

Queen's University and Affiliated Teaching Hospitals Research Ethics Board

Scientific/Peer Review Form

The Health Sciences and Affiliated Teaching Hospitals Research Ethics Board (HSREB) requires that all research ethics submissions that pose greater than minimal risk to participants must undergo a Scientific/Peer Review **prior to an ethics review submission**. The HSREB does not require duplication of Scientific/Peer Reviews. If your proposal has been reviewed by any granting body, please provide those reviews and the chair's response letter (whether or not your application was successful in gaining funding). Attach copies of reviews to your submission. Such reviews may satisfy the requirements for a Scientific/Peer Review. If not, please provide this form to an independent, qualified peer who has the expertise in the area of your research and can provide a critical review of your research protocol. The form below is a fillable form. Send it to your reviewer and have them complete it. If the reviewer wishes they can return the completed form to the Manager, Research Ethics Compliance for HSREB, Jennifer Couture at jennifer.couture@queensu.ca or they can return it to the Researcher who can then attach it to their research ethics submission.

If this is not possible or deemed unnecessary, an acceptable argument must be made as to why one has not been obtained. If you make an argument that a Scientific/Peer Review is unnecessary and HSREB does not agree, you may be asked to submit one as a condition of your study's ethical clearance.

PART A: GENERAL

Peer Reviewer:

Credentials:

Please state your confidence level to assess the scientific merit of this proposal:

HIGH SATISFACTORY LOW

Primary Investigator:

Project Title:

PART B: REVIEW

Reviewers that don't have the statistical background to answer some of the questions may skip those questions they feel they are not qualified to answer.

1. Does the summary in the protocol clearly and adequately describe the research project?
YES NO
2. Are the objectives of the research clearly identified? YES NO
3. Does this proposal address an important research question (or information gap)?
YES NO
4. Is it supported by an appropriate literature review? YES NO
5. Are the planned outcome measures appropriate and do they relate specifically to the stated objectives? YES NO
6. Is the proposed study population appropriate to accomplish the aims of the research?
YES NO
7. Are the Inclusion and exclusion criteria appropriate? YES NO
8. Are the study groups clearly defined? YES NO
9. Where there are interventions and are these clearly defined? YES NO
10. Are levels of risk associated with interventions fully identified? YES NO
11. Are they collecting information on all important variables and where applicable, using validated data collection instruments and/or scoring systems? YES NO

12. Is there a sample size justification that relates to the primary outcome / objective?

YES NO

13. Are the plans for data management and statistical analysis appropriate?

YES NO


14. Is this study feasible or are there unidentified limitations to this proposal that might prevent these researchers from meeting their stated objectives?

Please explain:

15. If the research is conducted according to the protocol, is it likely that the information produced will contribute to the advancement of knowledge? YES NO

16. What is your overall assessment of the application?

17. Please list any specific recommendations (attach an additional page if necessary).



PART C: CONFLICTS OF INTEREST DECLARATION (for reviewers):

Conflicts of Interest may be unavoidable in a small research community or specialized area of research and does not necessarily prohibit the reviewer(s) from reviewing this research proposal. Conflicts of interest may arise when an individual has a direct involvement or has a friend, family member or professional associate (current or former) involved in the research project. It may also be an issue when an individual has a financial interest in the research project or a relationship with a funder or sponsor. Please disclose if you have any conflicts of interest (real, potential or perceived) relating to this research project.

Please confirm with your signature that to the best of your knowledge all contracts and any conflicts of interests (real, potential or perceived) relating to this project have been disclosed.

Reviewer's Signature:

Date: