

**Peer Review for Applications to a Research Ethics Committee**

Please would you review the attached research/innovation project that has/will be submitted for review by the faculty ethics committee.

**Background:**

It is University policy that all proposed research/innovation projects receive a suitable ethics review[[1]](#footnote-1). Staff and post-graduate projects are commonly reviewed by their relevant Faculty Research Ethics Committee. Although these committees do include academics (normally two from each school), they do not necessarily include methodological and subject area expertise for every study that is reviewed. The committees therefore relies on a suitable peer review from an independent expert to reassure themselves that the area of study and proposed methodology are appropriate.

Peer reviewers are chosen on the basis that they are familiar with the type/area of the research/innovation proposed and can make an independent assessment of the quality of the protocol. Applicants should have provided you with sufficient information to allow you to make your judgement. Please complete the form and qualify your views where necessary, adding comments against individual criteria and outlining overall comments at the end.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this review.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Details of Project:** |  |
| Title of Project: |  |
| Supervisor / Principal Investigator: |  |
| Student name & Degree (if applicable): |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Details of reviewer:** |  |
| Name of Reviewer: |  |
| Area of expertise in relation to the project: |  |
| I have/have not\* been involved in the design or development of the proposed project \*please delete as appropriate |  |
| Date: |  |
| Email address (to confirm the review if necessary): |  |

Please provide your views on the project proposal, commenting specifically on the areas identified in the left-hand column.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **A. RESEARCH QUALITY** |  |
| **Prompts** | **Comments** |
| 1.  Background & Literature: Is the current state of knowledge outlined, well structured, coherent and well referenced? |  |
| 2.  Research Question/Hypothesis: Is there a clear hypothesis/ question/purpose which leads on from the background and literature? |  |
| 3.  Objectives: Are the objectives:   1. stated clearly? 2. appropriate? 3. c) achievable? |  |
| 4.  Sample:   1. Is the sample population described? 2. b) Is the recruitment process feasible? |  |
| 5.  Design:   1. is the design stated? 2. b) Is there a rationale for the approach? |  |
| 6.  Methodology:   1. Are the methods chosen appropriate? 2. b) Is the protocol of procedures clear? |  |
| 7.  Research tools: Are the research tools (such as equipment, questionnaires and interviews) well structured, informed, and suitable for analysis? |  |
| 8.  Analysis: is there an effective analysis plan? |  |
| **B. RESEARCH PLANNING AND PRACTICE** |  |
| 9.  The investigating team: Does the research team (including supervisors & collaborators) have the appropriate experience/skills to undertake the study? |  |
| 10.  Is there evidence of appropriate statistical support, where appropriate? |  |
| 11.  Would you advise further collaboration to ensure the study can be successfully completed? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **C. GENERAL COMMENTS** |  |
|  |  |

**Overall Assessment**

Please state clearly any specific changes you require.

|  |
| --- |
| **D. SPECIFIC CHANGES RECOMMENDED** |
|  |

**FOR RESEARCHER FOLLOWING COMPLETION BY PEER REVIEWER:**

|  |
| --- |
| **E. HOW CHANGES HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED** |
|  |

1. University Ethics Policy 2017: http://policies.docstore.port.ac.uk/policy-028.pdf?\_ga=2.174423591.421298547.1553026753-1739370023.1536651288 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)