GRIPP2-SF Item	Description
1.Aims: Report the aim of PPI in the study	*i) Ensure there is a patient voice included at all stages of the EURIPIDES study* *ii) WP1: To discuss the scoping study themes and to identify additional ones users feel are important* *iii) WP1: To discuss the themes and sub-themes identified in the main review to ensure face and content validity*
2.Methods: Provide a clear description of the methods used for PPI in the study	*The Patient and Public Involvement Team (PPIT) was established by the Mental Health Foundation. Members varying in background and experience. This reference group met regularly and at key points during the study. The group were facilitated by DCK who ensured they felt able, and were supported, to contribute and challenge.*
3.Study results Outcomes: Report the results of PPI in the study, including both positive and negative outcomes	*The PPIT provided a strong user and carer perspective. They critiqued the content of the themes identified in the scoping review, identifying additional areas such as boredom. They provided content and face validity of the themes and sub-themes identified in the main review. They provided real life examples of the themes from their own experiences. The PPIT also provided an opportunity to check the themes from studies resonated in a UK context.*
4. Discussion and conclusions Outcomes: Comment on the extent to which PPI influenced the study overall. Describe positive and negative effects	*The PPIT was important in confirming the systematic review had identified the themes of importance to service users and carers. This was particularly important because the strength of the patient voice was uncertain in the papers reviewed.*
5.Reflections/critical perspective: Comment critically on the study, reflecting on the things that went well and those that did not, so others can learn from this experience	*The PPIT worked well in the study. On reflection more embedded forms of involvement, with members of the group working more closely on the analysis may have embedded the user voice more strongly into the study and could have created the conditions for the co-production of knowledge and possibly additional sub-themes.*