NUFFIELD DEPARTMENT OF PRIMARY CARE HEALTH SCIENCES

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

QRESEARCH

Radcliffe Observatory Quarter, Woodstock Road, Oxford. OX2 6GG
Tel: +44(0)1865 289300 • qresearch@phc.ox.ac.uk

QResearch Scientific Committee Meeting 05.10.20
Minutes

Attending: Julia Hippisley-Cox, Rebekah Burrow, Stavros Petrou, Paul Aveyard, Clare Bankhead, Claire Meadows (Minutes)

Apologies: Sarah Lay-Flurrie, Mike Walton

Chair: Rafael Perera

	ACTION
1 Welcome and apologies	
2 Minutes and actions last meeting Last meeting's minutes approved by the Committee.	
3 Matters arising The Committee confirmed that the process of feeding back direct to the applicant was tested on a resubmitted application. It was quite tricky to ascertain how much detail to go into on the data and methods required in the application. We will have to wait until the revised application comes in to see how effective that was. A member pointed out the approval of applications needs to be joined up to the QResearch website with date of approval clearly noted on the lay summary. The Committee member in charge of this took note and has already been doing it.	
4 Update on recruitment to the Committee We have interviewed four people, expert, not lay members. All applicants, not just these four are a mix of applicants from statisticians to clinicians to data scientists. We will invite three including two candidates who, interestingly, have carried out work with QResearch before and had expertise that would be valuable to the panel, to observe our next meeting before reviewing an application before potentially being invited to join the committee. Another three experts are to be interviewed, four lay people. We will invite them in pairs to our upcoming meetings. The Committee presented details on three preferred candidates who will be attending a test Committee meeting Concern was raised at basing the performance of the candidates only based on attending one meeting. A member suggested that the candidates get involved in an existing application rather than a new one presented at Committee.	

The Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences is part of the NIHR School for Primary Care Research. Head of Department: Professor Richard Hobbs FRCGP FRCP FESC FMedSci

Athena SWAN Silver Award

Because the interviews are going to fall between meetings, and to avoid delay on instating new members into upcoming meetings, it was suggested that the Committee email their opinions on the candidates.	
5 Applications in progress **OX90** Requested amendments were sent and Committee confirmed that this is now approved.	
6. **Applications to be aware of** **OX29** Waiting for information from the applicant **OX99** Waiting for information from the applicant. **OX115** Requested information has been submitted. Committee confirmed this is now an approved application.	
7 Applications process/content questions It was suggested that the team keep a lead reviewer in charge of an application but let every Committee member have access to the applications to inform wider discussion in Committee. The Committee also considered the idea that the minutes of the meeting should contain the peer review for transparency in the public domain. A member thinks it would be a good idea for the whole Committee to see each application, but as the Committee grows not everyone would need access to every application. She is undecided on the peer review in the minutes. Another member suggested a smaller group of three members within the Committee having access to all applications, rather than the whole Committee. The Committee approved of this idea as it may remove the need to recruit external reviewers, though that option is always there. On fast track applications the PPI representative would be the third reviewer. A member then added that she be provided with the applications a few days before the meeting, rather than in increments. The Committee will action this by sending PDFs of all applications two weeks before the next meeting going forward. Another member suggested the first year stats on applications be collated, and the Committee approved of this idea. A member suggested we also collate information on which universities are applying and their areas of research. The Committee approved of this idea.	

The Committee also suggested that we record opinions of applicants as to the efficacy of the process, which could go into the cover email when the secretary sends the review letters out. The Committee considered the issue of whether if two areas are being requested from the database, do applicants need to submit two applications. The Committee suggested that we leave this question open, as there are going to be different circumstances for different applications. A member asked whether the Committee feel they should request an annual report the progress of all projects. The Committee suggested we ask for top-level information like whether the project had ended, whether the paper had come out, but anything else could be unwieldy. The Committee approved of this and asked that we formalise it.	
8 AOB A member informed the Committee that a researcher was going to submit an application for a feasibility study on QResearch to see whether it's suitable for his project. This is first feasibility application we have received for a long time. What should the process be? The Committee feels the usual application process is over the top for this purpose. He suggests that a Committee member approving is enough, with any further issues coming to the larger Committee. The Committee suggested that someone within QResearch could approve that decision. A member added the suggestion that, if the study was not going to lead to a paper, the Committee could delegate to another team member but if it was to lead to a paper we would have to look at adjusting the process. According to another member is the process followed by CPRD.	
9 Date of next meeting Next meeting 2nd November 2020 from 13:00-14:30	