QResearch Science Committee Meeting 7/10/19

Present

Rafael Perera-Salazar (Chair)

Julia Hippisley-Cox

Clare Bankhead

Sarah Lay-Flurrie

Stavros Petrou

Claire Meadows (Minutes)

Welcome and apologies (James Sheppard)

CB suggested that we have a shared drive containing all of the documents pertaining to this matter. JHC noted that this should be taken forward as an **action point**

Update on application OX7

RPS reviewed feedback from the OX7 application. The applicant confirmed that we could send those reviews over for her comment. She'll then hopefully say it's okay to go forward or if there are any outstanding issues we can get her to address those.

Notes/Actions from last meeting 02.09.2019 & matters arising

RPS has reviewed QResearch against the ISAC (CPRD) form. He went through the ISAC application elements, which can be divided into two. One of which is issues around the data, and the second element which is the protocol

JHC pointed out that we can add as many fields as we want to the online form. Her priority is not to place demands on researchers to fill out forms.

CB pointed out that not all questions on QReseach are relevant i.e. point 21 which is Linkage to Local Datasets. That wouldn't be relevant to QResearch as you can't link to it.

SLF said the view from her side is, does the form contain information we need critically to make a judgement. If we're not using it why would we want to gather that information?

RPS noted points in James Sheppard's email. He thinks QResearch should be as streamlined as possible and wonders if it's worth discussing if the team needs to know if there are going to be PPI or IP issues. His understanding is that it's for us to discuss the appropriateness of the scientific methods, not IP or PPI so maybe the team should review this?

Review of application form for ISAC compared with QResearch to finalise amendments to the form

RPS pointed out that the ISAC application has two sections in the way that QResearch has just one section for the whole thing, and it's probably fine to keep it as it is.

Points he thinks would be useful to add to QResearch application are number 5 (which is *'health outcomes to be measured'*) to have a bit of clarity about what would be measured, and 12 (which is *'Experience with CPRD and Statistics, data management, GP Practice,'*).

SLF wonders whether reference to health outcomes is really relevant here. CB suggested that maybe it shouldn't say health outcomes, just outcomes? JHC said we have question 14 which is *'what is the primary outcome?'* So whether we need a bit more information on whether this is actually a health outcome? So we could add to question 14, *'is it a health outcome? If so please specify what. If it's economic outcomes, specify what. All were in agreement.'*

RPS addressed the protocol, and that he thinks the form may cover some of these items. But it may be useful to have them more explicit. Particularly thinking of 'study type', 'study design'. JHC suggested should we have drop-down boxes instead of design? RPS countered this by saying that he thinks it's a good idea for the applicant to be able to prove the strength of their idea by writing it down, so not using a dropdown. SP agreed, and pointed out that there are so many different types of design that it would have to be a long list of options.

SLF and CB expressed discontent with 'study type', so group decided to go with 'study design' question but not 'study type'

JHC raised the subject of feasibility counts and that CPRD do feasibility counts where they give you the numerator but they won't give you the denominator or the rates. She likes the idea of us doing feasibility counts with the numerator only and then offering that if people have it as a question and we can basically build a bank of such offerings.

CB raised the issue of resources for this. RPS wondered who would cover the costs. SLF suggested we could move towards the goal of having someone handling feasibility as their main role down the line as we should be wary of increasing increase demand when we haven't got the resources to cover it. But SLF did add that there would be some clear cut cases, and we do have to go through the process, whether before application or after.

JHC would like to include a question on 'study period'. This can be subsumed into study population question. JHC would like to keep in points O and P on review document and wants to keep the PPI section on the form.

Summary

The team have accepted all of the red suggestions from RPS except the sections on feasibility counts and study type.

Next Meeting TBA