

<b>Name</b>	Procedure for the Peer Review of research projects sponsored by the National Waiting Times Board.
<b>Summary</b>	The document outlines When Peer Review is required, and the procedure for carrying this out.
<b>Associated documents</b>	
<b>Target audience</b>	NWTCB Researchers NWTCB Peer Reviewers NWTCB R&D Office
<b>Author</b>	Dr Catherine Sinclair, R&D Manager
<b>Reviewed by:</b>	R&D Steering Group
<b>Version number</b>	Version 1.0
<b>Name of Approving Committee</b>	National Waiting Times Centre Board Research & Development Steering Group
<b>Date Approved</b>	
<b>Signature of Chief Executive Officer/Delegated authority</b>	
<b>Signature of Sponsoring Director/Delegated authority</b>	

### Evaluation history

<b>Date of this evaluation</b>	<b>Date of next evaluation</b>	<b>Summary of changes recommended</b>
N/A	26/02/10	

### Revision history

<b>Date of this revision</b>	<b>Date of next revision</b>	<b>Summary of changes made</b>
N/A	26/02/10	N/A

**Distribution**

This document has been distributed to:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Method</b>

## Index

	Page Number
Background	<a href="#">4</a>
Purpose	<a href="#">4</a>
Scope	<a href="#">4</a>
Responsible Personnel	<a href="#">5</a>
Procedure	<a href="#">5</a>
Appendix 1	<a href="#">7</a>
Appendix 2	<a href="#">9</a>

## **Background**

In 2002, the Chief Scientist Office published a document on its website entitled 'Research Governance Development of Systems: Minimum Requirements'. For compliance with independent review, this states that there should be 'A system of review for research which has not already undergone external scientific peer review'. This review should be

- Independent - i.e. no conflicts of interest,
- Expert, in terms of understanding of the clinical and research methodologies and outcomes.
- Recorded.

This is a Sponsor responsibility, not a REC responsibility.

## **Research that should be reviewed**

In general, it is mainly NHS 'own account' research that organisations need to review. Review is also required for the following:

- Externally-funded research from sources where award of funding does not include sufficient independent review of methodology. This can include research funded by small charities or non-research statutory bodies and the research active NHS organisation needs to make a decision as to whether there has been independent review of the methodology.
- Research projects that use NHS resources, are done as part of a PhD or MD qualification and have not been through a rigorous peer review as part of the funding process.

## **Research that should not be reviewed**

This includes:

- Externally funded research that has been through a rigorous peer review procedure as part of the funding process.
- Commercially sponsored research.
- Research which is part of an undergraduate degree. In this case, the student supervisor provides the necessary assurances.

## **Purpose**

The purpose of the peer review process is to ensure that research projects sponsored by the National Waiting Times Board conform to the relevant quality indicators (page 7: Science) set out in the [Research Governance Framework for Health and Community Care](#).

## **Scope**

The contents of this document apply to those individuals with the responsibility for the administration of the Sponsor approval process:

- The Medical Director – the nominated NWTCB Director with responsibility for research sponsored and hosted by the Board.
- The R&D Steering Group – the Group with responsibility for the peer review process and for considering peer review comments prior to the Board accepting sponsor responsibility.
- The Research Manager – responsible for the administration of the peer review and sponsor processes.
- Researchers – responsible for identifying projects that may be classed as research – using the expertise in the Research Office and R&D Steering Group when appropriate.

### **Responsible Personnel**

Medical Director  
 Research Manager  
 R&D Steering Group  
 Researchers.

### **Procedure**

It is the responsibility of the Chief Investigator (CI) to develop the research project protocol (also termed 'project proposal'). The next step in the project start up process is peer review prior to an organising accepting the responsibility of sponsor. The sponsor is required to sign the REC application form and it is best practice that this is not done until the peer review process is complete.

The procedure is as follows:

1. The project proposal is submitted to the R&D Office (contact person is the Research Manager [catherine.sinclair@gjnh.scot.nhs.uk](mailto:catherine.sinclair@gjnh.scot.nhs.uk)).
2. The Research Manager selects two individuals to review the project, either from the R&D Steering Group or from the peer review group. This ensures that the process is expert and independent of the researcher.
3. The reviewers review the project and complete and sign [appendix 1](#) in order to record the review.
4. The reviews are sent (anonymised) to the CI who comments on them and provides written evidence of their response to the comments.
5. The reviewers indicate whether or not the comments resolve concerns detailed in the peer review form.
6. All comments are assembled into the response to review proforma ([appendix 2](#)) and circulated to the R&D Steering Group.
7. The Group have one calendar week to indicate whether or not the Board should sponsor the project.
8. The Research Manager signs the sponsor section in the REC application and the CI can proceed with the ethics review process.

This process is managed electronically and, only in exceptional circumstances will peer review be considered at R&D Steering Group meetings.

## Appendix A: Peer Review Checklist



### NATIONAL WAITING TIME CENTRE BOARD

Title of research project:			
Name of reviewer:			
Reasons for review:	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Funding</b>	<b>Both</b>
Does the research have a stated hypothesis or research question?	Yes	No	
Comment:			
Are the stated objectives clear?	Yes	No	
Comment:			
Is there a clear methodology?	Yes	No	
Comment:			
Has a case been made for the clinical service significance?	Yes	No	
Comment:			
Is it likely that the project will generate Intellectual Property?	Yes	No	
Is there justification for sample size?	Yes	No	
<i>There should be justification for sample size in both qualitative and quantitative research, and in the case of quantitative research, this should be backed up with a statistical calculation with stated power and P value, and/or named expert statistical advice.</i>			
Comment:			
What are the arrangements for project management, including the forming of a steering group?			
Comment:			

Is the sample representative of the target population?	Yes	No
Comment:		
Are the outcomes of the study stated and appropriate?	Yes	No
Comment:		
Is the timescale realistic and are the project's objectives likely to be met?	Yes	No
Comment:		
<b><u>Additional Comments</u></b>		

In my opinion, the National Waiting Times Centre Board should:

Sponsor the project	Yes	No
Fund the project	Yes	No

Signature

Date

**Appendix B: Response to peer review comments.**

Title of research project:

Chief Investigator:

Review Question	Peer Review Comments	Peer Reviewer's remarks on the response of the Chief Investigator to peer review comments.
Q1: Does the research have a stated hypothesis or research question?		
Q2: Are the stated objectives clear?		
Q3: Is there a clear methodology?		
Q4: Has a case been made for the clinical service significance?		
Q5: Is there justification for sample size?		
Q6: What are the arrangements for project management, including the forming of a steering group?		
Q7: Is the sample representative of the target population?		
Q8: Are the outcomes of the study stated and appropriate?		
Q9: Is the timescale realistic and are the project's objectives likely to be met?		
Q10 Additional Comments		