



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

**QResearch Scientific Committee**

**Meeting**

**(13:00-14:30, 11<sup>th</sup> January 2021, Teams)**

**Attending:** Julia Hippisley-Cox, Stavros Petrou (vice-chair), Clare Bankhead, Paul Aveyard, Paula Dhiman, Madhurima Bhadra, Rebecca Harmston, Franco De Crescenzo, Jennifer Camaradou, Rebekah Burrow, Claire Meadows (minutes), Polly Kerr (observer), Tom Ranger (observer)

**Apologies:** Mike Walton

**Chair:** Rafael Perera

1	<b>Welcome (including to new members and observers), and apologies</b>	
2	<b>Minutes and actions from last meeting</b>  Minutes approved	
3	<b>Matters arising from last minutes</b>  None	
4	<b>Declaration of conflicts of interest</b>  None required at this meeting.	
5	Applications for discussion:  <i>*Review of past application by potential committee members*</i>  <b>OX85</b>  The team discussed whether there should be a question about the benefits of the patients in this research on the Scientific Committee peer review form. The team want to make sure there's a distinction between patient contributions to the study design from the question about patient impact which might arise from the research itself. They do not want to change the application form. They think PPI should be included in the implementation of the study where it is really helpful. <b>The team will include a suggested text in the team chat for this meeting and members can review and provide suggestions with the aim of updating the scientific peer review form.</b>	

6	<p>Applications in progress:</p> <p><b>OX94 -</b> Awaiting revision and resubmission</p> <p><b>OX125 –</b> Awaiting revision and resubmission</p> <p><b>OX128 –</b> Awaiting revision and resubmission</p> <p><b>OX132 –</b> Awaiting revision and resubmission</p> <p><b>OX136 –</b> Awaiting revision and resubmission</p> <p>Fast-track applications: <b>OX107 -</b> Awaiting revision and resubmission</p> <p>Amendment applications: <b>OX39 -</b> Awaiting committee decision</p>	
7	<p><b>Feedback on research outputs and impacts since last meeting</b></p> <p>New standing agenda item. RB will add to this monthly meeting, as well as lay summaries and publications on the QResearch website. Nothing to present this month.</p>	
8	<p><b>Process clarifications, questions and discussions:</b></p> <p><b>a. What training would members like that we could provide?</b></p> <p>Some members would like a layperson’s guide to differing methods. ARC and BRC provide training on public and patients. Team to contact the person in the department who is the best person to contact on this kind of training. A member suggested a ten minute presentation in the SC meeting. They will also give an overview of the data we have if and when needed. Another member will also be happy to present on research methods e.g. case control vs cohort vs cross sectional study designs. One on sample size calculations would be welcome. A member suggested we see if we can make the training resource available for members for reference after the meeting. Various suggestions were made as to how this could be achieved without increasing the workload associated with producing the material. A member will send a relevant syllabus and texts from the stats department to a new member of the SC. there was agreement that the timing of the training sessions might need to be separate from the</p>	

committee meetings

**b. Would you like your reviews (completed peer review template) to be published on the website?**

The group are not in support of this due to the extra workload this would demand to make the reviews public facing. The team also doubt that they are of public interest. They should be marked confidential not for publication when they go back to the applicant.

**c. When submitting an amendment applicants need to confirm that all co-applicants have reviewed and agree with the request.**

The group have decided that the lead applicant (of the amendment request) should be responsible for gaining this consent and this should be made clear to applicants.

**d. When an application has been discussed at a meeting and given a revise and resubmit decision, and applicants make the required revisions, and the lead reviewer(s) are happy to approve an application, we will approve without waiting for further discussion at next SC meeting.**

The team agreed that this should be the case.

**c. RB can approve amendments to add or remove staff as this is an eligibility issue rather than a scientific issue.**

The team agreed this is an eligibility issue.

**e. Issues of access to the servers and datasets can be managed by the QResearch core team as they are issues covered by the delegated ethics review or scientific standard.**

A member explained that the terms of reference for the science committee is to ensure all projects meet a minimum scientific standard. The issues regarding eligibility, cost, access and retention of data on the servers falls within the QResearch advisory board (in relation to policy) and the QResearch management team regarding implementation, rather than the Scientific Committee. Approved projects will be monitored through annual reviews by the core team to record progress and report on outputs and impacts. Any changes to the projects are handled by the amendment process. A project completion form will be considered by the QResearch core team, for use when projects are completed. A discussion was had about whether the SC should have oversight to review ongoing projects. The core team will summarise an annual review of ongoing projects for SC.

**Should we request that applications include a data specification rather than requesting a data specification after the committee have approved an application?**

The group agreed that the application should include a data specification up front as

	well as a lay summary and scientific summary. It needs to be clear that the data specification has not been peer reviewed – it is just an indication of the data required, for information of the Scientific Committee only. <b>RB to organise.</b>	
9	<b>Honoraria</b>  RB asked for all external members to submit their R12 forms. A conversation on how this is worked out for department members will happen outside this meeting. <b>RB to convene.</b>	
10	<b>AOB &amp; date of next meeting</b>  8 <sup>th</sup> February 2021 13:00-14:30	