# Peer review of research proposal

for ethics applications

## Human Research Ethics Committee

## About this checklist

- The peer review of the research proposal should be completed **before** the Human Research Ethics Application (HREA) is filled in.

- The peer review process is to offer an independent assessment of the project, to ensure it is likely to meet the requirements of the relevant codes of conduct in the areas of adequate literature review, risk versus benefit, risk management, etc. This checklist is a tool to aid this process.

- Peer reviewers should be familiar with the type of research being reviewed, but not directly involved with the research project or part of the research team.

- Peer reviewers should hold the same level or higher qualification than the research being reviewed, or able to show equivalence.

- If revisions are suggested, researchers should respond to the peer reviewer's feedback by strengthening their application **before** submitting to the Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC).

> **Please refer to chapter 3 of the** national-statement-ethical-conduct-human-research-2023 **before completing this checklist.**

## Completing the checklist

- This checklist can be completed electronically.

- All fields are required.

- Click inside a text field to type your response.

- Digital forms and electronic signatures are preferred.

- If you have any questions, please contact ethics@csu.edu.au

All fields must be completed.

# 1. Research project

| | |
|---|---|
| **Project title** | |
| **Primary contact full name** *(incl. title)* <br> *Usually the chief investigator* | |
| **School / Faculty / Organisation / Unit** | |
| **Other research team members' names** | |

# 2. Peer reviewer

Peer reviewers should be familiar with the type of research being reviewed, but not directly involved with the research project or part of the research team.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Full name** *(incl. title)* | |
| **Position title** | |
| **School / Faculty / Organisation / Unit** | |
| **Email** | |
| **Phone** | |

# 3. Research proposal

When completing the checklist below, please comment (where applicable) on any discipline specific aspects of the project that may have ethical implications that the HREC should be made aware of and how these have been addressed.

| Statement | Comment |
|---|---|
| a. **The project title is suitable and aligns with project content** | |
| b. **The benefits outweigh the risks of this research project and have they been acknowledged and addressed where appropriate** | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **c. The research questions or hypotheses seem appropriate for the project** | |
| **d. Research design and methods seem appropriate to achieve the aims** | |
| **e. The research proposal is based on and supported by previous research or literature review** | |
| **f. The research team and supervisors seem appropriately qualified, competent and experienced** | |
| **g. The resources, equipment and facilities are appropriate and adequate** | |
| **h. The limitations of this research project have been acknowledged and addressed and/or are not detrimental to the project where appropriate** | ○ Yes    ○ No    ○ Not applicable |

# 4. Signature and declaration

## Peer reviewer

### Declaration

By signing below:

a. I confirm that I am familiar with this type of research but not directly involved with the research project.

b. Any revisions identified during the review process have been addressed by the research team and resolved to my satisfaction.

c. I have peer reviewed this research project in the interest of ensuring that the project demonstrates research merit and can now be submitted to the Human Research Ethics Committee.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Full name** *(Peer reviewer)* | |
| **Date** *(dd/mm/yyyy)* | |
| **Signature** | |

After signing above with your digital signature, return this checklist, all relevant attachments and annotated documents to the primary contact for the research project.