

Peer and Public Review Form

This template of the online public review form cannot be submitted as a review. Only reviews submitted online via the NIHR Research Management System (RMS) will be accepted.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Application information** | **Responses** |
| Reference Number |  |
| Research Title |  |
| Chief Investigator (S) |  |
| Contracting Organisation |  |
| Total Amount Requested |  |
| Reviewer Number |  |
| Reviewer |  |
| Reviewer Organisation |  |
| Reviewer Department |  |

# Reviewer Information

Thank you for agreeing to review this application submitted to the [Master Grant Type Programme Name] Programme. We appreciate your assistance with this important part of the commissioning process. We believe we have matched this application to your area of interest. Please contact the NIHR at ccf@nihr.ac.uk, as soon as possible if you feel unable to review this application.

# Confidentiality

You must treat the application you have agreed to review as confidential, meaning that you should not talk about the contents of the document with colleagues, friends and/or family. Please read our [confidentiality and disclosure policy](https://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/confidentiality-and-disclosure-a-guide-for-applicants-reviewers-and-commissioning-panels/12241) for more information.

Receipt of this document from the [Master Grant Type Programme Name (STH)] Programme, and your completed review, form a 'mutual confidentiality agreement'. This means that information will not be released without prior consent (except to the parties named below) unless required by law.

# How we will use your review

This form will be sent:

* unattributed to [Lead Applicant Name], the lead applicant of the application you are reviewing, with the overall score, recommendation and conflicts of interest removed. Please do not include any comments that you do not want seen by the applicants or which could identify you as the reviewer.
* to members of the [Master Grant Type Programme Name (STH)] Committee, and meeting observers. With the exception of public reviewers, Committee members will also be made aware of your name, organisation (not required for public reviewers) and area of expertise on the day that the Panel/Committee sits to deliberate.
* unattributed to other reviewers of the same application, with the conflicts of interest question removed. The programme views that sharing comments between reviewers helps their professional development, and improves the review process.

In order to recognise the essential work of the many people who complete reviews for us, we will publish an annual list of reviewers’ names.

For more information, please read the [NIHR privacy policy](https://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/nihr-privacy-policy/12242).

# Completing this form

The form is separated into sections with prompts to help you complete your review. The prompts are for guidance, there is **no need** to cover all of them. Any extra comments are also welcome, and these can be added in a section at the end of the form.

Public reviewers may find it helpful to read the NIHR [Public Reviewer Guidance](https://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/guidance-for-public-reviewers-of-research-funding-applications/12245). This contains information to help focus your review from a public perspective.

The form does not have to be completed all in one session. You can ‘Save and Close’ form at any time and return to it at a later date. You can also ‘Save and Print’ if you would like to have a paper copy of the form.

When you have completed all mandatory fields and you are ready to submit your review select the option ‘Submit Form’.

#  Reviewer Expertise

Please indicate the nature of your expertise by clicking on the appropriate tickbox(es) below:

* Health or Care professional in a broadly related field
* Health or Care professional in the same/a very similar field
* Industry professional in a broadly related field
* Industry professional in the same/a very similar field
* Researcher in a broadly related field
* Researcher in the same/a very similar field
* Methodologist (e.g., statistician, health economist, health psychologist)
* Patient/service user with direct experience of this health area
* Carer or family member with direct experience of this health area
* Member of the public with a more general view
* Service User (someone who uses health or social care services)
* Other (please see below)

If the tick boxes above do not adequately capture the nature of your expertise, please briefly provide details in the box below (or use it to give us more detail about your expertise if you wish).

25 words maximum

# Conflict of interest

Do you have any potential conflicts of interest in undertaking this review? For example, personal, professional and/or commercial. Please see the NIHR [conflicts of interest policy](https://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/nihr-conflicts-of-interest-policy-funding-and-awards/25637) for more information.

Yes/No (Mandatory)

If yes, please contact a member of the PPI team on 020 8843 8041 (We will not reject your review simply because you declare a competing interest, but we would like to know about it).

100 words maximum

# Relevance of the Proposed Research

Based on your expertise, you may want to consider whether:

* The research is relevant to the priorities of the NHS, Public Health and Social Care
* The research is important to, and addresses the needs of patients, service users, carers and/or the public
* The right question(s) has been asked and if not, how could it be improved.500 words maximum (Mandatory)

250 words maximum

# The potential for the research to make a significant difference

Based on your expertise, you may want to consider whether:

* The research has the potential to produce findings that will lead to sustainable change, and also, significant benefits for patients, service users, carers and the public. This change could be on individuals, communities, recipients or providers of health and social care services, decision makers as well as treatments and services themselves
* It is clear how many people could potentially benefit.

250 words maximum

# Team

Based on your expertise, you may want to consider whether:

* It has the right mix of skills and experience to deliver the research
* It includes patient, service user, carer and/or public representatives. If so, whether their role is clear (for example, as a co-applicant) and brings value to the project. You may wish to refer to the NIHR ‘[Public Co-applicants in Research](https://www.learningforinvolvement.org.uk/?opportunity=public-co-applicants-in-research-guidance)’ guidance
* There is a named patient, service user, carer lead to help support and deliver PPIE related activities.

250 words maximum

# Quality of the research plan

Based on your expertise, you may want to consider whether:

* The research can be delivered as described in the research plan
* The right designs and methods are being used to answer the question(s), and outcomes are appropriate
* The key risks, barriers and ethical issues have been identified and considered
* The plans for patient, service user, carer and/or public involvement and engagement are clear, meaningful and inclusive
* The resources set aside for patient, service user, carer and/or public involvement are sufficient. You may wish to refer to the NIHR [payment guidance](https://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/payment-guidance-for-researchers-and-professionals/27392)
* The research is inclusive in its design, and includes strategies to engage with under-served groups to ensure representation and equality. You may wish to refer to [INCLUDE](https://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/improving-inclusion-of-under-served-groups-in-clinical-research-guidance-from-include-project/25435)
* Intellectual property and its management has been considered.
* Governance and study management arrangements seem satisfactory, and include patient, service user, carer and/or the public representatives as appropriate
* The dissemination plans are satisfactory. In particular, if they include patient, service users, carer and/or the public representatives, and opportunities to enable people who have taken part in the study to participate in activities, and ensure the public learn about the research results
* The plain English summary is easy to understand, clear, free from jargon, and could be used on its own to describe the research. You may wish to refer to the NIHR [plain English summary guidance](https://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/plain-english-summaries/27363).

750 words maximum

Additional comments about the application not covered above. For example, whether:

* Funding the research would represent good value for money
* Where appropriate, the results of the research look feasible to roll out in the current health and social care system context.

200 words maximum

# Score

The scoring system below is intended to facilitate discussion at committee meetings and may help guide the amount of time spent discussing each application. Please note that the committee will have an opportunity to score each application at the meeting.

Taking into account your rating summaries above, and the comments you have provided, please give an overall score (lowest score 1, highest score 10) for this application.

1 to 10 (Mandatory)

Please select using the drop down box, using this guide to help you.

## Scoring Guide

| **Rating** | **Description** | **Score out of 10** | **Funding status** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exceptional | Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses | 10 | Fundable |
| Outstanding | Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses | 9 | Fundable |
| Excellent | Very strong with only some minor weaknesses | 8 | Fundable |
| Very good | Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses | 7 | Potentially fundable |
| Good | Strong but with at least one moderate weakness | 6 | Potentially fundable |
| Satisfactory | Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses | 5 | Potentially fundable |
| Fair | Some strengths but with at least one major weakness | 4 | Not fundable |
| Marginal | A few strengths and a few major weaknesses | 3 | Not fundable |
| Poor | Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses | 2 | Not fundable |
| Very poor | No strengths and numerous major weaknesses | 1 | Not fundable |