

## Supervisor Report

A completed copy of this report must accompany all submissions to the Research Ethics Committee related to research that is to be carried out as part of a postgraduate degree course.

### Purpose of this assessment

The Research Ethics Committee asks supervisors to provide an assessment of any student research proposal submitted to the committee. This serves two functions: first, the supervisor will be in a good position to spot potential weaknesses and problems of which the committee should be aware, since they will be familiar with the area of study and the proposed research.

Second, the exercise of evaluating the proposed research before it is submitted to the committee may help to detect potential problems which otherwise might not have been apparent until ethical review, with a consequent delay to the beginning of the research.

The supervisor's report evaluates the proposed research for scientific and practical soundness. Poorly-designed or executed research is unethical because it wastes the contribution of the participants, who generally give their time and co-operation free. In the worst cases, badly designed research can lead to misleading or wrong results that will leave the study population worse off than they were.

### Submitting for REC approval

A score of zero or one on any of the items should flag a proposal that may be returned for revision or even rejected by the committee. If any item is rated zero or one, please justify submitting the application in the space on the last page.

### REC protocol checklist

<p><b>How well has the applicant reviewed the background literature?</b></p> <p>0. No relevant literature cited in the proposal 1. Some relevant literature, but it is likely that significant research and/or methodological articles have been missed 2. The literature review is up to date in terms of our knowledge and understanding of the problem area, and shows an understanding of the methodological issues in this type of research.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>How well will the proposed research contribute to knowledge and/or understanding in the area?</b></p> <p>0. Cannot tell from the proposal 1. The study runs a significant risk of producing findings that are inaccurate, for example due to potential problems with sampling or data collection 2. The study does not have significant methodological weaknesses, but the small sample size or limited nature of the sample will limit the utility of the findings 3. The proposed research will make a significant contribution to our knowledge or understanding of the problem area</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Will the study methodology result in the collection of appropriate data in sufficient quantity to answer the research question?</b></p> <p>0. Cannot tell from the proposal 1. Scope for significant improvements in the methodology (e.g. by using validated scales, getting a more representative sample) 2. Methodology appropriate, but the study will be too small to provide a definitive answer to the research question 3. The data are likely to be sufficient in quality and quantity to answer the study question</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<p><b>Will the student be capable of carrying out the research within the time frame of the course?</b></p> <p>0. No  1. Probably, but there are potential threats to the successful completion of the project (describe on the last page)  2. Yes</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Does the protocol explicitly detail appropriate arrangements for obtaining consent from participants?</b></p> <p>0. No  1. Incomplete information on how patients will be contacted, informed and consent obtained  2. The consent process is clearly described, and the information sheet is clear to potential participants</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Are there likely significant risks to participants? If so, have arrangements for dealing with problems such as distress been detailed in the protocol?</b></p> <p>0. The study design contains the potential for exposure to risk which the applicant has not dealt with  1. The protocol details potential risks, but the steps envisaged for dealing with these need to be improved  2. The protocol provides appropriate arrangements for dealing with any risks that may arise in the study  3. There are no foreseeable risks entailed in the study</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>Title and name of supervisor</b></p>	
<p><b>Address and email of supervisor</b></p>	
<p><b>Date of this assessment</b></p>	
<p><b>Supervisor Signature</b></p>	
<p><b>If any item scored 0 or 1, please comment here on why the application is being submitted</b></p> <p><b>Potential threats to the project</b></p> <p><b>Additional comments</b></p>	