# PEER REVIEW: Request and template to Reviewer

Date

Dear \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Re Scientific Peer Review Request**

It would be much appreciated if you would provide a peer review of the attached project and make your recommendation to me as Chair of the Peer Review Committee of the Department of …..

The purpose of the review is to ensure the project has scientific validity and to provide the researcher feedback where improvements could be made. Your comments and recommendations will be conveyed (in confidence if you wish) to the researcher.

The Chairperson will make a final decision, based on reviewer reports and the responses of the researcher where this is required

Research Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Investigator: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Intended level of Peer Review: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Please return your review before \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

If you are unable to do this within this time please contact me.

Your review should be

* aligned to the “Guidelines for Peer Review” provided below
* commensurate with the complexity, resource implications, strategic impact and level of approval required
* in confidence and with respect for the researcher’s intellectual property
* constructive and aimed at enhancing the project proposed

Please find attached “Guidelines for Peer Review” and a “Reviewer Template” for your convenience.

Yours sincerely

Chairperson, Peer Review Committee,

Department of xxxxxx

**Guidelines for Peer Review**

Please consider the following points in order to determine scientific validity.

1. ***The relative merit of the research***: consideration of whether the proposed work is important, worthwhile and justifiable. The research should address a health issue that is important for health and/or society. The aims, research questions and hypotheses should build on and address gaps in existing knowledge.
2. ***The design and methods:*** consideration of the quality of study design and the robustness of the methods used. This might include study methodology, a description of sample recruitment and characteristics (including number, gender and ethnicity where relevant) and proposed methods of data analysis. An indication of timelines for the research should be included.
3. ***The feasibility of the research:*** consideration of whether the overall strategy, methodology and analyses are well reasoned and appropriate to achieve the specific aims of the project. The review will determine whether the research has the likelihood, on balance, of improving scientific knowledge, concepts, technical capacity or methods in the research field, or of contributing to better treatments, services, health outcomes or preventive interventions. The research should be achievable within the specified timeframe and the researcher/research team must have the appropriate experience and expertise to undertake the research.
4. ***The presentation of the application:*** consideration of the overall presentation, including structure, ‘understandability’, clarity and readability of the research application. While not directly about the research, the way in which the application reads and gets the message across often reflects how well the research has been planned and conceived. It is a strong determinant of whether the research will be fundable and therefore whether it will be done at all.

# SCIENTIFIC PEER REVIEW: Reviewer template

Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Research Title\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Researcher Name\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Name\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer signature \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Recommendation: Approve / Revise minor / Revise major / Decline

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **REVIEW GUIDELINE** | **GUIDELINE PROMPTS** | **COMMENTS**  |
| Relative merit of the research | * Important, worthwhile and justifiable.
* Addresses a health issue that is important for health and/or society.
* Aims, research questions and hypotheses build on and address gaps in existing knowledge.
 |  |
| Design and methods | * Quality of study design
* Robustness of the methods used.
* Includes a description of sample recruitment and characteristics (including number, gender and ethnicity where relevant) proposed methods of data analysis.
* Timelines for the research included
 |  |
| Feasibility of the research | * Overall strategy, methodology and analyses are well reasoned and appropriate to achieve the specific aims of the project.
* Likely to improve scientific knowledge, concepts, technical capacity or methods in the research field, or of contributing to better treatments, services, health outcomes or preventive interventions.
* Achievable within the specified timeframe
* Researcher/research team has the appropriate experience and expertise
 |  |
| Presentation of the application | * Appropriate overall presentation, including structure, ‘understandability’, clarity and readability
* In general the way in which the application reads and gets the message across reflects well planned and conceived research.
 |  |
| Other comments | Any reviewer observations that are not covered in the points above  |  |