



HRB Public Review Form*

General Form

2024

*This form has been adapted from the NIHR public review form with the permission of the NIHR Central Commissioning Facility.

Review Information

Thank you for agreeing to review this application. We very much appreciate your involvement in this stage of the funding process. Please contact ppi@hrb.ie at the Health Research Board as soon as possible if, for any reason, you are unable to review this application. A **Public Review Glossary** is provided to help clarify the meaning of some of the terms used in the guidance notes and Public Review form. Terms that are included in the glossary are written in *underlined blue Italic*.

How we will use your review

This form will be used to provide feedback to the lead applicant of the application you are reviewing. Please ensure that you do not include any comments that you would not want to be seen by the applicants or that could identify you as the reviewer. Your public review will also be made available to the review panel and chair for the funding scheme.

Additional Support

HRB Public Reviewer Guidance Notes and the **HRB Public Reviewer Glossary of Terms** are also available to support you in completing the review.

Completing this Form

Please comment against each of the criteria, using the *prompts* provided. 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 that you consider to be relevant. For more information please refer to our Guidance for Public Reviewers document.

We ask that you provide an overall rating of the application at the end of your review. The rating you choose should be based on the information provided in the application and the quality of the public, patient, service user and/or carer involvement in the application. It's important that the rating you choose reflects your review comments.

Unconscious Bias

Reviewers are asked to ensure their review is fair, equitable and free from bias. Reviewers should be aware of possible influences due to personal interests and should endeavour to ensure their review is free from unconscious bias that may arise from e.g. the gender, career stage or scientific domain of the applicant.

The HRB request that public reviewers, peer reviewers and panel members consider unconscious bias in their decision making. Please watch this [short video](#) (3 minutes) from the Royal Society, UK explaining unconscious bias.

<https://royalsociety.org/topics-policy/publications/2015/unconscious-bias/>

General Data Protection Regulation

The **General Data Protection Regulation** (GDPR) 2018 outlines the legal obligations that are attached to personal data that is held by The Health Research Board. The Health Research Board is committed to protecting the rights and privacy of individuals in accordance with this act.

All reviewers will be asked to confirm that they will;

1. only access application data for the purposes of reviewing,
2. not share information contained in the application with anyone else, and
3. will destroy any copy/record of the application after their review is submitted.

The standard HRB rules in relation to confidentiality of the review process will continue to apply.



Involvement is different to participation

Public and patient involvement (PPI) in research means that the public and patients are involved in the planning and doing of the research from start to finish and help tell the public about the results of research. Members of the public, patients, service users or carers are involved in decisions shaping the research project. There are PPI opportunities in almost all health research studies.

Separate to that, there may be participants (research subjects) in the study. Samples and data, such as blood samples or interviews, are collected from study participants to form part of the study results. Not all studies have participants.

For the purposes of your review, it's important to remember **Involvement** in a research study is different to **Participation**. We are mostly asking you to assess the application in terms of how well you think the researcher has involved members of the public/patients/service users/carers in carrying out the research.

However, in **Question 4** we will ask you to consider how well the researchers have thought through issues relating to study participants (**where applicable**). Making participation as easy and straightforward as possible to potential participants can be crucial to the success of a study.

Important: Please read Section 6 of the guidance notes for examples of **PPI** and of **participation in research**.

1 Plain English Summary (Lay Summary)

The plain English summary or lay summary is intended for an interested audience, who are not necessarily specialists. The Project Lay Summary is contained within the 'Project Details'. 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?
 - If not, what further information is needed?
 - 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?

Commented [SL1]: Do we need them to answer this? if the language is clear etc. maybe this could be implied?

500 words maximum

2 Relevance of the Proposed Research Question

- i. In your opinion, will knowing the answer to the research question make a difference to real people? (now or in the future). Please look at 'Research Question' in the 'Project Description', as well as the 'Project Lay Summary' and 'Project Abstract' in the 'Project Details' to help you answer this question.

Please give a clear explanation for your opinion.

500 word maximum (Mandatory)

3 Public and Patient Involvement in the development of and throughout the project

Hint: Within the 'Project Description' there is a subsection called '**Public and Patient Involvement (PPI) in Research Project**' which should be a good starting point for your review.

- i. Has there been PPI in the development of the application including: identifying the research topic; *prioritising the research questions*; preparing the application (e.g. contributing to the research design)? Can you identify particular strengths, weaknesses and/or areas for improvement?
- ii. Are there any plans for PPI in the research throughout its lifetime? Can you identify particular strengths, weaknesses and/or areas for improvement?

- iii. Are any plans for PPI in the management arrangements of an award? Are these appropriate and relevant for the project? Could the management arrangements be improved from this perspective? For example, do the researchers propose having the views of the public / patients / carers represented in the management structures? For example, researchers may have included public / patients / carers in a steering group which directs the project/management committee for the project.
- iv. Are members of the public, patients, service users or carers included in the research team? If so, is it clear what their role or roles will be and what they will bring to the research team?
- v. Will the researchers involve patients, service users, carers or members of the public in developing and delivering their dissemination plan? For example, will they be involved in bringing the results of the research to the attention of the HSE, health and social care services, clinicians or policy makers or a general public? If so, are these appropriate and if not do you think it would be of benefit to include them, and have you any suggestions for the best way to do this?
- vi. Have the applicants included any money for public involvement activities in their overall budget?

Please to give a clear explanation for your opinion.

500 word maximum (Mandatory)

4 Making it straightforward for research participants

Please remember that not all studies have participants (but many do). Within the 'Project Description' there is a subsection called 'Research Design and Methodological approach' which will help you answer this question. Here, you should find information on how potential study participants are invited and what study participants are being asked to do (for example, how many study visits are planned, where, what type of information and/or physical sample is being collected). This data will help to answer the research question.

- i) Have the researchers taken a realistic approach to recruiting people to participate in their research as research subjects? Could this be improved and if so, how?
- ii) Is the level of commitment for participants clearly described? Does it appear to be acceptable to potential participants (balancing the situation of participants such as severity of the illness being studied with the level of commitment/invasiveness)?
- iii) Do you have suggestions to make the research process easier for participants?

Please give a clear explanation for your opinion.

500 word maximum(Mandatory)

5 Potential Improvements

In your opinion, what could researchers do to improve this project?

500 words maximum (Mandatory)

Overall Rating

Having completed your review we would ask that you now provide a rating based on the information provided in the application and the quality of the PPI in this application.

Your rating should reflect your review comments.

Excellent	You are very satisfied with the quality of the public and patient involvement in the application. PPI is evident from the early planning stages and throughout the lifetime of the award (if successful), including in decision-making at management level. Methods of involvement are innovative and maximise benefits. Planned PPI activities seem appropriately resourced in the budget. Research participant recruitment plans (where relevant) are well thought out and the level of commitment is clear.
Good	You are satisfied with the quality of the public and patient involvement in the application; some additional clarifications would have been helpful. PPI may not have started at the earliest stage of research planning OR have been included in decision-making at management level but is well embedded in the application (if successful) at stages throughout its lifetime. Methods of involvement are tailored to the research. Planned PPI activities seem appropriately resourced in the budget. Research participant recruitment plan (where relevant) are adequate and/or the level of commitment required could have been more clearly described.
Appropriate	You are reasonably satisfied with the quality of the public and patient involvement in the application. Methods of involvement are generic; some additional clarifications would have been helpful and/or PPI could potentially have been included to a greater extent from the planning phase. Planned PPI activities seem appropriately resourced in the budget. Research participant recruitment plans (where relevant) require

	<p>more consideration and/or the level of commitment required is not clear.</p> <p><i>OR</i></p> <p>There was no public and patient involvement in the application, and you agree that this is appropriate due to the nature of the research.</p>
<p>Fair</p>	<p>You are satisfied with some of the public and patient involvement provided in the application. PPI could potentially have been included at other stages throughout the lifetime of the award (if successful), methods of involvement are generic and/or planned PPI activities seem to be under resourced in the budget. Research participant recruitment plans (where relevant) are unlikely to entice enough participants to take part and/or the level of commitment required is not clear.</p> <p><i>OR</i></p> <p>You are somewhat satisfied with the justification provided not to include public and patient involvement in the application. However, PPI could potentially have been included at some of the research stages in the application.</p>
<p>Poor</p>	<p>You are not satisfied with the public and patient involvement in the application because important information seems to be lacking. PPI does not appear to have been a significant part of the planning for the award (if successful). Planned PPI activities seem to be under resourced in the budget. Research participant recruitment plans (where relevant) are not realistic and/ or the level of commitment required is not clear.</p> <p><i>OR</i></p> <p>You are not satisfied with the justification provided to exclude public and patient involvement in the application. PPI activities could have been included in the application and resourced in the budget.</p>