

HLS FREC Checklist for Reviewers

This checklist focuses upon key issues. See also the [UKRIO Researcher Checklist](#).

Details [think about risk]

Is the risk rating is appropriate, based upon your reading of the [DMU Research Ethics Code of Practice](#)? [See Appendix 2, pp. 23-9]. Factors impacting risk been submitted?

Is the project background understandable and justifiable? Is there an identified research gap supported by appropriate, up-to-date literature? This includes in replication studies.

Does the project have clear aims and objectives, which are not simply additional background material? Do these aims and objectives align, and clarify the research to be undertaken?

Does the project clearly explain how it will maintain research quality and integrity, in relation to honesty, rigour, transparency and open communication, with care and respect for those involved in research? Does it make explicit connections to disciplinary/DMU/in-country codes of practice? NB this must not be a copy of the methodology.

Methodology [think about the validity of the methods, and any risks/mitigations]

The first question asks for details about each research *method*. Has the applicant separated out and detailed each separate method, with an appropriate description of participants (including numbers to be recruited, and from where), why this method was selected, and how the data will be analysed? Is it feasible in the timescale?

For each of the methods detailed, is there a corresponding participant information sheet (PIS), and consent form (or means of giving con

T0c -01w -029 -136 d[(an)0(y)0(r)-0(is)-2.1(k)0(s)-2.1()-5(

