**Peer Reviewer Feedback Form**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Reference (IRAS/JRES):**  |  |
| **Title of project** |  |
| **Name of reviewer** |  |
| **Date of review** |  |
| **Place of work** |  |
| **Post held** |  |
| **Purpose of review** |  |
| **Please rate your suitability to review this study – relevant expertise/skills (score from 10, where 1 is lowest).** |  |
| ***Please declare any conflicts of interest that may affect your ability to provide an objective review*** |

Grading

1. Unable to assess
2. Requires major revision
3. Some areas that should be addressed
4. Minor revisions suggested
5. Clear appropriate

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **REVIEW CRITERIA** | **HINTS** | **COMMENTS**  | **Grade** **1 low-5 high** |
| 1. Relative merit of the research/importance
 | * Research aims clear
* Research question clear
* Addresses a health issue that is important for health and/or society.
* Aims, research questions and hypotheses build on and address gaps in existing knowledge.
* Public involvement
* Relevance to stakeholders
 |  |  |
| 1. Research quality
 | * Suitability of study design/methodology for question
* Robustness of the methods used.
* Includes a description of sample recruitment and proposed methods of data analysis.
* Risk of bias, transferability considered as applicable
 |  |  |
| 1. Feasibility of the research
 | * Overall strategy, methodology and analyses are well reasoned and appropriate to achieve the specific aims of the project.
* Likely to improve scientific knowledge, concepts, technical capacity or methods in the research field, or of contributing to better treatments, services, health outcomes or preventive interventions.
* Achievable within the specified timeframe
* Researcher/research team has the appropriate experience and expertise
 |  |  |
| 1. Presentation of the application
 | * Appropriate overall presentation, including structure, ‘understandability’, clarity and readability
* In general the way in which the application reads and gets the message across reflects well planned and conceived research.
 |  |  |
| 1. Ethical issues (application will have separate ethical review)
 | * any potential adverse consequences for humans, animals or the environment and whether these risks have been addressed satisfactorily in the proposal
 |  |  |
| 1. Other comments
 | Any reviewer observations that are not covered in the points above  |  |  |

Overall Score:

Taking into account your ratings summary above, and the comments you have provided, please give an overall score, using the guide below to help you.

|  |
| --- |
| **Overall Score** |

**Guide**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Ranking** | **Meaning** |
| A | Acceptance |
| B | Revision and Review |
| C | Rejection |

|  |
| --- |
| **Signature:** **Date:**  |