



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

1 Welcome and apologies	ACTION
<p>2 Minutes and actions last meeting</p> <p>Last meeting's minutes approved by the Committee.</p>	
<p>3 Matters arising</p> <p>RP 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 required in the application. We will have to wait until the revised application comes in to see how effective that was.</p> <p>JHC 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. RB took note of this and will be responsible for it.</p>	
<p>4 Update on recruitment to the Committee</p> <p>We have interviewed four people, expert, not lay members. There was a mix of applicants from statisticians to clinicians to data scientists. We opted for two candidates who, interestingly, have carried out work with QResearch before and had expertise that would be valuable to the panel.</p> <p>Another three experts are to be interviewed for lay people. The process will be to shortlist four experts and four lay people and invite them in pairs of four to one of our upcoming meetings.</p> <p>RB presented details on three preferred candidates who will be attending a test Committee meeting</p> <p>SP expressed concern at basing the performance of the candidates only based on attending one meeting. RP suggested that the candidates get involved in an existing application rather than a new one presented at Committee.</p>	

<p>Because the interviews are going to fall between meetings, and to avoid delay on instating new members into upcoming meetings, RP suggested that the Committee email their opinions on the candidates.</p>	
<p>5 Applications in progress</p> <p>OX90</p> <p>SP has submitted requested amendments and SLF has confirmed that this is now approved.</p>	
<p>6. Applications to be aware of</p> <p>OX29</p> <p>Waiting for information from the applicant</p> <p>OX99</p> <p>Waiting for information from the applicant.</p> <p>OX115</p> <p>Requested information has been submitted. SLF confirmed this is now an approved application. As SLF is not at this meeting, RP accepts her email confirmation.</p>	
<p>7 Applications process/content questions</p> <p>JHC 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.</p> <p>JHC also raised the idea that the minutes of the meeting should contain the peer review for transparency in the public domain.</p> <p>CB 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.</p> <p>SP suggested a smaller group of three members within the Committee having access to all applications, rather than the whole Committee. JHC 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.</p> <p>CB then added that she be provided with the applications a few days before the meeting, rather than in increments. RB will action this by sending PDFs of all applications two weeks before the next meeting going forward.</p> <p>JHC suggested the first year stats on applications be collated, and RP approved of this idea. SP suggested we also collate information on which universities are applying and their areas of research. JHC approved of this idea and will get JC to add tick boxes into the application form.</p> <p>JHC also suggested that we record opinions of applicants as to the efficacy of the process, which could go into the cover email when CM sends the review letters out.</p>	

<p>RB relayed a question from SLF on whether if two areas are being requested from the database, do applicants need to submit two applications. RP suggested that we leave this question open, as there are going to be different circumstances for different applications.</p> <p>JHC asked whether the Committee feel they should request an annual report the progress of all projects. RP 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. JHC approved of this and asked that we formalise it and CM/RB come up with a process for gathering this information. ACTION CM&RB</p>	<p>CM/RB</p>
<p>8 AOB</p> <p>JHC 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?</p> <p>PA 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.</p> <p>CB suggested that someone within QResearch could approve that decision.</p> <p>JHC added the suggestion that, if the study was not going to lead to a paper, the RP could delegate to RB but if it was to lead to a paper we would have to look at adjusting the process. According to CB is the process followed by CPRD.</p>	
<p>9 Date of next meeting</p> <p>Next meeting 2nd November 2020 from 13:00-14:30 (chaired by SP)</p> <p>CM to adjust date of December's meeting from 7th Dec to the following week to allow for RPs commitments. Action CM</p>	<p>CM</p>