|  |
| --- |
|  **Human Ethics Peer Review Checklist** |

The purpose of the Peer Review Checklist is to guide peer reviewers in providing feedback regarding research design and merit and must be undertaken prior to submission to the HREC.

1. Peer review process provides an independent assessment of the project to ensure it is likely to meet the requirements of peer review as per the NHMRC [Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research, 2018](https://www.nhmrc.gov.au/about-us/publications/australian-code-responsible-conduct-research-2018) and the NHMRC Peer Review guide eg: sound study design, statistical significance, builds on current knowledge or is novel.
2. Peer reviewers should be familiar with the type of research being reviewed, but not directly involved with the research project or part of the research team.
3. If revisions are suggested, applicants should carefully consider modifying their project accordingly (prior to submission to the HREC). Students should also consult their supervisor.

This Checklist is a tool to aid this process and should be completed in consultation with the Peer Review Guidelines. The ACU researchers requesting peer review should complete Section 1 and 2 which will assist the peer reviewer to understand why they may have been chosen to review the research project in question eg: in their area of expertise etc.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 1** | **To be completed by the ACU researcher requesting peer review.** |
| PROJECT TITLE | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Version number & date of Research Proposal / Protocol under review | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Section 2** |  |
| PEER REVIEWER NAME | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Position Title | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Peer Reviewer expertise, qualifications and/or experience relevant to the research project being reviewed | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Relationship to the Chief Investigator / Research Team | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Department / Group | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Institution | Click or tap here to enter text. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section 3** | **To be completed by the Peer Reviewer listed above** |
| **CRITERIA:**  | If no, please comment. | **YES / NO** |
| 1. The project title is suitable and aligns with project content.
 | Click or tap here to enter text. | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No  |
| 1. There is a focussed and credible research question. (E.g.: Does the question include population, intervention or exposure, comparator (if applicable) and outcomes?)
 | Click or tap here to enter text. | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No  |
| 1. The research proposal is based on and supported by previous research or literature review and will add to the body of research.
 | Click or tap here to enter text. | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No  |
| 1. Research design and methods seem appropriate to achieve the aims. (Should this be classified as a pilot study or proof of concept?)
 | Click or tap here to enter text. | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No  |
| 1. The data analysis has been clearly described and justified?
* Eg: Has sufficient detail been provided to assess whether there is rigorous approach to data analysis?
* Has a framework/structure/approach to data analysis been identified and described (if appropriate)?
* Does the proposed method of data analysis align with the chosen methodology?
* Is the data analysis appropriate to answer the research question?

Are the statistical tests clearly described? Appropriate? Valid?) | Click or tap here to enter text. | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No  |
| 1. The study sample has been clearly described, defined and appropriate to address the research question.
* Does the study sample represent the population of interest?
* Is a sample size provided and justified (eg for small samples sizes eg: 6-20 participants)? Is it feasible and able to cover potential withdrawals? ? Is there a power calculation?
* Is there potential risk of bias in sample selection or recruitment?
* Is the intention to achieve data saturation (if appropriate)?
 | Click or tap here to enter text. | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No  |
| 1. The project has research merit.
 | Click or tap here to enter text. | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 4** |
| **What, if any, revisions are required, recommended or suggested?** |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |

**PEER REVIEWER DECLARATION:**

* I confirm that I am familiar with this type of research but not directly involved with the research project.
* I have peer reviewed this research project in the interest of ensuring that the project demonstrates research merit.

Signature: Click or tap here to enter text.       Date: Click or tap to enter a date.

*When complete please return this form to the researcher.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Section 5** |
| **ACU Researchers to complete.****Justification should be provided to the HREC in the event any of the above changes have not been made.** |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |