This checklist is offered as a guide to peer reviewers of ethics applications. Although not required to be submitted to the ethics office with an application, some Schools may require evidence of peer review prior to authorisation of the proposal.

The peer review process is to offer a fresh perspective to the application, to ensure it is likely to meet the requirements of the relevant codes of conduct; in the areas of adequate literature review; risk versus benefit; risk management etc. this checklist is a tool to aid this process.

Peer reviewers should be familiar with the type of research being reviewed but not directly involved with the research project. If revisions are suggested, researchers should respond to the peer reviewer’s feedback by strengthening their application prior to submission of their application for final authorisation within the School and subsequent submission to the Ethics office.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **The Project Title is suitable / aligns with project content**
 |
| [ ]  Yes [ ]  No |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Risks and benefits of this research project been acknowledged and addressed where appropriate.**
 |
| [ ]  Yes [ ]  No  | Please comment:       |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **The research questions and hypotheses seem appropriate for the project type (eg: Honours/ PhD/ Academic)**
 |
| [ ]  Yes [ ]  No  | Please comment:       |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Research design and methods seem appropriate to achieve aims.**
 |
| [ ]  Yes [ ]  No  | Please comment:       |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Is the research proposal based on and supported by previous research or literature review?**
 |
| [ ]  Yes [ ]  No  | If not, has an appropriate explanation been supplied? Choose an item.Please comment:       |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Are the expected outputs and outcomes from this research appropriate for the project type? (eg: Honours/PhD/Staff)**
 |
| [ ]  Yes [ ]  No  | Please comment:       |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **The research team and supervisors seem appropriately qualified, competent and experienced.**
 |
| [ ]  Yes [ ]  No  | Please comment:       |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Are the resources, equipment and facilities appropriate and adequate?**
 |
| [ ]  Yes [ ]  No  | Please comment:       |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **The strengths and limitations of this research project been acknowledged and addressed where appropriate.**
 |
| [ ]  Yes [ ]  No  | Please comment:       |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Does this project demonstrate research merit?**
 |
| [ ]  No, major revisions are required to be seen by me before I confirm that this project demonstrates research merit[ ]  No, minor revisions are required to be seen by me before I confirm that this project demonstrates research merit[ ]  Yes, minor revisions have been recommended but I am satisfied that this project demonstrates research merit [ ]  Yes, I am satisfied that this project demonstrates research merit. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **What, if any, revisions are required or recommended?**

*Please track changes in the application as appropriate.*  |
|       |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Peer Reviewer Details**
 |
| Name (Title, First name, Last name): |       |
| Position Title |       |
| School / Organisational unit: |       |
| Email address: |       |
| Contact phone number: |       |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Peer Reviewer Declaration**
 |
| *I confirm that I am familiar with this type of research but not directly involved with the research project. I have peer reviewed this research project in the interest of ensuring that the project demonstrates research merit and can now be authorised by the appropriate authority and submitted to the ethics office..* |
| Signature: Date: \_\_ \_\_ / \_\_ \_\_ / \_\_ \_\_ \_\_ \_\_ |

**When complete, please return this form and all required attachments to the researcher.**