

## QResearch Scientific Committee Meeting

### Minutes

(1pm -2.30pm/24.09.20/dial in)

Attending: Julia Hippisley-Cox, Sarah Lay-Flurry, Stavros Petrou, Paul Aveyard

Apologies: Rebekah Burrow, Mike Walton, Clare Bankhead

Chair: Rafael Perera

1 Welcome and apologies	ACTION
<p><b>2 Minutes and actions last meeting</b></p> <p>Regarding point 5 – JHC – reported that CTRG have approved changes to TOR which have now been published on website.</p> <p>Regarding point 7 – Advisory Board to be consulted at their next meeting as to whether they recommend that applicants disclose all conflicts of interest and sources of funding (in line with journals etc.) rather than just the source of funding for the project under application.</p> <p>Regarding point 7 – Committee agree that generally an econometrician (rather than a statistician) is enough for health economics applications, but that it is helpful (rather than essential) to have a statistician as well. The reviewer can decide if a statistician is essential as well. It is incumbent on applicants to make their application accessible to reviewers (for example, by using clear language). Although pairing of reviewers based on expertise is not currently possible due to the small number of committee members, ideally a methodologist (statistician or health econometrician) would be paired with a content expert.</p> <p>Last meeting's minutes approved by the Committee.</p>	
<p><b>3 Matters arising</b></p> <p>Regarding point 7 – Advisory Board – CM to add to agenda</p> <p>Regarding point 7 – Committee agree – RB to update Information for Researchers and keep in mind when assisting reviewers.</p>	<p>CM</p> <p>RB</p>
<p><b>4 Update on process for identifying and inviting new committee members</b></p> <p>Lay adverts placed:</p>	

<p><a href="https://oxfordbrc.nihr.ac.uk/pair/qresearch-scientific-committee/">https://oxfordbrc.nihr.ac.uk/pair/qresearch-scientific-committee/</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.dailyinfo.co.uk/volunteering/2578758">https://www.dailyinfo.co.uk/volunteering/2578758</a></p> <p>CM to circulate to advisory board Patient experts for their dissemination.</p> <p>Expert adverts sent to, and waiting to be placed in university communications (social sciences newsletter and twitter, OxfordMedSci News (who are sending to departmental comms teams), Blueprint Bulletin, PHC newsletter, Alumni twitter, SPCR, NDPH newsletter) Other university channels no response yet.</p> <p>We need to formalise payment of experts. RB to work out how long they spend on SC work per month. Could supply it as FTEs (1-2%?). Given project codes RB could organise transfer. RP to ask Richard Stevens what ISAC pay.</p> <p>RP says James Sheppard has stepped down from committee. He sent a letter expressing his distress of having to deal with an applicant that objected to his reviews. The Committee agreed that members of the Scientific Committee should be protected from this. We need to ensure discussions about applications and reviews only go via RB, RP (Chair) and SP (Deputy-Chair) to protect reviewers and applicants. RB to make this explicit in review templates, in QWeb, and in Information for Researchers. Need to include this information in the induction for new committee members.</p>	<p>CM</p> <p>RB</p>
<p><b>5 Applications in progress</b></p> <p>JHC and SP stepped out</p> <p>OX90 – Revise and resubmit</p> <p>SP returned</p> <p>OX102 – Approved</p> <p>OX7 – Revise and resubmit</p> <p>OX123 – Revise and resubmit</p> <p>OX29 (re-review) – revise and resubmit</p> <p>OX99 – (re-review) revise and resubmit</p>	
<p><b>6 Other applications to discuss</b></p> <p>OX115 – Committee to review</p>	
<p><b>7 lay members</b></p> <p>For discussion once members have been identified from Committee recruitment drive</p>	
<p><b>8 Application process/content questions</b></p> <p>Amendments can be screened by one of the chair or vice-chair and approved without further review. Form for amendment applications agreed. Application process same as full applications otherwise.</p>	

<p>JHC proposed proportionate review and an external panel of reviewers. Committee decided that this would be worth considering when volume of applications increases.</p>	
<p><b>9 AOB &amp; Date of next meeting</b></p> <p>RB suggested that the team send a thank you letter to James Sheppard for all of this work on the Committee. Team agreed to this.</p> <p>Next meeting 23.09.2020 at 14:00</p>	