

Peer Review

# Review of: "Trust and Trade: Patient Perspectives on the Ethics of Real-World Data Monetisation"

Pam Enderby<sup>1</sup>

1. School of Medicine and Population Health, The University of Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom

I have been convinced about the potential of collecting and conducting research, including real-world evidence, in the field of rehabilitation given that many randomised controlled trials and research using standard methodologies for recruitment exclude many individuals with multi-morbidities, as well as frequently focusing on issues associated with medical impairment rather than broader issues associated with psychosocial consequences often targeted in rehabilitation. Furthermore, I have felt that using real-world evidence would assist in identifying benefits and concerns associated with equity of access and different models of care secondary to funding and other resource issues.

It is rare that I have read and reviewed a paper that has stopped me in my tracks and made me rethink some of my strongly held views. This article did just that! The author stimulated me to think more broadly and question some of my long-held beliefs and to move from my comfort zone. The author develops and expands issues of concern related to ethics and, I would suggest, goes beyond that of just monetisation.

The authors need to consider the extra burden related to governance and potential loss of subjects, and how these can be overcome given the increasing bureaucracy related to clinical practice and research.

There is an argument that not sharing anonymized or all pseudonymous data is unethical given the impact it can have on the quality of the delivery of services.

Definitely a paper that gives plenty of food for thought!!

## **Declarations**

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.