory design	Telemedicine	Shared service centre	35 clinicians, 29 representatives, 4 patients	Collaboration	Collaboration	Collaboration
Latulippe et al. [86]	2020	Canada	Co-design	Social health inequalities	eHealth tool for caregivers	31 community workers, 22 health professionals, 33 caregivers; co-designers	Collaboration	Collaboration	Non-involvement
Latulippe et al. [87]	2020	Canada	Social justice design	Social health inequalities	eHealth tool for caregivers	26 community workers, 18 health professionals, 30 caregivers	Sharing knowledge	Collaboration	Sharing knowledge
Latulippe et al. [88]	2019	Canada	Co-design	Support for older persons	eHealth tool for caregivers	2 community workers, 2 health professionals, 3 caregivers	Sharing knowledge	Collaboration	Sharing knowledge
Lee et al. [89]	2017	United States	User-centered design	Support for older adults	Social robots	5 older adults, 5 mental health therapists; co-designers	Sharing knowledge	Collaboration	Non-involvement

Leeming and Thew [90]	2017	United Kingdom	Public patient involvement	Patient records	Federated platform	30 care organisations; steering group	Non-involvement	Non-involvement	Collaboration
Leong and Johnston [91]	2016	Australia	Participatory design	Aging people	Social robots	8 older adults	Sharing knowledge	Collaboration	Non-involvement
Leslie et al. [92]	2019	Canada	User-centred design	Health services	Mobile App to assist caregivers	25 family caregivers	Collaboration	Collaboration	Sharing knowledge
Limaye et al. [93]	2018	Peru	Community based participatory research	Maternal mortality	Digital story telling	135 people from the community	Collaboration	Collaboration	Sharing knowledge
Livingood et al. [94]	2017	United States	Community based participatory research	Obesity	Digital communication intervention	30 youths aged 15 to 19	Collaboration	Citizens in the lead	Collaboration
Lo et al. [95]	2020	Canada	Symposium	Health informatics	Health information technology	37 participants	Non-involvement	Collaboration	Non-involvement
Lockerbie and Maiden [96]	2020	United Kingdom	Co-design	Dementia	Digital quality of life model	10 care workers	Non-involvement	Collaboration	Sharing knowledge
Lu et al. [97]	2017	4 EU countries	Co-creation	Healthy and active ageing	Assistive living technologies	Unknown number of multi-stakeholders	Non-involvement	Collaboration	Non-involvement

Maertens et al. [98]	2017	United States	Community oriented approach	Human papillomavirus infection	Web-based intervention	20 Latina young adults, 27 Latino parents; community advisory committee	Collaboration	Collaboration	Sharing knowledge
Martin et al. [99]	2020	3 EU countries	Co-design	Healthy lifestyle	mHealth apps	74 adolescents aged 13 to 16	Sharing knowledge	Sharing knowledge	Collaboration
Matthews et al. [100]	2016	United States	Participatory design	Mental illnesses	Smartphone and web app	3 patient, 3 clinicians	Sharing knowledge	Collaboration	Non-involvement
Mburu et al. [101]	2018	South Africa	Co-design	Preterm infants	Digital communication	17 mothers, 17 NICU nurses, 4 doctors	Sharing knowledge	Collaboration	Non-involvement
McMillan et al. [102]	2018	United Kingdom	Public patient involvement	Health check results	website	19 members of the public; co-facilitators	Citizens in the lead	Collaboration	Sharing Knowledge
McNaney et al. [103]	2017	United Kingdom	Co-design	Dementia	Mobile app	14 young family members of people with dementia	Collaboration	Collaboration	Sharing knowledge
Miller et al. [104]	2016	United States	Participatory design	Health information	Information technology	8 parents, 2 children, 3 clinicians	Collaboration	Collaboration	Sharing knowledge
Mrklas et al. [105]	2020	Canada	Co-design	Knee osteoarthritis	MHealth app	4 patients, 5 physicians, 3 trainees, 2 decision makers;	Collaboration	Collaboration	Collaboration

						research coalition			
Naeemabadi et al. [106]	2020	Denmark	Participatory design	Total knee replacement	Telerehabilitation program	8 patients, 4 health professionals, 4 student assistants, 2 software developers	Collaboration	Collaboration	Non-involvement
Payton [107]	2016	United States	Co-creation	Health information HIV	Social media	15 participants	Non-involvement	Citizens in the lead	Non-involvement
Rabba et al. [108]	2020	Australia	Participatory action research	Autism	Web-based resource	3 parents, 9 clinicians; advisory group	Collaboration	Collaboration	Non-involvement
Rai et al. [109]	2020	United Kingdom & Ireland	Public patient involvement	High blood pressure	Digital intervention	40 patients and partners, 35 care professionals; co-investigators	Collaboration	Collaboration	Collaboration
Rathnayake et al. [110]	2020	Australia	Co-design	Dementia	mHealth application	10 carers	Non-involvement	Collaboration	Non-involvement
Reade et al. [111]	2017	United Kingdom	Public patient involvement	Joint pain; rheumatoid arthritis	Smartphone app	20 patients	Collaboration	Collaboration	Collaboration
Russ et al. [112]	2020	United Kingdom	Participatory action research	Surgical care	Smartphone app	42 patients; steering group	Collaboration	Non-involvement	Collaboration
Sin et al. [113]	2019	United Kingdom	Co-design	Psychosis	eHealth intervention	14 experts; advisory group	Non-involvement	Collaboration	Non-involvement

Skovlund et al. [114]	2020	Denmark	Public patient involvement	Metastatic melanoma	Dialogue tool	5 patients	Collaboration	Collaboration	Collaboration
Solem et al. [115]	2020	Norway	User centred design	Chronic pain	eHealth intervention	20 project team members, 33 external stakeholders	Collaboration	Collaboration	Collaboration
Synnot et al. [116]	2018	Australia	Participation in research	Multiple sclerosis	Website	83 patients; advisory group	Collaboration	Sharing knowledge	Collaboration
Tsvyatkov a and Storni [117]	2019	Ireland	Participatory design	Type 1 diabetes mellitus	eBook	24 parents, 20 children; design partners	Non-involvement	Collaboration	Sharing knowledge
Tuckett et al. [118]	2018	Australia	Citizen science	Physical activity for mental health	Mobile application	8 older adults aged 65 and older; citizen scientists	Collaboration	Collaboration	Collaboration
Vacca [119]	2019	United States	Participatory design	Teen-caregiver relationship	Digital media creation platform	8 Latina teens	Non-involvement	Citizens in the lead	Sharing knowledge
Vallentin-Holbech et al. [120]	2020	Denmark	Co-creation	Health promotion; alcohol prevention	Virtual Reality (VR) simulation	9 students; development team	Non-involvement	Collaboration	Non-involvement
Van Leersum et al. [34]	2020	Netherlands	User-centred design	Long-term care	Web-based preference elicitation tool	21 end-users; development team	Collaboration	Citizens in the lead	Sharing knowledge

Vilarinho et al. [121]	2017	5 EU countries	Co-design	Cystic fibrosis	mHealth application	14 children, 15 parents, 12 health professionals	Non-involvement	Collaboration	Non-involvement
Wikman et al. [122]	2018	Sweden	Participatory action research	Cancer	Internet-administered intervention	6 parents, 2 clinical psychologists; research partners	Non-involvement	Collaboration	Sharing knowledge
Yarosh and Schueller [123]	2017	United States	Participatory design	Children well-being and resilience	Computing technologies	12 children; investigators	Non-involvement	Collaboration	Non-involvement

277 *Fig 1. The scoping review search delivered 3846 records with no duplicates. After title and abstract screening 2983 records*
278 *were excluded. Method screening resulted in the exclusion of 667 records. In 111 records, the study solely involved citizens on*
279 *the level of sharing knowledge or non-involvement, therefore, 83 records were finally included.*

280

281 From the 83 included records, eight were published in 2016, 14 in 2017, 15 in 2018, 17 in 2019, and 29
282 in 2020. Most studies were conducted in the United States (N=17) [44, 46-48, 52, 54, 71, 72, 76, 89,
283 94, 98, 100, 104, 107, 119, 123], followed by Canada (N=14) [42, 43, 45, 59, 65, 69, 70, 81, 86-88, 92,
284 95, 105], the United Kingdom (N=12) [51, 56, 57, 67, 80, 90, 96, 102, 103, 111-113], Denmark (N=6)
285 [77, 78, 85, 106, 114, 120], and Australia (N=6) [83, 91, 108, 110, 116, 118]. Five studies were
286 conducted in multiple countries [53, 97, 99, 109, 121], three studies were conducted in Sweden
287 [Erlingdottir et al. 2019; Gardsten 2017; Wikman et al. 2018], and Norway [74, 75, 115], and two in
288 Austria [61, 66], the Netherlands [34, 68], and Ireland [79, 117]. One study was conducted in Belgium
289 [49], India [50], Italy [58], Brazil [62], Spain [64], Germany [73], Korea [82], France [84], Peru [93], and
290 South Africa [101].

291 One of the 83 records was based on a quantitative research design, all other included record
292 had a research design based on qualitative methodologies. Participatory design was most prominent
293 (N=24) [42, 44, 45, 50, 57, 61, 63, 66, 69, 74, 75, 77, 78, 80, 82, 83, 85, 91, 100, 104, 106, 117, 119,
294 123], followed by co-design (N=16) [55, 64, 65, 72, 76, 81, 86, 88, 96, 99, 101, 103, 105, 110, 113, 121].
295 Other often used terms were community based participatory research (N=9) [48, 52-54, 56, 70, 71, 93,
296 94], co-creation (N=8) [43, 46, 58, 62, 73, 97, 107, 120], public and patient involvement (N=7) [67, 79,
297 90, 102, 109, 111, 114], participatory action research (N=5) [59, 68, 108, 112, 122], and user centered
298 design (N=4) [34, 89, 92, 115]. Citizen science was only used in two records [49, 118], and usability
299 study [47], co-production [51], human centered participatory design [84], social Justice design [87],
300 symposium [95], community oriented approach [98], and participation in research [116] were all only
301 used once to describe the research design.

302 Besides the term citizen, participant, patient, actor or (end) user, there are different terms
303 used to describe the involved citizens. These include key informants [45], co-leadership [46, 81], co-

304 designers [45, 65, 86, 89], co-researchers [51], co-creators [58, 73], co-facilitators [102], co-
305 investigators [109], inventors [123], design/research partners [117, 122], citizen scientist [118],
306 community advisory committee [98], research coalition [105], steering group [71, 90, 112], (expert)
307 advisory group [51, 108, 113, 116], and development group/team [34, 59, 74, 120]. Fifty-nine of 83
308 records included adults, 11 records included younger adults (13 to 25 years old) [43, 51, 58, 59, 67, 78,
309 94, 98, 99, 119, 120], eight records included children (12 years or younger) [61, 69, 70, 72, 104, 117,
310 121, 123], and nine records included older adults [59, 68, 73, 83, 84, 89, 91, 97, 118]. The number of
311 involved citizens is variable among all records, most studies involved between 30 and 40 citizens, with
312 a highest amount of 6246 [49] and the lowest of five citizens [76, 82, 84, 114].

313

314 **Research phases and citizen involvement**

315 Full texts were read of 194 records. A total of 111 records involved citizens solely on the levels of
316 sharing knowledge or non-involvement. In these records researchers were in the lead during all
317 research phases and decisions. Sixty-five records were considered to have citizen involvement on a
318 collaboration level in one or more research phases. There were eight records analysed as having
319 citizens in the lead in one research phases. These records had citizens who were responsible and made
320 decisions regarding a development process or were themselves the initiators of a project. Most records
321 involved citizens during the data collection phase. Forty of 83 records had user inclusion in all three
322 research phases, 11 records involved citizens in the data collection and evaluation phase, ten records
323 in the preparation and data collection phase, and one record in the preparation and evaluation phase.
324 Thirteen records described citizen involvement only in one research phase. Table 4 shows the level of
325 citizen involvement in the different research phases of all 194 included for full text reading. Five
326 records are further discussed in the next section as example cases of citizen involvement in research
327 regarding health, care or well-being.

328

329 *Table 4. Number of records for each level of citizen involvement and within each research phase. This table is based on the*
 330 *194 records included for full text reading.*

	PREPARATION OF RESEARCH	DATA COLLECTION	DATA ANALYSIS & EVALUATION
NON-INVOLVEMENT	77	20	80
SHARING KNOWLEDGE	62	83	66
COLLABORATION	39	69	33
CITIZENS IN THE LEAD	1	7	0

331

332 **Example cases with high level of involvement in multiple phases**

333 I In this section five example cases are elaborated upon to show a diversity of topics, methods, and
 334 citizen inclusion. These cases are chosen based on inclusion of citizens in multiple research phases and
 335 at a level of collaboration or higher in one or more research phases. The aim of these cases is to analyse
 336 the citizen science method during the innovation process in the domain of health, care or well-being.
 337 How were citizens involved, who were involved, what worked well, what kind of problems were met,
 338 and what kind of motivation do researchers or citizens have?

339

340 Case 1. An online self-management tool for spinal cord injury [45]

341 The technology in this case is an online tool to promote self-management in order to avoid
 342 rehospitalization of patients after spinal cord injury (SCI). The data was collected in 2015 and 2016
 343 involving Canadian citizens of different provinces. This case is chosen because it shows a clear
 344 description of the organisation and collaboration between the different stakeholders. The authors
 345 included several teams demonstrating a divers and broad network (see Box 1 for a case description).

346

Box 1. Case description:

Online self-management tool for spinal cord injury

Self-management tools are available for many chronic conditions. The use of these tools is linked to a decrease in rehospitalization rates. However, satisfaction with most self-management tools is low, and there is no known online tool for users with SCI. The goal in this study was to apply a participatory design process in order to develop an online self-management tool for users with SCI. This process was chosen by the authors to define design constraints and solutions. Sixteen individuals, seven researchers and nine persons with SCI, participated in ten different meetings of the participatory design process. Experiences with self-management were discussed in the first meetings (exploration). Thereafter, features for a new online tool were defined (discovery). These features were translated and embedded in a prototype which the group discussed in following meetings, and feedback was used to make iterations (prototyping). The design process and collaboration with potential users was valuable to engage end users in the design of a tool to promote self-management after SCI.

347

348 In this case, the participatory design process consisted of three steps: exploration, discovery, and
349 exploration [124]. The design process was described as an interactive design in which the knowledge
350 of end-users was acknowledged and taken into the design by involving users. The process should
351 include expressing tacit knowledge and encouraging sensitivity [45]. The design process included a
352 core co-design and co-development team meeting on regular basis. The record clearly shows the
353 connections between this core team and the council. This council consisted of a consumer advisory
354 group of users with SCI and a product advisory group of researchers and a clinician [45]. Several other
355 records described a collaboration between different groups, for example Wikman et al. [2018] included
356 parent research partner group and an expert research partner group [122], Russ et al. [2020] made
357 use of a steering group in which public representatives collaborated with researchers [112], and Mrklas
358 et al. [2020] had a research coalition [105]. A difference with the study of Allin et al. [2018], quite often
359 these advisory boards did not include the actual users, but healthcare professionals [45].

360 The minimal involvement of citizens in the evaluation phase could be seen as a limitation of
361 this case, but in all other phases it was very strong. Furthermore, they recognize possible bias due to
362 a low number of involved citizens, and we noticed a lack of involvement of citizens with a lower
363 educational level. Allin et al. [2018] discuss that all involved citizens had access to high-speed internet,
364 which is associated with a high self-reported health status, and therefore these involved citizens are
365 maybe less in need of self-management than those who are not online [45].

366 Beforehand the authors motivated their choice to use a participatory design, because it might
367 empower and educate the citizens, and encourages them to adopt the developed application. The
368 three benefits reported afterwards include *“elicitation and consideration of diverse accessibility*
369 *considerations”*, *“prioritization of features and identification of core design concerns”*, and *“co-creation*
370 *of acceptable strategies and techniques to mitigate identified concerns”* [45]. Although the expected
371 benefits considered the citizens, the experienced benefits show the value for the development
372 process.

373

374 Case 2. Digital stories for health promotion [59]

375 In this case, digital stories are the technologies, which are at the same time the technologies under
376 development as well as the technologies used to perform the research. Sharing knowledge on healthy
377 lifestyle and increasing self-esteem are the health goals with the stories. From 2012 to 2014, 18
378 workshops on digital stories were organised in communities from Victoria to Ahousat in Canada. This
379 second case was chosen due to intensive groupwork and collaboration between younger and older
380 adults within the community as researchers. A mutual learning process was present between the
381 younger and older adults to develop the digital stories (see Box 2 for a case description).

382

Box 2. Case description:

Digital stories for health promotion

Aboriginal youth in Canada experience lower health and well-being due to different challenges they face. Digital stories can emphasize on community connection and cultural continuity, which are factors influential to improve health and well-being. The aim of the study was to create and share digital stories to support health promotion and encourage interactions within a community. This creates a place for younger and older adults where knowledge on healthy lifestyle could be shared, where mentorship could be facilitated, and where self-esteem could be increased by celebrating identity and community. Participatory action research was used to engage younger and older adults in the community. A youth research team was formed with eight younger adults. Next to this team there were 60 core younger participants, 170 younger workshop participants, and 14 older adults involved. At the start, the youth research team was trained to create digital stories. After workshops in which the older adults taught about their healthy lifestyle, the younger and older adults together created mini stories with the use of cameras, audio recorders, and story boards. These stories were evaluated during follow-up sessions, and a small group of younger adults were trained to lead other communities in creating their digital stories.

383

384 Fletcher and Mullett [2016] refer to McIntyre [2007], but do not give a definition for their research
385 method [59, 125]. The authors argue that participatory action research was beneficial because it was
386 a non-prescriptive approach. Other records using similar participatory action research methods do give
387 a definition. For example Wikman et al. [2018] based their design on Kindon et al. [2008], "*which is a*
388 *collaborative process of knowledge production and co-learning, placing people with lived experience at*
389 *the centre of the process*" [122, 126], and Rabba et al. [2020] based their method on Baum et al. [2006],
390 "*the stakeholders are integral to all parts of the research process, participants' active role in the*
391 *outcome sets participatory action research apart from traditional research methods where the*
392 *participants tend to be more passive in their receipt of research outcomes*" [108, 127]. Often a
393 participatory action research is divided in phases. Rabba et al. [2020] used planning, action,
394 observation, reflection, and using the new learning to plan further steps in their research [108], and

395 Haufe et al. [2019] used the two phases of understanding the current and developing a tool [68]. All
396 participants of the study by Fletcher and Mullet [2016] were involved in the phases planning, designing,
397 and evaluation of the community workshops [59].

398 The research process gave the community members together with the researchers the
399 opportunity to create a unique, broad, and holistic concept of healthy lifestyle, including personal
400 wellness in body, mind, and spirit. Clear outcome and follow-up include ownership of the stories by
401 the communities, the youth took on leadership in training other communities to develop digital stories,
402 and the older adults took a teaching role in ecology, traditional food preparation, cleansing rituals, and
403 medicinal plants [59]. There were more records discussing the need for public health interventions and
404 the involvement of community members in creating digital stories based on their community and
405 personal stories. Although in most records the creation was done by the community members, this
406 creation was more seen as a needs assessment activity and the researchers chose which stories were
407 used in discussions [93].

408 It seems that the aim to use a participatory action approach with digital stories to improve
409 health and well-being was positive. The creation of stories by community members was relevant to
410 capture a personal voice and made explicit which public health themes were recognized. The
411 workshops were fun and engaging, and the youth experienced a process with the older adults giving
412 them a voice and a sense of belonging. However, Fletcher and Mullett [2016] also acknowledge that
413 the participants were very active in the creation of stories, presenting, training, and workshops, but
414 there was a much lower interest in planning and analysis [59].

415

416 Case 3. Design social play things [61]

417 This case is about technology for social play for mixed groups of neurodivergent and neurotypical
418 children. The well-being goal is to scaffold and support the development of complex social skills
419 through technology-facilitated social play. In the 'SocialPlayTechnologies' project the researchers
420 collaborated over the course of three years with two inclusive mainstream primary schools in Vienna,

421 Austria. Three social play technology prototypes were designed together with three groups of children,
422 aged 7 to 12 years. We selected this case due to researchers' effort to give children the lead in the
423 collaborative design process, their flexibility in adapting to the children's needs, and to showcase how
424 citizen science can be executed with challenging target groups (see Box 3 for a case description).
425

Box 3. Case description:

Design social play things

Social play is an essential part of children's healthy development. For neurodivergent children engaging in social play with neurotypical peers that have different interaction styles can be challenging, often leading to a preference for solitary play. This study sought to explore how digital technologies can facilitate and support social play among mixed groups of neurotypical and neurodiverse children. The aim was to create technologies that are engaging for both target groups, interactive, open-ended, robust, embedded in their natural play context, extendable, and non-normative. The researchers engaged in a long-term participatory design (PD) process with three groups of children aged 7 to 12 years in. In total 16 children participated as co-designers in this study. The PD process consisted of weekly or bi-weekly series of design workshops (50 in total across the three groups) with at least two research team members as facilitators. Groups were completely free in what social play technology they would design. The first phase of the PD process focussed on exploring children's perception of playfulness. This phase was followed by various technology immersion activities to introduce the children to sensors and actuators. In the next phase, researchers provided new input through material, scenarios, and narratives, while also narrowing the design space to agreed-upon ideas. When concepts were more concrete, researchers started to bring in first prototypes or groups collaboratively designed prototypes. Three distinct social play technologies were designed: 1) a concept with coloured fabrics embedded with interactive lighting called LightSpaces, 2) a set of interactive pads that trigger sounds called MusicPads, and 3) a concept consisting of a reading lamp with a Raspberry Pi, a camera and a projector called PictureStage.

Towards the end of the design process researchers worked on increasing the maturity of the prototypes for the purpose of evaluation. This evaluation phase is escribed in another paper.

426

427 The researchers applied a PD to reach their design goal of creating social play technologies suitable for
428 the different ways neurodivergent and neurotypical children make sense of the world, can only be
429 achieved by including these children directly in the design process [61]. As neurotypical adult
430 researchers they felt unequipped to imagine the children’s distinct sense making process in social play.
431 Similar reasoning on the value of PD is given by [42] who argue that PD ensures that a design solution
432 meets the target groups needs and beliefs, and is culturally relevant. Besides understanding
433 perspective and producing relevant design solutions, PD can provide other benefits to participants,
434 such as fostering agency and teaching useful skills [123]. The researchers’ design process was built on
435 previous PD work with children including co-operative Inquiry [128]. Co-operative inquiry has three
436 key elements: 1) children are regarded as research partners and involved throughout the design
437 process, 2) design activities with low-tech materials, and 3) technology immersion in which children
438 explore the design space of novel technologies. Yarosh and Schueller [2017] also worked with children
439 and showed methodological similarities by having co-operative inquiry as a framework to build their
440 PD process, and having long-term engagement since they met with the children twice a week for 14
441 design sessions [123].

442 Another concept, central in the researchers’ design process, is ‘Handlungsspielraum’ (in
443 English: room to act) [129]. To open up Handlungsspielraum it was important for the researchers to
444 create design activities that balance structure and freedom through the used materials, planned
445 activities, physical setting and role of the facilitator. While structure provides safety, guides
446 participants, and offers stimuli to participant, freedom allows participants to explore their creativity
447 and ideas. Researchers found that this balance between structure and freedom had a similar effect on
448 creativity within play. Hence, this balance was also reflected in the final prototypes through
449 modularity, manipulability and the option to use the prototypes without the technological component.

450 The researchers in this case tried to let children lead the design process. This is reflected in the fact
451 that each group came up with a different social play technology. Moreover, while the design process
452 followed the same overall blueprint across design groups, the overall pace and specific content of each
453 design session was different for each group and evolved based on the children's interest and
454 conceptions of playfulness. On the other hand, the researchers noted that they sometimes made
455 design decision contrary to the wishes of the children to limit the complexity of the designed
456 technologies.

457 Researchers in the current case indicated that working with a mixed group of neurotypical and
458 neurodivergent children was challenging, especially in the groups where no teacher was present.
459 Researchers had to act as mediators when conflict occurred between children and prepared for this
460 task by drawing on previous literature about appropriate design frameworks for this target group.
461 Moreover, they interviewed the teachers at the start of the design process to learn about the group
462 dynamics. Some team members received a training from a special needs educator to learn how to deal
463 with conflict.

464

465 Case 4. New voices to design exercise technology [78]

466 The technology in this case is a health promoting digital application to support vulnerable young adults
467 in exercising and physical activities. The 'Pulse Up project' is a collaboration of a general practitioner
468 (GP), community workers, and citizens in a neighbourhood in Denmark. Eighteen young adults, aged
469 18-30, suffering from depression and/or anxiety, and having a low level of physical activity,
470 participated in the exploration and manifestation of design ideas. This case is chosen because of the
471 situated PD process, the creative PD activities, and the inclusion of vulnerable citizens in the choice of
472 research activities, design ideas, analysis, and evaluation of each step in the process (see Box 4 for a
473 case description).

474

Box 4, case description

New voices to design exercise technology

Most research into digital technologies to support exercise is centred on people already engaged in exercise activities, while those who are challenged to exercise and are at risk of ill health due to low physical activity level have a limited voice in technology design. This research presents a PD process with young adults suffering from depression and/or anxiety, living in a neighbourhood identified as a high-risk health zone, and motivated but faced with challenges to exercise. The design process consisted of two interventions. The first intervention focussed on developing appropriate participatory methods for bringing new voices to the design of exercise technology and to gain initial insight to inform future design. The second intervention focussed on exploring and manifesting design ideas. Participants met twice a week for eight weeks in the neighbourhood's local gym to exercise with an instructor and participate in a total of 16 PD activities. Eleven young adults participated in the first intervention. Four continued in the second intervention, and seven new participants were recruited. Exercise itself was not challenging, but the challenge was in the sub-activities to complete before exercise. The participants created three visions to meet with this challenge: 1) dragging friends to exercise, 2) keeping an eye on the activities of group members, and 3) a 'join' functionality as an easy way to join activities. The participants' visions on exercise technology were low since they did not prioritize tracking and competition, health information or exercise instructions. However, based on their challenge, they created visions for digital support.

475

476 To bring the voices of vulnerable young adults into the design process of digital technologies to support

477 health promotion, Kanstrup et al [2016] chose for a situated PD [78]. The process combined physical

478 exercises with PD activities. Although the researchers initially planned to do the PD activities in a

479 classroom setting, the participants expressed a dislike of classrooms and preferred activities in the

480 gym. Therefore, the PD activities were integrated with the physical activities in the gym. To change the

481 setting, they made rules for the activities to emphasise on the need for professionalism, effectiveness,

482 and the ability to trigger design. This formed the foundation for the development of a design cycle with

483 progressive stages, supported by game-like PD activities, continuous analysis and evaluation of results.
484 All activities were developed as a fusion of training sessions with music and exercises, and PD activities.
485 In addition, Kanstrup et al. [2016] developed a variation of artefacts to trigger exercise and technology
486 design [78].

487 The previous case had a similar approach in their research of social playthings. Both the
488 location and the integration of playful activities became part of the design process. Yarosh and
489 Schueller [2017] also reported that they deviated from their original plan of putting the researchers in
490 charge of video-recording design sessions [123]. They decided to give the participants control over the
491 recording process to change the perceived power-imbalance between researchers (as data-collector)
492 and participants (as data-objects). These studies show the benefits of situated research in which group
493 activities are part of the research process. Although this situated approach can be in a physical place,
494 it can also be interpreted as a safe space for open discussions, as is visible in the study of Dewa et al.
495 [2020]. In their study with young people with mental health, a WhatsApp-group became the place for
496 open discussions between the co-researchers [51].

497 Each PD intervention was evaluated by the participants, who were engaged in an iterative
498 analytical process. Visualisations of analytical results were shared with the participants between two
499 interventions, and they were invited to reflect on the presented analysis and to reconstruct any
500 misinterpretations, missed insight or future visions. After the second intervention, the co-researchers
501 conducted a final analysis of the visions, in which they identified design elements for exercise
502 technology. The created visions move beyond an understanding of exercise technology for vulnerable
503 groups as simply information apps, towards an ambition to design mediators of community health
504 resources in which digital communication is the mediator for physical activities. This requires critical
505 insight about adolescent use of digital communication and the potential importance of messaging,
506 apps, gaming, wearable technology, and rapid changes in youth communication and use of digital
507 technology in developing adolescent physical activity health promotion. This is visible in the study of

508 Livingood et al [2017] in which they develop a digital communication intervention to reduce adolescent
509 obesity [94].

510

511 Case 5. A person-centred patient portal [81]

512 This study focuses on a patient portal app for patients with cancer. A patient portal is a secure
513 extension of an electronic medical record (EMR) of a health care institution where patients and
514 professionals have access to [130]. In the study of Kildea et al. [2019] participatory stakeholder co-
515 design was applied, involving patients and health care providers [81]. Data were collected between
516 2015 and 2018. This study was selected because of the interface between patients and the medical
517 world, and the authors strongly show their used participatory stakeholder co-design (see Box 5 for a
518 case description).

519

Box 5. Case description

Design and development of a patient portal (eHealth)

Patient portals represent a real-world example of patients facing electronic health (eHealth). Patient portals become important in daily care because they provide patients with personal health information and contribute to patient engagement and empowerment. A participatory stakeholder co-design was applied involving patients and health care providers. Six core elements were used: equal co-leadership, patient preference determination, security, governance, and legal input, user evaluation and feedback, continuous staff input, and end-user testing. Regarding 'equal co-leadership', all three co-leads, a patient, a radiation oncologist, and a medical physicist, were equally involved in decisions and in constant communication. 'Patient preference determination' was conducted by a voluntary convenience sampling survey, to obtain input from people receiving cancer treatment. For 'security, governance and legal input' purposes a Security and Governance team provided guidance regarding the security and confidentiality of patient data and compliance with applicable regulations. Three patients were participated in a focus group to provide 'user evaluation

and feedback'. The prototype was demonstrated, and participants were observed. A second focus group was conducted before pilot release, consisting of five members of the cancer centre's patients committee. 'Continuous staff' input was ensured by a clinical co-lead, radiation therapists, staff ranging from health care providers to senior management, medical physicists, oncology nurses, radiation oncologists, administrative assistants, and the board of directors of the institution. Finally, to ensure 'end-user testing', students and real patients tested the first version of the prototype.

520

521 In this case the differences between co-design, patient-centred design and person-centred design
522 were described. In co-design, patients help identify the process or project that needs to be designed
523 based on personal experience. Patient-centered design focuses on fulfilling the needs of the patients,
524 but the project may not have been identified by patients or involve patients. Person-centered design
525 focuses on patients' need as a whole person and as an equal partner in their care [131, 132]. Kildea et
526 al. [2019] described that the term patient co-design is often confused with patient-centered design
527 and person-centered design [81]. Therefore, the term participatory stakeholder co-design was
528 preferred as term in this study. Patients and clinicians were involved as equal partners, and both
529 actively participate in all parts of the design process [81]. Some other studies involving both patients
530 and health care providers used the term PD [42, 57, 74, 77, 85, 100, 104, 106, 108].

531 Furthermore, in this case an agile development approach was applied, which consisted of rapid
532 prototyping and testing of various features [133]. A team of developers, students in computer science
533 and medical physics, and co-leads worked together. This led towards a person-centered, clinician
534 acceptable, and informatics feasible patient portal. Comparable to this case, in the study of Leeming
535 and Thew [2017] a patient data platform was developed involving different stakeholders as part of a
536 steering group. Public and patient views were explored during design sessions, and the steering group
537 highlighted the key learnings from the feedback to guide the design [90].

538 Kildea et al. [2019] described several challenges during the process of this study [81]. For
539 example, the equal co-leadership, where patients are on an equal level as clinicians. This was often not

540 clear to people outside of the immediate design and development team because the hierarchical
541 health care system assumed that projects must be led by a clinician. Also, challenges regarding
542 security, governance, and legal input, especially time-consuming legal issues, were encountered, for
543 example intellectual property, liability, and the contents of the patient disclaimer form. However, as a
544 result of this study a final design of the patient portal smartphone app for patients with cancer was
545 developed from scratch within the health care system based on the principles of person-centeredness
546 design.

547

548 **Discussion**

549 **Main findings**

550 The aim was to provide insight in 1) the levels of citizen involvement in current research on
551 technological innovations for health, care or well-being, 2) the used participatory methodologies, and
552 3) lesson's learned by the researchers as described in identified records. From the 194 records included
553 after full text reading, 83 records involved citizens on a collaboration level in at least one research
554 phase. The level of citizen involvement differed across research phases. In contrast to the review of
555 Domecq et al. [2014] in which citizen involvement was lacking or tokenism in the data collection phase,
556 in our scoping review most citizens were involved in the data collection, and less in preparation or
557 evaluation [29].

558 The metrics of these 84 records show that there was a two-fold increase in one year between
559 2019 and 2020. This shows a growing interest in citizen science for health, care or well-being in the
560 last years. Health, care or well-being research was originally considered less adequate for citizen
561 science, but exceptions are arising [13]. The increase is also visible in the scientific journals that are
562 picking up citizen science as a separate field. The journal 'Citizen Science Theory and Practice' was a
563 first journal on citizen science, with a first issue in 2016 [134]. Other journals, such as PlosONE, include
564 citizen science as a search or subject area. In the domain of health, care or well-being the use of citizen
565 science was also incorporated recently, considering the entry of the Medical Subject Heading (MeSH)

566 in 2020. Looking at the countries where the citizen science studies were performed, most of the 83
567 records in our sample originated from developed countries. In the entire dataset (N=3846), there is a
568 lot of community-based research in developing countries, and in most research the citizens are
569 involved, but most records were excluded due to lack of technological innovation [135-138]. The
570 included studies show a variation in the number of citizens involved, but most studies did not include
571 more than 20. Although the number of citizens in the studies is often argued as sufficient or data
572 saturation was reached, it introduces the risk of recruiting only a minority of the population, often the
573 well-educated and most affluent citizens [37].

574 Apparent from all records was the terminology used to describe the research methodology or
575 the citizen involvement. The term citizen science was only used in two records and participatory design
576 was most prominent in the included records. Identical authors give different terms to their research
577 design across studies [42, 43, 46, 47, 86, 87], and when using similar terms, the authors base the
578 research method on different sources [86, 88]. Inclusion of all the different research methods is due
579 to our broad search string, however, this is in line with continuing discussions on the definition for
580 citizen science [11], and the acceptance of working in citizen science with different terms and
581 methodologies [12]. Den Broeder et al. [2018] also wrote “*some approaches in health research strongly*
582 *resemble citizen science, one of these is participatory action research*” [5]. However, they argue that
583 there is a main difference between participatory action research and citizen science, and that
584 difference is in the action part, which refers to the need to act, having change, addressing a specific
585 problem, or developing an intervention. Citizen science can also be a method used to do research
586 without a focus on any action. Furthermore, participatory action research aims towards a strong
587 involvement of citizens and in citizen science, the citizens can be engaged in a less intensive way [5].
588 Regarding the two records naming their research method citizen science, the level of involvement was
589 diverse. One aimed to reach a large audience with a citizen science-mass experiment with no focus on
590 action [49], and the other trained citizen scientists to become agents of change in their own

591 environment which had a focus on action [118]. These examples show that there is no consensus on
592 the use and terminology of citizen science and related methodologies.

593 These different views and approaches towards citizen science raise questions regarding the
594 value and benefits of citizen science. Greenwood et al. [2019] argue that active involvement of citizens
595 in the preparation phase ensures that the most relevant research questions will be asked [139]. Also,
596 successful involvement of citizens causes sensitivity and understanding of needs to incorporate in
597 design and implementation [61, 140]. Thereby increasing the chance of adoption and sustainable
598 implementation. Many records in this scoping review consider a form of citizen science to raise
599 awareness on health, care or well-being issues. This is in line with the benefits of citizen science for the
600 citizen scientists [8, 9]. However, little evaluation was done in the included empirical studies. Some
601 discussed the possible benefits for the citizen scientists, such as improved personal health. However,
602 these issues were not obtained from the citizens, but expected or experienced by the researchers. One
603 record discussed that the development team had the feeling of being heard and all ideas were
604 considered in the development [34], but it is often unknown how citizens have experienced their
605 contributions and if they would recognize their ideas as part of a prototype [141].

606 Compared to traditional science, citizen science asks for different research approaches and
607 skills from researchers. The selected cases imply that successful citizen science project develop a
608 structural and longitudinal partnership with their collaborators [45, 59, 61, 78, 81]. Citizen science
609 requires an open attitude, flexibility and context sensitivity from researchers. They have to give-up
610 traditional power dynamics, step away from their own expectations and pre-conceptions, be sensitive
611 to the signals of their co-researcher and be willing to engage in a mutual learning experience. For
612 example, researchers might have preconceived theoretical knowledge about the topic of interest and
613 probably about the research population, but this does not always align with the views of the co-
614 researchers. Yarosh and Schueller [2017] and Gobl et al. [2019] both underline that it is important that
615 the researchers learned how to engage and learn from the mental models and views of their co-
616 researchers [66, 123]. Being sensitive to the context and the co-researcher often means that pre-

617 planned methods and approaches have to be adapted on the fly to create a comfortable and
618 stimulating environment for citizens to actively engage in research [61, 78].

619

620 **Conclusion**

621 In this scoping review, our main interest was 1) the levels of citizen involvement in current research
622 on technological innovations for health, care or well-being, 2) the used participatory methodologies,
623 and 3) lesson's learned by the researchers. The increasing number of publications per year in the
624 period 2016-2020, shows the growing interest in citizens science in the field of health, care or well-
625 being. The records that surfaced in this review confirm the diversity of research methods that are
626 applied in citizen science for health care or well-being, mainly applying qualitative methods, often
627 tailored to the specific research problem and group of co-researchers. The five example cases
628 showcase how the contextuality of citizen science as a situated research approach has an impact on
629 the chosen research methods, analysis, and research results. Citizen science in this context requires an
630 open attitude towards how citizens are involved, who the involved citizens are, which methods are
631 used and what kind of topics are researched.

632 Based on this scoping review, the topic of the required flexibility of researchers in citizen
633 science projects is an opportunity for further research. Although citizen science projects could take
634 more time, it has a meaningful impact on researchers and citizen scientists [Dewa et al. 2020].
635 Researchers need to engage with co-researchers and find a balance between control and an open
636 structure. The records in this review show some directions to adapt and relinquish control based on
637 learning experience during the citizen science project. Explore this learning process in more depth
638 could provide further understanding and recommendations for researchers as well as citizen scientists
639 involved in citizen science projects. Where is guidance of researchers asked, where is it necessary to
640 give citizens more space, and when would you exert more supervision?

641 Another follow-up could include exploration of collaboration with vulnerable target groups.
642 The cases and other records in this review show that it is possible to actively involve and collaborate

643 with vulnerable target populations, with or without the use of proxies. Furthermore, based on the
644 minimal findings considering the value of citizen science for the involved citizens, motivation of
645 researchers to start collaborating and motivation of citizens to become active in a project, this could
646 be an interesting direction to explore. Connected to this question on the value of citizen science is the
647 question on the need of a high level of citizen involvement. This scoping review showed that the
648 involvement of citizens in citizen science projects could differ in each research phase. From the
649 included records, it cannot be discussed whether this difference in level of involvement effects the
650 project, research outcome or contribution of the citizens. Despite the lower levels of involvement in
651 one research phase or another, the contribution of citizens in other phases was worthwhile. Therefore,
652 it might be argued that a high level of involvement is not always necessary to execute a valuable citizen
653 science project, but we cannot draw firm conclusions without empirical evidence.

654

655 **Acknowledgements**

656 The authors thank all colleagues of TOPFIT Citizenlab for their regular support and collaboration.
657 Special thanks to R. Wolkorte and L. Heesink for their involvement at the start of this scoping review
658 and K.E. Konrad and M.E.M. den Ouden for their supervision.

659

660 **Author Contributions**

661 **Conceptualization:** Catharina M. van Leersum, Christina Jaschinski, Marloes Bults, Johan van der Zwart

662 **Data curation:** Johan van der Zwart

663 **Data analysis:** Catharina M. van Leersum, Christina Jaschinski, Marloes Bults, Johan van der Zwart

664 **Data interpretation:** Catharina M. van Leersum, Christina Jaschinski, Marloes Bults, Johan van der
665 Zwart

666 **Writing – first draft:** Catharina M. van Leersum

667 **Writing – review & editing:** Catharina M. van Leersum, Christina Jaschinski, Marloes Bults, Johan van
668 der Zwart

669

670 **References**

- 671 1. Liu JX, Goryakin Y, Maeda A, Bruckner T, Scheffler R. Global Health Workforce Labor Market
672 Projections for 2030. *Hum Resour Health*. 2017;15(1):11. Epub 2017/02/06. doi: 10.1186/s12960-017-
673 0187-2. PubMed PMID: 28159017; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5291995.
- 674 2. Krick T, Huter K, Domhoff D, Schmidt A, Rothgang H, Wolf-Ostermann K. Digital technology and
675 nursing care: a scoping review on acceptance, effectiveness and efficiency studies of informal and
676 formal care technologies. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2019;19(1):400. Epub 2019/06/22. doi:
677 10.1186/s12913-019-4238-3. PubMed PMID: 31221133; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6585079.
- 678 3. Wiggins A, Wilbanks J. The Rise of Citizen Science in Health and Biomedical Research. *Am J*
679 *Bioeth*. 2019;19(8):3-14. Epub 2019/07/25. doi: 10.1080/15265161.2019.1619859. PubMed PMID:
680 31339831.
- 681 4. Rosner H. Data on wings. *Sci Am*. 2013;308(2):68-73. Epub 2013/02/02. doi:
682 10.1038/scientificamerican0213-68. PubMed PMID: 23367787.
- 683 5. Den Broeder L, Devilee J, Van Oers H, Schuit AJ, Wagemakers A. Citizen Science for public
684 health. *Health Promot Int*. 2018;33(3):505-14. Epub 2016/12/25. doi: 10.1093/heapro/daw086.
685 PubMed PMID: 28011657; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6005099.
- 686 6. Irwin A. *Citizen Science: A Study of People, Expertise, and Sustainable Development*. London:
687 New York: Routledge; 1995.
- 688 7. Ceccaroni L, Woods SM, Sprinks J, Wilson S, Faustman EM, Bonn A, et al. *Citizen Science,*
689 *Health, and Environmental Justice*. Vohland K, Land-Zandstra A, Ceccaroni A, Lemmens R, Perelló J,
690 Ponti M, et al., editors: Springer, Cham; 2021.
- 691 8. Haywood B. A "Sense of Place" in Public Participation in Scientific Research. *Science Education*.
692 2013;98:64-83.
- 693 9. King AC, Winter SJ, Sheats JL, Rosas LG, Buman MP, Salvo D, et al. Leveraging Citizen Science
694 and Information Technology for Population Physical Activity Promotion. *Transl J Am Coll Sports Med*.

- 695 2016;1(4):30-44. Epub 2016/08/16. PubMed PMID: 27525309; PubMed Central PMCID:
696 PMCPMC4978140.
- 697 10. Auerbach J, Barthelmess EL, Cavalier D, Cooper CB, Fenyk H, Haklay M, et al. The problem with
698 delineating narrow criteria for citizen science. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2019;116(31):15336-7. Epub
699 2019/08/01. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1909278116. PubMed PMID: 31363074; PubMed Central PMCID:
700 PMCPMC6681715.
- 701 11. Heigl F, Kieslinger B, Paul KT, Uhlik J, Dorler D. Opinion: Toward an international definition of
702 citizen science. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2019;116(17):8089-92. Epub 2019/04/25. doi:
703 10.1073/pnas.1903393116. PubMed PMID: 31015357; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6486707.
- 704 12. Eitzel MV, Cappadonna JL, Santos-Lang C, Duerr RE, Virapongse A, West SE, et al. Citizen
705 Science Terminology Matters: Exploring Key Terms. *Citizen Science: Theory and Practice*. 2017;2:1-20.
- 706 13. Kullenberg C, Kasperowski D. What Is Citizen Science?--A Scientometric Meta-Analysis. *PLoS*
707 *One*. 2016;11(1):e0147152. Epub 2016/01/15. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0147152. PubMed PMID:
708 26766577; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4713078.
- 709 14. Huang J, Hmelo-Silver CE, Jordan R, Gray S, Frensley T, Newman G, et al. Scientific discourse of
710 citizen scientists: Models as a boundary object for collaborative problem solving. *Comput Hum Behav*.
711 2018;87:480-92. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2018.04.004. PubMed PMID: WOS:000441485600047.
- 712 15. Rafner J, Gajdacz M, Kragh G, Hjorth A, Gander A, Palfi B, et al. Revisiting Citizen Science
713 Through the Lens of Hybrid Intelligence. *arXiv*. 2021:34. doi: abs/2104.14961.
- 714 16. Danielsen F, Burgess ND, Coronado I, Enghoff M, Holt S, Jensen PM, et al. The value of
715 indigenous and local knowledge as citizen science. In: Hecker S, Haklay M, Bowser A, Makuch Z, Vogel
716 J, editors. *Citizen Science: Innovation in Open Science, Society and Policy*. London: UCL Press; 2018. p.
717 110-23.
- 718 17. Koepnick B, Flatten J, Husain T, Ford A, Silva DA, Bick MJ, et al. De novo protein design by citizen
719 scientists. *Nature*. 2019;570(7761):390-+. doi: 10.1038/s41586-019-1274-4. PubMed PMID:
720 WOS:000472145700069.

- 721 18. Snik F, Rietjens JHH, Apituley A, Volten H, Mijling B, Di Noia A, et al. Mapping atmospheric
722 aerosols with a citizen science network of smartphone spectropolarimeters. *Geophys Res Lett*.
723 2014;41(20):7351-8. doi: 10.1002/2014gl061462. PubMed PMID: WOS:000345343100046.
- 724 19. Wright J, Parry J, Mathers J. Participation in health impact assessment: objectives, methods
725 and core values. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2005;83(1):58-63. Epub 2005/02/01. doi: /S0042-
726 96862005000100015. PubMed PMID: 15682250; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2623465.
- 727 20. Burton P. Conceptual, Theoretical and Practical Issues in Measuring the Benefits of Public
728 Participation. *Evaluation*. 2009;15(3):263-84. doi: 10.1177/1356389009105881.
- 729 21. Ianniello M, Iacuzzi S, Fedele P, Brusati L. Obstacles and solutions on the ladder of citizen
730 participation: a systematic review. *Public Manag Rev*. 2019;21(1):21-46. doi:
731 10.1080/14719037.2018.1438499. PubMed PMID: WOS:000449712700003.
- 732 22. Carpini MXD, Cook FL, Jacobs LR. Public deliberation, discursive participation, and citizen
733 engagement: A review of the empirical literature. *Annu Rev Polit Sci*. 2004;7:315-44. doi:
734 10.1146/annurev.polisci.7.121003.091630. PubMed PMID: WOS:000222518100015.
- 735 23. Conrad CC, Hilchey KG. A review of citizen science and community-based environmental
736 monitoring: issues and opportunities. *Environ Monit Assess*. 2011;176(1-4):273-91. Epub 2010/07/20.
737 doi: 10.1007/s10661-010-1582-5. PubMed PMID: 20640506.
- 738 24. Garau C. Citizen Participation in Public Planning: A Literature Review. *International Journal of*
739 *Sciences*. 2012;1(12):21-44.
- 740 25. Irvin RA, Stansbury J. Citizen participation in decision making: Is it worth the effort? *Public*
741 *Admin Rev*. 2004;64(1):55-65. doi: DOI 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2004.00346.x. PubMed PMID:
742 WOS:000187666300005.
- 743 26. Kimura AH, Kinchy A. Citizen Science: Probing the Virtues and Contexts of Participatory
744 Research. *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society*. 2016;2:331-61. doi:
745 <https://doi.org/10.17351/ests2016.99>.

- 746 27. McGuire M. Collaborative Public Management: Assessing What We Know and How We Know
747 It. *Public Admin Rev.* 2006;66(S1):33-43. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00664.x.
- 748 28. Peter M, Diekötter T, Kremer K. Participant Outcomes of Biodiversity Citizen Science Projects:
749 A Systematic Literature Review. *Sustainability-Basel.* 2019;11(10). doi: ARTN 2780
750 10.3390/su11102780. PubMed PMID: WOS:000471010300063.
- 751 29. Domecq JP, Prutsky G, Elraiyah T, Wang Z, Nabhan M, Shippee N, et al. Patient engagement in
752 research: a systematic review. *Bmc Health Services Research.* 2014;14. doi: Artn 89
753 10.1186/1472-6963-14-89. PubMed PMID: WOS:000332614600001.
- 754 30. Malterud K, Elvbakken KT. Patients participating as co-researchers in health research: A
755 systematic review of outcomes and experiences. *Scand J Public Health.* 2020;48(6):617-28. Epub
756 2019/07/20. doi: 10.1177/1403494819863514. PubMed PMID: 31319762.
- 757 31. Arnstein SR. Ladder of Citizen Participation. *J Am Planners.* 1969;35(4):216-24. doi: Doi
758 10.1080/01944366908977225. PubMed PMID: WOS:A1969Y429300002.
- 759 32. Haklay M. Citizen Science and Volunteered Geographic Information: Overview and Typology of
760 Participation. Sui D, Elwood S, Goodchild M, editors. Dordrecht: Springer; 2013.
- 761 33. Kotus J. Position of the Polish city on the ladder of public participation: Are we going the right
762 way? The case of Poznan. *Cities.* 2013;35:226-36. doi: 10.1016/j.cities.2013.08.001. PubMed PMID:
763 WOS:000326847700025.
- 764 34. van Leersum CM, Moser A, van Steenkiste B, Reinartz M, Stoffers E, Wolf J, et al. What matters
765 to me - a web-based preference elicitation tool for clients in long-term care: a user-centred design.
766 *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak.* 2020;20(1):57. Epub 2020/03/19. doi: 10.1186/s12911-020-1067-6.
767 PubMed PMID: 32183786; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7077015.
- 768 35. Connor DM. A new ladder of citizen participation. *National Civic Review.* 1988;77(3):249-57.
769 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/ncr.4100770309>.

- 770 36. Heyen NB. Self-Tracking as Knowledge Production: Quantified Self between Prosumption and
771 Citizen Science. Selke S, editor. Wiesbaden: Springer VS; 2016.
- 772 37. Ferro E, Molinari F. Making Sense of Gov 2.0 Strategies: 'No Citizens, No Party'. Prosser A,
773 Parycek P, editors. Vienna (Austria)2009.
- 774 38. Munn Z, Peters MDJ, Stern C, Tufanaru C, McArthur A, Aromataris E. Systematic review or
775 scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review
776 approach. *Bmc Med Res Methodol*. 2018;18. doi: ARTN 143
777 10.1186/s12874-018-0611-x. PubMed PMID: WOS:000451310200002.
- 778 39. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International*
779 *Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 2005;8(1):19-32. doi: 10.1080/1364557032000119616.
- 780 40. Jackson N, Waters E, Guidelines for Systematic Reviews in Health P, Public Health T. Criteria
781 for the systematic review of health promotion and public health interventions. *Health Promot Int*.
782 2005;20(4):367-74. Epub 2005/09/20. doi: 10.1093/heapro/dai022. PubMed PMID: 16169885.
- 783 41. Behney C. Medical technology – contributions to health care, *The Future of Health in America*.
784 Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office; 1989.
- 785 42. Abbass-Dick J, Brolly M, Huizinga J, Newport A, Xie F, George S, et al. Designing an eHealth
786 Breastfeeding Resource With Indigenous Families Using a Participatory Design. *J Transcult Nurs*.
787 2018;29(5):480-8. Epub 2018/01/09. doi: 10.1177/1043659617731818. PubMed PMID: 29308703.
- 788 43. Abbass-Dick J, Chyzy B, Newport A, Huizinga J, Xie F. Designing an eHealth Breastfeeding
789 Resource With Young Mothers Using a Participatory Design. *J Transcult Nurs*. 2021;32(3):295-303.
790 Epub 2020/09/11. doi: 10.1177/1043659620957065. PubMed PMID: 32909517.
- 791 44. Ahmed R, Toscos T, Rohani Ghahari R, Holden RJ, Martin E, Wagner S, et al. Visualization of
792 Cardiac Implantable Electronic Device Data for Older Adults Using Participatory Design. *Appl Clin*
793 *Inform*. 2019;10(4):707-18. Epub 2019/09/19. doi: 10.1055/s-0039-1695794. PubMed PMID:
794 31533172; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6751067 Pharmaceuticals, and iRhythm Technologies,
795 Inc. M.M. declares the following: Compensation for services, Zoll Medical Corporation; Equity

796 interests/stock options-Non-public, Murj Inc./Viscardia; Equity interests/stock options-Public, iRhythm
797 Technologies; Research grants, Medtronic, Inc., Biotronik, Janssen Pharmaceuticals; and Indiana
798 University Trustee. R.A., R.R.G., C.D., R.H., S.W., A.C., and E.M. declare no conflicts of interest. Dr. Mirro
799 reports grants from Biotronik, Inc, during the conduct of the study; grants from Agency for Healthcare
800 Research and Quality (AHRQ), Medtronic plc, Janssen Scientific Affairs, consulting fees / honoraria from
801 iRhythm Technologies, Inc., Zoll Medical Corporation, and nonpublic equity/stock interest in Murj,
802 Inc./Viscardia outside the submitted work. Dr. Mirro's relationships with academia include serving as
803 trustee of Indiana University. Dr. Toscos reports grants from Biotronik, Inc, during the conduct of the
804 study; grants from Medtronic plc, Janssen Scientific Affairs, and iRhythm Technologies, Inc, outside the
805 submitted work.

806 45. Allin S, Shepherd J, Tomasone J, Munce S, Linassi G, Hossain SN, et al. Participatory Design of
807 an Online Self-Management Tool for Users With Spinal Cord Injury: Qualitative Study. *JMIR Rehabil*
808 *Assist Technol.* 2018;5(1):e6. Epub 2018/03/23. doi: 10.2196/rehab.8158. PubMed PMID: 29563075;
809 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5885063.

810 46. Arevian AC, O'Hora J, Jones F, Mango J, Jones L, Williams PG, et al. Participatory Technology
811 Development to Enhance Community Resilience. *Ethn Dis.* 2018;28(Suppl 2):493-502. Epub
812 2018/09/12. doi: 10.18865/ed.28.S2.493. PubMed PMID: 30202203; PubMed Central PMCID:
813 PMC6128332.

814 47. Arevian AC, O'Hora J, Rosser J, Mango JD, Miklowitz DJ, Wells KB. Patient and Provider
815 Cocreation of Mobile Texting Apps to Support Behavioral Health: Usability Study. *JMIR Mhealth*
816 *Uhealth.* 2020;8(7):e12655. Epub 2020/07/30. doi: 10.2196/12655. PubMed PMID: 32723714;
817 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7424494.

818 48. Ceasar J, Peters-Lawrence MH, Mitchell V, Powell-Wiley TM. The Communication, Awareness,
819 Relationships and Empowerment (C.A.R.E.) Model: An Effective Tool for Engaging Urban Communities
820 in Community-Based Participatory Research. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2017;14(11). Epub

- 821 2017/11/22. doi: 10.3390/ijerph14111422. PubMed PMID: 29160826; PubMed Central PMCID:
822 PMCPMC5708061.
- 823 49. De Cocker K, Chastin SFM, De Bourdeaudhuij I, Imbo I, Stragier J, Cardon G. Citizen Science to
824 Communicate about Public Health Messages: The Reach of a Playful Online Survey on Sitting Time and
825 Physical Activity. *Health Commun.* 2019;34(7):720-5. Epub 2018/02/08. doi:
826 10.1080/10410236.2018.1433955. PubMed PMID: 29412005.
- 827 50. DeRenzi B, Dell N, Wacksman J, Lee S, Lesh N. Supporting Community Health Workers in India
828 through Voice- and Web-Based Feedback. *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*;
829 New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2017. p. 2770–81.
- 830 51. Dewa LH, Lawrence-Jones A, Crandell C, Jaques J, Pickles K, Lavelle M, et al. Reflections, impact
831 and recommendations of a co-produced qualitative study with young people who have experience of
832 mental health difficulties. *Health Expect.* 2021;24 Suppl 1:134-46. Epub 2020/06/10. doi:
833 10.1111/hex.13088. PubMed PMID: 32515538; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8137486.
- 834 52. Doty JL, Brady SS, Monardez Popelka J, Rietveld L, Garcia-Huidobro D, Doty MJ, et al. Designing
835 a Mobile App to Enhance Parenting Skills of Latinx Parents: A Community-Based Participatory
836 Approach. *JMIR Form Res.* 2020;4(1):e12618. Epub 2020/02/06. doi: 10.2196/12618. PubMed PMID:
837 32012034; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7007588.
- 838 53. Edwards C, Costello E, Cassidy N, Vick B, Russell AM. Use of the patientMpower App With
839 Home-Based Spirometry to Monitor the Symptoms and Impact of Fibrotic Lung Conditions:
840 Longitudinal Observational Study. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth.* 2020;8(11):e16158. Epub 2020/11/21. doi:
841 10.2196/16158. PubMed PMID: 33216007; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7718088.
- 842 54. Elk R, Emanuel L, Hauser J, Bakitas M, Levkoff S. Developing and Testing the Feasibility of a
843 Culturally Based Tele-Palliative Care Consult Based on the Cultural Values and Preferences of Southern,
844 Rural African American and White Community Members: A Program by and for the Community. *Health
845 Equity.* 2020;4(1):52-83. Epub 2020/04/08. doi: 10.1089/heq.2019.0120. PubMed PMID: 32258958;
846 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7104898.

- 847 55. Erlingsdottir G, Rydenfalt C, Persson J, Johansson G. Conceptual Design of E-health Services by,
848 and for Support of, Home Care Staff. Proceedings of the 20th Congress of the International Ergonomics
849 Association (Iea 2018), Vol VII: Ergonomics in Design, Design for All, Activity Theories for Work Analysis
850 and Design, Affective Design. 2019;824:793-9. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-96071-5_83. PubMed PMID:
851 WOS:000473061800072.
- 852 56. Evans C, Turner K, Suggs LS, Occa A, Juma A, Blake H. Developing a mHealth intervention to
853 promote uptake of HIV testing among African communities in the conditions: a qualitative study. BMC
854 Public Health. 2016;16. doi: ARTN 656
855 10.1186/s12889-016-3278-4. PubMed PMID: WOS:000381003100005.
- 856 57. Ferguson M, Leighton P, Brandreth M, Wharrad H. Development of a multimedia educational
857 programme for first-time hearing aid users: a participatory design. Int J Audiol. 2018;57(8):600-9. Epub
858 2018/05/03. doi: 10.1080/14992027.2018.1457803. PubMed PMID: 29718733.
- 859 58. Ferri F, D'Andrea A, D'ulizia A, Grifoni P. Co-Creation of e-Learning Content: The Case Study of
860 a MOOC on Health and Cyber-Bullying. Journal of Universal Computer Science. 2020;26:200-19.
- 861 59. Fletcher S, Mullett J. Digital stories as a tool for health promotion and youth engagement. Can
862 J Public Health. 2016;107(2):e183-e7. Epub 2016/08/16. doi: 10.17269/cjph.107.5266. PubMed PMID:
863 27526216; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6972260.
- 864 60. Fraco Z, Hooyer K, Rizia R, Kowser Patwary ABM, Armstrong M, Semaan B, et al. Crisis Warning
865 Signs in mHealth for Military veterans: A Collaborative Design Approach. Proceedings of the ISCRAM
866 2016 Conference; Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Tapia, Antunes, Bañuls, Moore and Porto de Albuquerque;
867 2016.
- 868 61. Frauenberger C, Kender K, Scheepmaker L, Werner K, Spiel K. Designing Social Play Things.
869 Proceedings of the 11th Nordic Conference on Human-Computer Interaction: Shaping Experiences,
870 Shaping Society; New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 2020. p. 1-12.
- 871 62. Garcia FE, Brandao RP, Mendes GCD, Neris VPD. Able to Create, Able to (Self-)Improve: How
872 an Inclusive Game Framework Fostered Self-Improvement Through Creation and Play in Alcohol and

- 873 Drugs Rehabilitation. *Human-Computer Interaction - Interact* 2019, Pt I. 2019;11746:337-58. doi:
874 10.1007/978-3-030-29381-9_21. PubMed PMID: WOS:000561042200021.
- 875 63. Gardsten C, Mortberg C, Blomqvist K. Designing an ICT self-management service: suggestions
876 from persons with type 2 diabetes. *Health Technol-Ger.* 2017;7(2-3):197-206. doi: 10.1007/s12553-
877 016-0176-9. PubMed PMID: WOS:000423997100005.
- 878 64. Garmendia M, Epelde G, Zabala B, Sucre A, Etxeberría A, Cajaraville G, et al. ONKOVIS, Co-
879 designed Oncology Follow-up Visualisation Tool. *HEALTHINF*; Prague, Czech Republic2019.
- 880 65. Giroux D, Tremblay M, Latulippe K, Provencher V, Poulin V, Giguere A, et al. Promoting
881 Identification and Use of Aid Resources by Caregivers of Seniors: Co-Design of an Electronic Health
882 Tool. *JMIR Aging.* 2019;2(2):e12314. Epub 2019/09/14. doi: 10.2196/12314. PubMed PMID: 31518284;
883 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6744817.
- 884 66. Gobl B, Hristova D, Jovicic S, Chevron MF, Sluneco T, Hlavacs H. Fostering Social Media
885 Literacy through a Participatory Mixed-Methods Approach: Discussion of Workshop Findings. *Int
886 Conf Seriou.* 2019. PubMed PMID: WOS:000556154500033.
- 887 67. Grant C, Widnall E, Cross L, Simonoff E, Downs J. Informing the development of an E-platform
888 for monitoring wellbeing in schools: involving young people in a co-design process. *Res Involv
889 Engagem.* 2020;6:51. Epub 2020/09/11. doi: 10.1186/s40900-020-00219-0. PubMed PMID: 32908677;
890 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC67470434.
- 891 68. Haufe M, Peek STM, Luijckx KG. Matching gerontechnologies to independent-living seniors'
892 individual needs: development of the GTM tool. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2019;19(1):26. Epub
893 2019/01/13. doi: 10.1186/s12913-018-3848-5. PubMed PMID: 30634971; PubMed Central PMCID:
894 PMC6329159.
- 895 69. Hernandez HA, Khan A, Fay L, Roy JS, Biddiss E. Force Resistance Training in Hand Grasp and
896 Arm Therapy: Feasibility of a Low-Cost Videogame Controller. *Games Health J.* 2018;7(4):277-87. Epub
897 2018/08/15. doi: 10.1089/g4h.2017.0193. PubMed PMID: 30106641.

- 898 70. Hill ME, Bodnar P, Fenton R, Mason B, Bandoh G. Teach Our Children: Stroke Education for
899 Indigenous Children, First Nations, Ontario, Canada, 2009-2012. *Prev Chronic Dis.* 2017;14:E68. Epub
900 2017/08/18. doi: 10.5888/pcd14.160506. PubMed PMID: 28817789; PubMed Central PMCID:
901 PMCPMC5716642.
- 902 71. Hiratsuka VY, Moore L, Avey JP, Dirks LG, Beach BD, Dillard DA, et al. An Internet-Based
903 Therapeutic Tool for American Indian/Alaska Native Adults With Posttraumatic Stress Disorder: User
904 Testing and Developmental Feasibility Study. *JMIR Form Res.* 2019;3(4):e13682. Epub 2019/11/14. doi:
905 10.2196/13682. PubMed PMID: 31719027; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6914281.
- 906 72. Hong MK, Lakshmi U, Olson TA, Wilcox L. Visual ODLs: Co-Designing Patient-Generated
907 Observations of Daily Living to Support Data-Driven Conversations in Pediatric Care. *Proceedings of*
908 *the 2018 Chi Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Chi 2018).* 2018. doi:
909 10.1145/3173574.3174050. PubMed PMID: WOS:000509673105077.
- 910 73. Jarke J, Gerhard U, Kubicek H. Co-creating digital public services with older citizens: Challenges
911 and opportunities. In: David K, Geihs K, Lange M, Stumme G, editors. *INFORMATIK: 50 Jahre*
912 *Gesellschaft für Informatik – Informatik für Gesellschaft; Kassel, Germany; Bonn: Gesellschaft für*
913 *Informatik e.V.; 2019. p. 51-64.*
- 914 74. Jessen S, Mirkovic J, Nes LS. MyStrengths, a Strengths-Focused Mobile Health Tool:
915 Participatory Design and Development. *JMIR Form Res.* 2020;4(7):e18049. Epub 2020/07/25. doi:
916 10.2196/18049. PubMed PMID: 32706651; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7414410.
- 917 75. Jessen S, Mirkovic J, Ruland CM. Creating Gameful Design in mHealth: A Participatory Co-
918 Design Approach. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth.* 2018;6(12):e11579. Epub 2018/12/16. doi: 10.2196/11579.
919 PubMed PMID: 30552080; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6315237.
- 920 76. Jo E, Toombs AL, Gray CM, Hong H. Understanding Parenting Stress through Co-designed Self-
921 Trackers. *Proceedings of the 2020 Chi Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Chi'20).*
922 2020. doi: 10.1145/3313831.3376359. PubMed PMID: WOS:000695438100032.

- 923 77. Jorgensen TS, Skougaard M, Taylor PC, Asmussen HC, Lee A, Klokke L, et al. The Parker Model:
924 Applying a Qualitative Three-Step Approach to Optimally Utilize Input from Stakeholders When
925 Introducing New Device Technologies in the Management of Chronic Rheumatic Diseases. *Patient*.
926 2018;11(5):515-26. doi: 10.1007/s40271-018-0306-8. PubMed PMID: WOS:000444011000006.
- 927 78. Kanstrup AM, Bertelsen P. Bringing new voices to design of exercise technology: participatory
928 design with vulnerable young adults. *Participatory Design Conference*; New York, NY, USA: Association
929 for Computing Machinery; 2016. p. 121-30.
- 930 79. Kearns A, Kelly H, Pitt I. Rating experience of ICT-delivered aphasia rehabilitation: co-design of
931 a feedback questionnaire. *Aphasiology*. 2020;34(3):319-42. doi: 10.1080/02687038.2019.1649913.
- 932 80. Kenning G, Treadaway C. Designing for Dementia: Iterative Grief and Transitional Objects. *Des*
933 *Issues*. 2018;34(1):42-53. doi: 10.1162/DESI_a_00475. PubMed PMID: WOS:000419156800005.
- 934 81. Kildea J, Battista J, Cabral B, Hendren L, Herrera D, Hijal T, et al. Design and Development of a
935 Person-Centered Patient Portal Using Participatory Stakeholder Co-Design. *J Med Internet Res*.
936 2019;21(2). doi: ARTN e11371
937 10.2196/11371. PubMed PMID: WOS:000458303900001.
- 938 82. Kim SI, Jo E, Ryu M, Cha I, Kim YH, Yoo H, et al. Toward Becoming a Better Self: Understanding
939 Self-Tracking Experiences of Adolescents with Autism Spectrum Disorder Using Custom Trackers. *Int*
940 *Conf Per Comp*. 2019:169-78. doi: 10.1145/3329189.3329209. PubMed PMID:
941 WOS:000482176100018.
- 942 83. LaMonica HM, Milton A, Braunstein K, Rowe SC, Ottavio A, Jackson T, et al. Technology-Enabled
943 Solutions for Australian Mental Health Services Reform: Impact Evaluation. *JMIR Form Res*.
944 2020;4(11):e18759. Epub 2020/11/20. doi: 10.2196/18759. PubMed PMID: 33211024; PubMed
945 Central PMCID: PMC7714649.
- 946 84. Lan Hing Ting K, Dessinger G, Voilmy D. Examining Usage to Ensure Utility: Co-Design of a Tool
947 for Fall Prevention. *Irbm*. 2020;41(5):286-93. doi: 10.1016/j.irbm.2020.03.001. PubMed PMID:
948 WOS:000576259700006.

- 949 85. Larsen SB, Sorensen NS, Petersen MG, Kjeldsen GF. Towards a shared service centre for
950 telemedicine: Telemedicine in Denmark, and a possible way forward. *Health Informatics J.*
951 2016;22(4):815-27. Epub 2015/08/12. doi: 10.1177/1460458215592042. PubMed PMID: 26261216;
952 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5117122.
- 953 86. Latulippe K, Hamel C, Giroux D. Co-Design to Support the Development of Inclusive eHealth
954 Tools for Caregivers of Functionally Dependent Older Persons: Social Justice Design. *J Med Internet*
955 *Res.* 2020;22(11):e18399. Epub 2020/11/10. doi: 10.2196/18399. PubMed PMID: 33164905; PubMed
956 Central PMCID: PMC7683256.
- 957 87. Latulippe K, Hamel C, Giroux D. Integration of Conversion Factors for the Development of an
958 Inclusive eHealth Tool With Caregivers of Functionally Dependent Older Persons: Social Justice Design.
959 *JMIR Hum Factors.* 2020;7(3):e18120. Epub 2020/08/28. doi: 10.2196/18120. PubMed PMID:
960 32845242; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7481878.
- 961 88. Latulippe K, Tremblay M, Poulin V, Provencher V, Giguere AM, Sevigny A, et al. Prioritizing the
962 Needs of Caregivers of Older Adults to Support Their Help-Seeking Process as a First Step to Developing
963 an eHealth Tool: The Technique for Research of Information by Animation of a Group of Experts
964 (TRIAGE) Method. *JMIR Aging.* 2019;2(1):e12271. Epub 2019/09/14. doi: 10.2196/12271. PubMed
965 PMID: 31518269; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6716487.
- 966 89. Lee HR, Sabanovic S, Chang WL, Nagata S, Piatt J, Bennett C, et al. Steps Toward Participatory
967 Design of Social Robots: Mutual Learning with Older Adults with Depression. *Acmeeee Int Conf Hum.*
968 2017;244-53. doi: 10.1145/2909824.3020237. PubMed PMID: WOS:000463724200027.
- 969 90. Leeming G, Thew S. DataWell: Public Involvement in the Development of a Federated Platform
970 for Shared Patient Records in Greater Manchester, UK. *Stud Health Technol.* 2017;244:48-52. doi:
971 10.3233/978-1-61499-824-2-48. PubMed PMID: WOS:000450270500010.
- 972 91. Leong TW, Johnston B. Co-design and Robots: A Case Study of a Robot Dog for Aging People.
973 *Lect Notes Artif Int.* 2016;9979:702-11. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-47437-3_69. PubMed PMID:
974 WOS:000389816500069.

- 975 92. Leslie M, Khayatzadeh-Mahani A, MacKean G. Recruitment of caregivers into health services
976 research: lessons from a user-centred design study. *Res Involv Engagem.* 2019;5:17. Epub 2019/05/30.
977 doi: 10.1186/s40900-019-0150-6. PubMed PMID: 31139432; PubMed Central PMCID:
978 PMCPMC6528243.
- 979 93. Limaye NP, Rivas-Nieto AC, Carcamo CP, Blas MM. Nuestras Historias- Designing a novel digital
980 story intervention through participatory methods to improve maternal and child health in the Peruvian
981 Amazon. *PLoS One.* 2018;13(11):e0205673. Epub 2018/11/06. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0205673.
982 PubMed PMID: 30396200; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6218201.
- 983 94. Livingood WC, Monticalvo D, Bernhardt JM, Wells KT, Harris T, Kee K, et al. Engaging
984 Adolescents Through Participatory and Qualitative Research Methods to Develop a Digital
985 Communication Intervention to Reduce Adolescent Obesity. *Health Educ Behav.* 2017;44(4):570-80.
986 Epub 2016/11/05. doi: 10.1177/1090198116677216. PubMed PMID: 27811164.
- 987 95. Lo B, Zhang T, Leung K, Mehta R, Kuziemy C, Booth RG, et al. Identifying best approaches for
988 engaging patients and family members in health informatics initiatives: a case study of the Group
989 Priority Sort technique. *Res Involv Engagem.* 2020;6:25. Epub 2020/06/02. doi: 10.1186/s40900-020-
990 00203-8. PubMed PMID: 32477591; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7236324.
- 991 96. Lockerbie J, Maiden N. Modelling the quality of life goals of people living with dementia.
992 *Information Systems.* 2022;104:N.PAG-N.PAG. PubMed PMID: 153961956.
- 993 97. Lu Y, Valk C, Steenbakkens J, Bekker T, Visser T, Proctor G, et al. Can technology adoption for
994 older adults be co-created? *Gerontechnology.* 2017;16(3):151-9. doi:
995 <https://doi.org/10.4017/gt.2017.16.3.004.00>.
- 996 98. Maertens JA, Jimenez-Zambrano AM, Albright K, Dempsey AF. Using Community Engagement
997 to Develop a Web-Based Intervention for Latinos about the HPV Vaccine. *J Health Commun.*
998 2017;22(4):285-93. doi: 10.1080/10810730.2016.1275890. PubMed PMID: WOS:000397988300001.

- 999 99. Martin A, Caon M, Adorni F, Andreoni G, Ascolese A, Atkinson S, et al. A Mobile Phone
1000 Intervention to Improve Obesity-Related Health Behaviors of Adolescents Across Europe: Iterative Co-
1001 Design and Feasibility Study. *Jmir Mhealth and Uhealth*. 2020;8(3). doi: ARTN e14118
1002 10.2196/14118. PubMed PMID: WOS:000517542500001.
- 1003 100. Matthews M, Abdullah S, Gay G, Choudhury T. Detecting and Capitalizing on Physiological
1004 Dimensions of Psychiatric Illness. *Physics: Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on*
1005 *Physiological Computing Systems*. 2016:98-104. doi: 10.5220/0005952600980104. PubMed PMID:
1006 WOS:000387282000010.
- 1007 101. Mburu CW, Wardle CJ, Joolay Y, Densmore M. Co-designing with Mothers and Neonatal Unit
1008 Staff: Use of Technology to Support Mothers of Preterm Infants. *Proceedings of the Second African*
1009 *Conference for Human Computer Interaction: Thriving Communities (Africhi)*. 2018:118-27. doi:
1010 10.1145/3283458.3283487. PubMed PMID: WOS:000475845000012.
- 1011 102. McMillan B, Fox S, Lyons M, Bourke S, Mistry M, Ruddock A, et al. Using patient and public
1012 involvement to improve the research design and funding application for a project aimed at fostering a
1013 more collaborative approach to the NHS health check: the CaVIAR project (better Care Via Improved
1014 Access to Records). *Research Involvement and Engagement*. 2018;4(18). doi: 10.1186/s40900-018-
1015 0101-7.
- 1016 103. McNaney R, Vines J, Mercer J, Mexter L, Welsh D, Young T. DemYouth: Co-Designing and
1017 Enacting Tools to Support Young People's Engagement with People with Dementia. *Proceedings of the*
1018 *2017 Acm Sigchi Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Chi'17)*. 2017:1313-25. doi:
1019 10.1145/3025453.3025558. PubMed PMID: WOS:000426970501029.
- 1020 104. Miller AD, Pollack AH, Pratt W. Bursting the Information Bubble: Identifying Opportunities for
1021 Pediatric Patient-Centered Technology. *AMIA Annu Symp Proc*. 2016;2016:894-903. Epub 2017/03/09.
1022 PubMed PMID: 28269886; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5333303.
- 1023 105. Mrklas KJ, Barber T, Campbell-Scherer D, Green LA, Li LC, Marlett N, et al. Co-Design in the
1024 Development of a Mobile Health App for the Management of Knee Osteoarthritis by Patients and

- 1025 Physicians: Qualitative Study. JMIR Mhealth Uhealth. 2020;8(7):e17893. Epub 2020/07/17. doi:
1026 10.2196/17893. PubMed PMID: 32673245; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7382016.
- 1027 106. Naeemabadi M, Sondergaard JH, Klastrup A, Schlunsen AP, Lauritsen REK, Hansen J, et al.
1028 Development of an individualized asynchronous sensor-based telerehabilitation program for patients
1029 undergoing total knee replacement: Participatory design. Health Informatics J. 2020;26(4):2492-511.
1030 Epub 2020/03/17. doi: 10.1177/1460458220909779. PubMed PMID: 32175788.
- 1031 107. Payton FC. Cultures of participation for students, by students. Inform Syst J. 2016;26(4):319-38.
1032 doi: 10.1111/isj.12086. PubMed PMID: WOS:000378422300002.
- 1033 108. Rabba AS, Dissanayake C, Barbaro J. Development of a Web-Based Resource for Parents of
1034 Young Children Newly Diagnosed With Autism: Participatory Research Design. Jmir Pediatr Parent.
1035 2020;3(2). doi: ARTN e15786
1036 PMID 32996890
- 1037 10.2196/15786. PubMed PMID: WOS:000780472700001.
- 1038 109. Rai T, Morton K, Roman C, Doogue R, Rice C, Williams M, et al. Optimizing a digital intervention
1039 for managing blood pressure in stroke patients using a diverse sample: Integrating the person-based
1040 approach and patient and public involvement. Health Expect. 2021;24(2):327-40. doi:
1041 10.1111/hex.13173. PubMed PMID: WOS:000598279600001.
- 1042 110. Rathnayake S, Moyle W, Jones C, Calleja P. Co-design of an mHealth application for family
1043 caregivers of people with dementia to address functional disability care needs. Inform Health Soc Ca.
1044 2021;46(1):1-17. doi: 10.1080/17538157.2020.1793347. PubMed PMID: WOS:000551619200001.
- 1045 111. Reade S, Spencer K, Sergeant JC, Sperrin M, Schultz DM, Ainsworth J, et al. Cloudy with a
1046 Chance of Pain: Engagement and Subsequent Attrition of Daily Data Entry in a Smartphone Pilot Study
1047 Tracking Weather, Disease Severity, and Physical Activity in Patients With Rheumatoid Arthritis. JMIR
1048 Mhealth Uhealth. 2017;5(3):e37. Epub 2017/03/28. doi: 10.2196/mhealth.6496. PubMed PMID:
1049 28341616; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7384994.


- 1050 112. Russ S, Latif Z, Hazell AL, Ogunmuyiwa H, Tapper J, Wachuku-King S, et al. A Smartphone App
1051 Designed to Empower Patients to Contribute Toward Safer Surgical Care: Community-Based Evaluation
1052 Using a Participatory Approach. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2020;8(1):e12859. Epub 2020/01/21. doi:
1053 10.2196/12859. PubMed PMID: 31958067; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6997920.
- 1054 113. Sin J, Henderson C, Woodham LA, Sese Hernandez A, Gillard S. A Multicomponent eHealth
1055 Intervention for Family Carers for People Affected by Psychosis: A Coproduced Design and Build Study.
1056 *J Med Internet Res*. 2019;21(8):e14374. Epub 2019/08/08. doi: 10.2196/14374. PubMed PMID:
1057 31389333; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6701165.
- 1058 114. Skovlund PC, Nielsen BK, Thaysen HV, Schmidt H, Finset A, Hansen KA, et al. The impact of
1059 patient involvement in research: a case study of the planning, conduct and dissemination of a clinical,
1060 controlled trial. *Res Involv Engagem*. 2020;6:43. Epub 2020/07/24. doi: 10.1186/s40900-020-00214-5.
1061 PubMed PMID: 32699648; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC67370448.
- 1062 115. Solem IKL, Varsi C, Eide H, Kristjansdottir OB, Borosund E, Schreurs KMG, et al. A User-Centered
1063 Approach to an Evidence-Based Electronic Health Pain Management Intervention for People With
1064 Chronic Pain: Design and Development of EPIO. *J Med Internet Res*. 2020;22(1). doi: ARTN e15889
1065 10.2196/15889. PubMed PMID: WOS:000508423800001.
- 1066 116. Synnot AJ, Hawkins M, Merner BA, Summers MP, Filippini G, Osborne RH, et al. Producing an
1067 evidence-based treatment information website in partnership with people affected by multiple
1068 sclerosis. *Health Sci Rep-Us*. 2018;1(3). doi: ARTN e24
1069 10.1002/hsr2.24. PubMed PMID: WOS:000700750200004.
- 1070 117. Tsvyatkova D, Storni C. Designing an educational interactive eBook for newly diagnosed
1071 children with type 1 diabetes: Mapping a new design space. *International Journal of Child-Computer
1072 Interaction*. 2019;19:1-18.
- 1073 118. Tuckett AG, Freeman A, Hetherington S, Gardiner PA, King AC, Burnie Brae Citizen S. Older
1074 Adults Using Our Voice Citizen Science to Create Change in Their Neighborhood Environment. *Int J*

- 1075 Environ Res Public Health. 2018;15(12). Epub 2018/11/30. doi: 10.3390/ijerph15122685. PubMed
1076 PMID: 30487444; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6313568.
- 1077 119. Vacca R. Brokering Data: Co-Designing Technology with Latina Teens to Support
1078 Communication with Parents Leveraging Cultural Practices of Latinx Youth through Co-Design.
1079 Proceedings of Acm Interaction Design and Children (Idc 2019). 2019:197-207. doi:
1080 10.1145/3311927.3323142. PubMed PMID: WOS:000559055100022.
- 1081 120. Vallentin-Holbech L, Guldager JD, Dietrich T, Rundle-Thiele S, Majgaard G, Lyk P, et al. Co-
1082 Creating a Virtual Alcohol Prevention Simulation with Young People. Int J Env Res Pub He. 2020;17(3).
1083 doi: ARTN 1097
1084 10.3390/ijerph17031097. PubMed PMID: WOS:000517783300422.
- 1085 121. Vilarinho T, Floch J, Stav E. Co-designing a mHealth Application for Self-management of Cystic
1086 Fibrosis. Lect Notes Comput Sc. 2017;10515:3-22. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-67687-6_1. PubMed PMID:
1087 WOS:000452224900001.
- 1088 122. Wikman A, Kukkola L, Borjesson H, Cernvall M, Woodford J, Gronqvist H, et al. Development
1089 of an Internet-Administered Cognitive Behavior Therapy Program (ENGAGE) for Parents of Children
1090 Previously Treated for Cancer: Participatory Action Research Approach. J Med Internet Res.
1091 2018;20(4). doi: ARTN e133
1092 10.2196/jmir.9457. PubMed PMID: WOS:000430392800001.
- 1093 123. Yarosh S, Schueller SM. "Happiness Inventors": Informing Positive Computing Technologies
1094 Through Participatory Design With Children. J Med Internet Res. 2017;19(1). doi: ARTN e14
1095 10.2196/jmir.6822. PubMed PMID: WOS:000392330900022.
- 1096 124. Spinuzzi C. The methodology of participatory design. Tech Commun-Stc. 2005;52(2):163-74.
1097 PubMed PMID: WOS:000228954800005.
- 1098 125. McIntyre A. Participatory Action Research. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications; 2007.

- 1099 126. Kindon S, Pain R, Kesby M. Participatory action research approaches and methods: connecting
1100 people, participation and place. New York: Routledge; 2008.
- 1101 127. Baum F, MacDougall C, Smith D. Participatory action research. *J Epidemiol Community Health*.
1102 2006;60(10):854-7. Epub 2006/09/16. doi: 10.1136/jech.2004.028662. PubMed PMID: 16973531;
1103 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC2566051.
- 1104 128. Druin A, editor *Cooperative Inquiry: Developing New Technologies for Children with Children*.
1105 SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems; 1999: ACM, New York, NY, USA.
- 1106 129. Makhaeva J, Frauenberger C, Spiel K, editors. *Creating Creative Spaces for Co-Designing with*
1107 *Autistic Children – The concept of a “Handlungsspielraum”*. 14th Participatory Design; 2016: ACM
1108 Press, Aarhus, Denmark.
- 1109 130. Irizarry T, DeVito Dabbs A, Curran CR. Patient Portals and Patient Engagement: A State of the
1110 Science Review. *J Med Internet Res*. 2015;17(6):e148. Epub 2015/06/25. doi: 10.2196/jmir.4255.
1111 PubMed PMID: 26104044; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4526960.
- 1112 131. Bate P, Robert G. Experience-based design: from redesigning the system around the patient to
1113 co-designing services with the patient. *Qual Saf Health Care*. 2006;15(5):307-10. Epub 2006/11/01. doi:
1114 10.1136/qshc.2005.016527. PubMed PMID: 17074863; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC2565809.
- 1115 132. Ekman I, Swedberg K, Taft C, Lindseth A, Norberg A, Brink E, et al. Person-centered care--ready
1116 for prime time. *Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs*. 2011;10(4):248-51. Epub 2011/07/19. doi:
1117 10.1016/j.ejcnurse.2011.06.008. PubMed PMID: 21764386.
- 1118 133. Beck K, Beedle M, van Bennekum A, Cockburn A, Cunningham W, Fowler M, et al. Principles
1119 behind the agile manifesto 2001 [cited 2022 september]. Available from:
1120 <http://agilemanifesto.org/principles.html>.
- 1121 134. Bonney R, Cooper C, Ballard H. *The Theory and Practice of Citizen Science: Launching a New*
1122 *Journal*. *Citizen Science: Theory and Practice*. 2016;1(1):1. doi: <http://doi.org/10.5334/cstp.65>
- 1123 135. Healey J, Conlon CM, Malama K, Hobson R, Kaharuza F, Kekitiinwa A, et al. Sustainability and
1124 Scale of the Saving Mothers, Giving Life Approach in Uganda and Zambia. *Glob Health Sci Pract*.

- 1125 2019;7(Suppl 1):S188-S206. Epub 2019/03/15. doi: 10.9745/GHSP-D-18-00265. PubMed PMID:
1126 30867217; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6519672.
- 1127 136. Hodes R, Doubt J, Toska E, Vale B, Zungu N, Cluver L. The stuff that dreams are made of: HIV-
1128 positive adolescents' aspirations for development. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2018;21 Suppl 1. Epub 2018/02/28.
1129 doi: 10.1002/jia2.25057. PubMed PMID: 29485764; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC65978641.
- 1130 137. Iles IA, Nan XL, Ma ZX, Feldman R, Butler J, Wang MQ, et al. Self-affirmation and defensive
1131 processing of graphic cigarette warning labels by African American smokers: A community-based
1132 study. *Health Educ J.* 2019;78(3):301-14. doi: 10.1177/0017896918805129. PubMed PMID:
1133 WOS:000460983700005.
- 1134 138. Kalokhe AS, Iyer S, Katendra T, Gadhe K, Kolhe AR, Paranjape A, et al. Primary Prevention of
1135 Intimate Partner Violence Among Recently Married Dyads Residing in the Slums of Pune, India:
1136 Development and Rationale for a Dyadic Intervention. *Jmir Res Protoc.* 2019;8(1). doi: ARTN e11533
1137 10.2196/11533. PubMed PMID: WOS:000457502500050.
- 1138 139. Greenwood DA, Litchman ML, Ng AH, Gee PM, Young HM, Ferrer M, et al. Development of the
1139 Intercultural Diabetes Online Community Research Council: Codesign and Social Media Processes. *J*
1140 *Diabetes Sci Technol.* 2019;13(2):176-86. Epub 2019/01/08. doi: 10.1177/1932296818818455.
1141 PubMed PMID: 30614252; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6399805.
- 1142 140. Ostrow L, Penney D, Stuart E, Leaf PJ. Web-based Survey Data Collection With Peer Support
1143 and Advocacy Organizations: Implications of Participatory Methods. *Prog Community Health*
1144 *Partnersh.* 2017;11(1):45-52. Epub 2017/06/13. doi: 10.1353/cpr.2017.0006. PubMed PMID:
1145 28603150.
- 1146 141. Bratteteig T, Wagner I, editors. What is a participatory design result? 14th Participatory Design
1147 Conference; 2016: ACM Press, Aarhus, Denmark.

Socping review search



Search terms

Involvement

Citizen science; Participatory research; User involvement; Citizen engagement; Citizen knowledge; Patient and public involvement; Community-based participatory research; Community engagement; Community participation; Citizen participation; Co-creation; Co-design; Participatory design; Co-production; User-centred design

AND

Health

Health; Healthcare; Care; Wellbeing; Well-being; Lifestyle; Healthy

AND

Technology innovation

Innovation; technology; App; Digital; Robotics; Robots; Smart; Gaming; Web based; Games; Game design; Tool; Computer-based; Ehealth, E-health; Telehealth; M-health; Mhealth; Mobile health; E-therapy; Digital health

AND

Citizens

Citizen; Public; Community; Patients; Clients; Elderly; Seniors; Caregivers; Neighbours; Family; Children; Parents; Adult

Fig 1