<u><Name of Programme></u>
<u>Public Review Form</u>

This template of the online public review form cannot be submitted as a review and only reviews submitted online via the CCF RMS will be accepted.

Reviewer Information

Thank you for agreeing to review this application submitted to the [Master Grant Type Programme Name] Programme. We very much appreciate your involvement in this stage of the commissioning process. Please contact a member of the Central Commissioning Facility's (CCF) Patient and Public Involvement (PPI) team on 020 8843 8041 as soon as possible if, for any reason, you are unable to review this application.

Confidentiality

You must treat the application you have agreed to review as confidential. Our confidentiality and disclosure policy gives details of what this means for you and our expectations: https://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/confidentiality-and-disclosure-a-guide-for-applicants-reviewers-and-commissioning-panels/12241

Receipt of this document from the [Master Grant Type Programme Name (STH)] programme, and your subsequent completed review, form a 'mutual confidentiality agreement'. This 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 distributed:

- **unattributed to [Lead Applicant Name], the lead applicant** of the application you are reviewing, with the ratings summary, overall score, recommendation and conflicts of interest removed. Please ensure that you **do not include any comments which you would not want to be seen by the applicants or which could identify you as the reviewer.**
- **to designated members of the [Master Grant Type Programme Name (STH)] Panel, and meeting observers, who will also be made aware of your name** on the day that the Panel sits to deliberate.
- **unattributed to other reviewers of the same application**, with the conflicts of interest question removed (from within the 'Reviewer Expertise' section). The programme views that sharing reviews between reviewers contributes to their development and to overall improvement of the review process.

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

For more information, our privacy and data protection policy is available at this link: https://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/nihr-privacy-policy/12242

Completing this Form

The form is separated into sections that align with the selection criteria the Panel will also be using in order to assess the application. Please comment against each of the criteria, using the prompts provided and scoring the application in the relevant section(s). The prompts are intended to help you focus your review on issues from the perspective of patients, service users, carers and members of the public, but please feel free to comment on any additional aspects which you consider to be relevant. For more information and support please click on this link to access our Public Reviewer Guidance: https://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/guidance-for-public-reviewers-of-research-funding-applications/12245

The form does not have to be completed all in one session: you can select the option 'Save and Close' to save any details and return to the form at a later date or 'Save and Print' if you would like to review what the form looks like as a PDF.

When you have completed all mandatory fields and you are ready to submit your review, the option 'Submit Form' will become available for you to submit your completed review.

Reviewer Expertise

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

- ☐ Carer or family member with direct experience of this area
- ☐ Member of public with a more general view
- ☐ Patient or service user with direct experience of this area
- ☐ Service User Researcher
- ☐ 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.

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 word maximum

Relevance of the proposed research

i) Is there a clear and credible reason for doing this research? If there is, what is it?

ii) Is this research important or relevant to patients or carers? Why is that?

iii) Could the results of the research make a difference to patients or carers? If yes, how would they make a difference? If not, why not?

500 words maximum (Mandatory)

Relevance of proposed research rating summary

Drop down list (Mandatory);
Excellent
Good
Fair
Poor
Don't know

NIHR Public review form

Quality of the proposed work 1

Research design

i) Are the outcomes the researchers are planning to measure appropriate? Will the research ultimately benefit patients, service users, carers and/or the public? Why is that the case? Are there other outcomes that are more important? If so, what are they?

ii) Have the researchers taken a realistic approach to recruiting people to participate in their research? Could this be improved and if so, how? Do you think people are likely to agree to take part? Would you be willing to take part in the research or suggest to a friend that they did?

1500 words maximum (Mandatory)

Has the research team taken account of previous research in this area?

Yes/No (Mandatory)

Quality (research design) rating summary

Drop down list (Mandatory);
Excellent
Good
Fair
Poor
Don't know

Quality of the proposed work 2

Work plan and proposed management arrangements

i) How are any plans for patient and public involvement in the research also referred to in the work plan and in the proposed management arrangements? Could the plan and the management arrangements be improved from this perspective?

500 words maximum (Mandatory)

Quality (work plan and management) rating summary

Drop down list (Mandatory);
Excellent
Good
Fair
Poor
Don't know

NIHR Public review form

Quality of the proposed work 3

Plain English summary

The plain English summary is intended for an interested audience, who are not necessarily specialists. The summary should be written at roughly the same level as an article in a newspaper. With this in mind, please comment on the following:

i) Does the plain English summary give a clear explanation of the research?
- Does it help you carry out your review? If not, why not?
- Is the language used appropriate and clear? If not, where are the problems?
- Are scientific terms, abbreviations and jargon explained? If not, which terms need explanation?

ii) If this research is funded, the plain English summary will be published on a variety of websites, without the rest of this application form. Could this plain English summary be used on its own to describe the proposed research? If not, what further information is needed?

Further information for researchers on how to write a plain English summary and what to include in a summary is available online at NIHR Make it clear https://www.invo.org.uk/resource-centre/plain-english-summaries/nihr-funding-applications/

500 words maximum (Mandatory)

Quality (plain English summary) rating summary

Drop down list (Mandatory);
Excellent
Good
Fair
Poor
Don't know

Strength of the research team

i) Does the research team appear to have the right mix of skills to carry out this research? For example, if the research involves looking at what nurses do, is there a nurse on the team? If not, how could the team be strengthened?

ii) Is there one or more suitably experienced member of the research team with responsibility for coordinating, supporting and delivering patient and public involvement activities? If not, how could this be addressed?

iii) Are patients, service users or carers included in the research team? And if so, is it clear what their role or roles will be and what they will bring to the research team?

500 words maximum (Mandatory)

Strength of research team summary rating

Drop down list (Mandatory);
Excellent
Good
Fair
Poor
Don't know

NIHR Public review form

Potential for impact of the proposed work

Dissemination, outputs and anticipated impact

NIHR aims to fund research that has the potential to be of significant benefit to the NHS, patients and the public. To support this, the applicants should consider how they will achieve impact from the outset. This helps them to identify potential benefits and beneficiaries beyond the academic community, and plan processes by which the research can directly or incrementally over time, lead to change in the 'real world'.

i) Have the applicants clearly expressed a real-world problem and how their research contributes towards a 'solution'? How well do the planned outputs match this aim? If not, what changes are needed?

ii) Have the applicants made it clear what impacts they are aiming to achieve from the research? Are these plans appropriate? Are they achievable? Do they seem realistic in terms of scale and timing? If not, what needs changing?

iii) Have the applicants clearly stated who will benefit from this research (e.g., patients, carers, clinicians, policy makers, healthcare planners) and how they will benefit? Are plans to engage and communicate with these individuals/groups appropriate? If not, what is missing?

iv) Have the applicants chosen suitable activities to achieve impact? Have they made it clear how the outputs, beneficiaries and planned impacts are linked? If not, what needs changing?

v) Are the applicants clear on what would be needed (e.g. more funding, further partnerships) to sustain or increase impact after the project? If not, what else needs to be considered?

vi) Have the applicants sufficiently considered the barriers they may face in achieving impact (e.g. regulations, intellectual property/rights, acceptability to users)? Have they adequately considered how to overcome these? If not, what is missing?

500 word maximum (Mandatory)

Impact (Dissemination) rating summary

Drop down list (Mandatory);
Excellent
Good
Fair
Poor
Don't know
N/A

Value for money

The NIHR provides guidance on what can and cannot be included in the costs of research. CCF carries out an initial financial scrutiny of all applications received. A more detailed scrutiny of finances is always carried out on any application that is recommended for funding.

As a public reviewer, you are not expected to assess whether the entire budget is costed correctly. However, comments on the following aspects are welcome:

i) Overall, does the research budget seem a reasonable investment of public money? Could it save health and social care costs in the long term?

ii) Are the resources set aside for patient and public involvement appropriate for the proposed activities? E.g. for training and support, travel and other expenses, staff salaries? For more see: INVOLVE's https://www.invo.org.uk/resource-centre/payment-and-recognition-for-public-involvement/involvement-cost-calculator/. If not, how could it be improved?

300 word maximum (Mandatory)

Value for money rating summary
Drop down list (Mandatory); *Excellent* *Good* *Fair* *Poor* *Don't know*

INVOLVEMENT of patients and the public

Was there any patient and public involvement in the application? i) What is your assessment of the patient and public involvement in the development of the application including involvement in: identifying the research topic; prioritising the research questions; preparing the application (e.g. contributing to the research design); and identifying potential impact? ii) What is your assessment of any proposed plans for patient and public involvement throughout the life of the research? Can you identify particular strengths, weaknesses and/or areas for improvement?
500 word maximum (Mandatory)

Involvement of patients & public rating summary
Drop down list (Mandatory); *Excellent* *Good* *Fair* *Poor* *Don't know*

Additional comments

If you have any additional comments, not covered by the sections above, please provide them below.
500 word maximum

Overall Score and Funding Recommendation

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. Please select using the drop down box below, using the guide to help you.
1 → 10 (Mandatory)

NIHR Public review form

Scoring Guide

Exceptional	Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses	10	FUNDABLE
Outstanding	Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses	9	
Excellent	Very strong with only some minor weaknesses	8	
Very good	Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses	7	POTENTIALLY FUNDABLE
Good	Strong but with at least one moderate weakness	6	
Satisfactory	Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses	5	
Fair	Some strengths but with at least one major weakness	4	NOT FUNDABLE
Marginal	A few strengths and a few major weaknesses	3	
Poor	Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses	2	
Very poor	No strengths and numerous major weaknesses	1	

Please include any supporting statement(s) below
100 word maximum

Once you have completed this review

Please press the 'Submit Form' button. A copy of your completed review will be available to you in the "Submitted reviews" section of your CCF RMS account.

For further guidance on submitting your review form, please contact us via email ccfppi@nihr.ac.uk or phone 020 8843 8041.

Thank you very much for your review. We appreciate how busy our reviewers are, and are very grateful for your assistance in this important part of the commissioning process.

NIHR Public review form