**SCIENTIFIC PEER REVIEW TEMPLATES**

**Health and Disability Ethics Committees**

# INTRODUCTION

The following templates are intended as guidance for researchers who are submitting applications for HDEC review.

The reviewer templates listed below may be used or adapted to suit the particular circumstances. However, please keep within the NEAC informed peer review standards described in the guidelines and in the instruction to researchers and reviewers.

For more information on peer review please refer to [Chapter 9 of the National Ethical Standards for Health and Disability Research and Quality Improvement](https://neac.health.govt.nz/national-ethical-standards/part-two/9-research-development-and-design/).

# SCIENTIFIC PEER REVIEW: Instructions to the researcher

**Introduction**

Scientific peer review (hereafter referred to as peer review) in the context of human research refers to the scientific validity of the research project and is a vital step in research project development. Peer review is a requirement of ethical approval and can enhance research project development in a variety of ways through providing an objective perspective from an informed reader.

It is a requirement of the Health and Disability Ethics Committees that all research projects involving humans undergo peer review.

**Standards for peer review**

Peer reviewers will consider the following points in order to determine scientific validity. Your proposal/application should ensure these are addressed.

1. ***The relative merit of the research***: consideration of whether the proposed work is important, worthwhile and justifiable. The research should address a health issue that is important for health and/or society. The aims, research questions and hypotheses should build on and address gaps in existing knowledge.
2. ***The design and methods:*** consideration of the quality of study design and the robustness of the methods used. This might include study methodology, a description of sample recruitment and characteristics (including number, gender and ethnicity where relevant) and proposed methods of data analysis. An indication of timelines for the research should be included.
3. ***The feasibility of the research:*** consideration of whether the overall strategy, methodology and analyses are well reasoned and appropriate to achieve the specific aims of the project. The review will determine whether the research has the likelihood, on balance, of improving scientific knowledge, concepts, technical capacity or methods in the research field, or of contributing to better treatments, services, health outcomes or preventive interventions. The research should be achievable within the specified timeframe and the researcher/research team must have the appropriate experience and expertise to undertake the research.
4. ***Peer review delivers an informed opinion:*** An effective peer review process provides perspectives from subject matter experts. It may be suitable for informed perspectives to be sought from individuals in the same organisation as the researcher, as long as the requirements of freedom from bias, equity and fairness can be met. An appropriate peer is one who can deliver an informed opinion on some or all of a proposal. Reviewers will be knowledgeable about the topic and/or context for the research, have the appropriate expertise relative to the breadth and scope of research under review and, as a result, will be well placed to make a statement as to whether the research in question has verifiable scientific merit. Peer review of scientific validity may include consideration of cultural relevance and appropriateness.
5. ***Peer review delivers an objective opinion:*** Those acting in the capacity of reviewers are charged with delivering a balanced and considered analysis of the research. Generally, the success of the peer review process is determined by the extent to which these evaluations can be considered free of bias, equitable and fair. Objectivity can be compromised if peer reviewers have conflicts of interest, and so appropriate peer reviewers typically will not be materially connected to the researcher(s) in a way that might undermine objectivity, and be free from either positive or negative inducements.
6. ***A consensus opinion on scientific validity is formed:*** An HDEC will need to receive assurance that the peer review process has delivered support for the scientific validity of the proposed research. When a peer review process has engaged a range of experts, there needs to be a process that leads to a consensus opinion about the quality of the research.

# SCIENTIFIC PEER REVIEW:

Date: 3rd May 2022

Research Title: Endoscopic ultrasound-guided PPG measurement (EUS-PPHM) in patients undergoing liver resection and major intra-abdominal surgeries

Co-coordinating Investigator: Dr. Frank Weilert.

Peer Reviewer Name: Dr Wayne Bai

Peer Reviewer Position: Gastroenterologist

Independent from study? Yes / No

Peer Reviewer signature \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Recommendation: Approve / Revise minor / Revise major / Decline

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **REVIEW GUIDELINE** | **GUIDELINE PROMPTS** | **COMMENTS**  |
| Relative merit of the research | * Important, worthwhile and justifiable.
* Addresses a health issue that is important for health and/or society.
* Aims, research questions and hypotheses build on and address gaps in existing knowledge.
 | Very important and worthwhile study. It is well known that elevated portal pressure as measured indirectly via HVPG measurements correlate well with the risk of decompensation and mortality for cirrhotic undergoing surgeries. We now have a new novel method of direct PPG measurements via EUS and it Is important to prove the same.  |
| Design and methods | * Quality of study design
* Robustness of the methods used.
* Includes a description of sample recruitment and characteristics (including number, gender and ethnicity where relevant) proposed methods of data analysis.
* Timelines for the research included
 | The methodology is an open label, unblinded cohort study. The investigators will follow up the patients with liver cancer /metastasis who are referred to the upper gastrointestinal multidisciplinary team and are undergoing intraabdominal/liver surgery. A detailed and robust methodology has been outlined. It is important that Ethnicity data will be collected to aid identifying any inequities. |
| Feasibility of the research | * Overall strategy, methodology and analyses are well reasoned and appropriate to achieve the specific aims of the project.
* Likely to improve scientific knowledge, concepts, technical capacity or methods in the research field, or of contributing to better treatments, services, health outcomes or preventive interventions.
* Achievable within the specified timeframe
* Researcher/research team has the appropriate experience and expertise.
 | It is well known that the liver cancer is one of the top 5 most common cancers in New Zealand and the 4th leading cause of cancers mortality for male Māori. Ethnicity data will be collected in the study and recruiting Maori patients would be important. By knowing the absence of clinically significant portal hypertension via EUS-PPG measurement, more Maori patients with liver cancer/ metastasis could benefit from a life-saving or prolonging treatment. Therefore, once the direct PPG measurement is validated, there would be a great impact for our Maori population and could reduce the potential inequities. |
| Reviewer Independence /objectivity | * Peer review is considered free of bias, equitable and fair.
* Objectivity can be compromised if peer reviewers have conflicts of interest, and so appropriate peer reviewers typically will not be materially connected to the researcher(s) in a way that might undermine objectivity, and be free from either positive or negative inducements.
* If the peer reviewer is connected to the study please explain what measures are taken to mitigate conflict of interest.
 | I have no conflicts of interest in this project.I do not participate in this study and I am not materially connected to the researchers in any way. |
| Other comments | * Any reviewer observations that are not covered in the points above.
 |  |