

## QResearch Scientific Committee Minutes 26/11/19

**Attending:** Stavros Petrou, Julia Hippisley-Cox, Claire Meadows (minutes)

**Apologies :** James Sheppard, Sarah Lay-Flurrie, Clare Bankhead, Mike Walton

**Chair:** Rafael Perera

1. Welcome and apologies	ACTION
<p><b>2. Minutes and action points</b></p> <p>Minutes of the last meeting on 7<sup>th</sup> October 2019 were accepted. The group agreed that the minutes for these meetings going forward would contain an action point table. <b>ACTION CM</b></p> <p>JHC has created a shared drive for minutes and other documents on OneDrive and a link has been sent to members.</p> <p>With regards to OX7 project, the document is now with applicant who is currently revising it according to the group's feedback. She may be extending the age range for the project. This document should be ready to present at the group's next meeting.</p> <p>SP asked whether we need to have versions of the same document to show where revisions have been carried out. RP asked whether we can number editions of the same document and JHC stated that the new online application system does this automatically.</p> <p>JHC said that the software developer has done review of software as per last meetings minutes and made the changes requested. JHC will circulate the new link and get the group's thoughts. <b>ACTION JHC</b></p>	<p>CM</p> <p>JHC</p>
<p><b>3. Finalising processes and information for researchers</b></p> <p><b>Section (a)</b></p> <p>The group reviewed the web link for the Information for Researchers section of the QResearch website. RP suggested use signposting on the left to cut down the length and make it more accessible? Subheadings? <b>ACTION JHC to</b></p>	<p>JHC</p>

**speak to the software developer to see if this can be done.**

With regards the letters of support process, group to review the process for reviewing outline applications. Only two have been submitted thus far since the new process was introduced. JHC asked should the group be carrying out a thorough review on each proposal? SP is in favour of deeper reviews, though RP is concerned about the lack of resources to carry this out for every applicant. RP suggested that the process should be different for internal and external applicants, with vigilance regarding progressing applications that could actually fail to reach a conclusion. SP agrees in principle as there have been examples highlighting that maybe reviews were not done when they should have been done.

RP suggested we could utilise a 'tick box' system which can be checked if the subcommittee think it should be reviewed more thoroughly. JHC suggested that if the application does not feature a methodologist (e.g. statistician), it should be considered for a more detailed review.

Group discussed a review process for fellowship applications that Paul Aveyard is currently working on that's relevant to this point. Perhaps we should try to integrate his findings into our system of review? Maybe with applications going through PA?

**ACTION RP to speak to PA about the process and feed back in the next meeting.**

RP

Letter needs to be rigorous but not be demanding of team.

SP suggested that applications should be submitted well ahead of deadline (especially fellowship applications), perhaps a couple of months before the deadline is due? The review should take into account communications angles and forward planning for the year.

RP asked whether the RCGP team is going to go through the same review process. JHC stated this is currently not the case but that the department wanted to make sure everything is working together and there is a clear system in place for the different databases. CB and JHC drew up a comparison document between CPRD and QResearch, with input by the RCGP team. This will go to the Research Committee in due course.

The hope for this document is that it will be embedded into Department procedure. The document can be reviewed by the rest of the Scientific Committee if they have time, so they are aware of the contents.

### **Section (b)**

With regards to the Data page on the QResearch website, RP said that this is an informative section but, again, the page could be signposted and broken down and easier to navigate. JHC will ask the software developer whether this can be done. **ACTION JHC**

JHC

SP would like to see a data dictionary, but JHC says this could take up a lot of

<p>time and that there is already a summary of the data on the QResearch website. This could be added to over time subject to resources.</p> <p>RP recommended that we assess incoming applications and then we can make a business case for having someone to do this as part of their role within the next year. RP will ask the CPRD group – over the past two years how many applicants have asked for counts. <b>ACTION RP.</b></p> <p><b>Section 3e will be dealt with later</b></p> <p><b>Section (f)</b></p> <p>Group agreed that meeting minutes should be shared because transparency is important. RP suggested that sections could be redacted by the committee if needed. CM to get all minutes together and put them on the QResearch website. <b>ACTION CM/JHC</b></p>	<p>RP</p> <p>CM/JHC</p>
<p><b>4. CRUK award and committee membership in 2020</b></p> <p>JHC said that CRUK funding we have obtained will cover one Grade 6 and one Grade 7 post. One of the research projects will be on myeloma, drawing in people from this department that have been working on CPRD. The CRUK group will be getting a meeting together of people who are going to be working on CRUK projects. RP and SP happy to participate in this meeting subject to availability. Group raised whether Oncology Department members should be sitting on the Science Committee as there are going to be more cancer projects coming through because of CRUK funding.</p> <p>RP said that we should be having someone from Population Health on the Science Committee would be useful. SP added that ethicists and PPI should also be included</p> <p>RP said raised what should the invitation process should be, and that we should be more explicit with regards to why people have been invited to the committee. JHC suggested that this should be the terms of reference. She will think about, email to get the committee’s thought and present this at the next meeting. <b>ACTION JHC</b></p>	<p>JHC</p>
<p><b>5. Record of current applications and summary of applications in progress</b></p> <p>JHC shared her record of all current applications, of which there are over 40. JHC asked whether the group thought that she was logging the right information on this sheet and who should have access to the information, particularly pending grant applications, given that this has been shared in confidence. JHC noted that projects which are live are posted on the website once they start. RP suggested that a redacted read only version of the sheet or a summary could be made available to everyone on the committee. JHC said that Ethics Committee want to know about accepted and rejected proposals. SP says committee should only have read access and ability to edit should be restricted to CM and JHC. To keep this reviewable on an ongoing basis. Accurate spreadsheets will enable us to do a report at the end of the year and</p>	

<p>plan capacity for the following year.</p>	
<p><b>6. Tracking outputs/publications</b></p> <p>SP stated that the value of QResearch would be enhanced by keeping more details of publications where project results are published. This would be good for auditing purposes also. JHC said that most publications are currently listed on the QResearch website, but there could very well be more if researchers have not notified the team about publications.</p> <p>The group decided that the Science Committee was not responsible for gathering information on publications, as it's more of an administrative task. An annual email should perhaps be sent out to applicants and users to gather outcomes.</p> <p>Following up more thoroughly on publications would allow us to feature more projects in the QResearch newsletter. This would be approved of by QResearch Advisory Board as outcomes are a big focus for that group.</p> <p><b>ACTION CM</b></p>	<p>CM</p>
<p><b>7. AOB</b></p> <p>JHC stated that the Ethics Review report was due at the end of December. JHC sent link around for comments from group and invited comments.</p> <p><b>ACTION ALL to provide comments by 15.12.2019</b></p> <p>SP said that thinking about areas of health that are underserved and doing this through QResearch would be a great focus for 2020. JHC said this is a focus for CRUK projects too.</p> <p>JHC said that the department wanted to know how we can scale up activity on QResearch. RP happy to advise JHC and the department on how this can be done.</p> <p>January's meeting is set for 13<sup>th</sup> January 2020</p>	<p>ALL</p>