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

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

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

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

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

Recommendation: Approve / Revise minor / Revise major / Decline

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **REVIEW GUIDELINE** | **GUIDELINE PROMPTS** | **COMMENTS** [Please note that the ethics committee greatly appreciates and carefully considers comments made by peer reviewers when assessing the scientific validity and consequentially the ethics of the applications.] | **Researcher response** |
| 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  |  |  |