

Systematic Review Grant 2024: Reviewer's feedback form

Note this form is based on the *Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols* (PRISMA-P) (Moher et al 2015).

Project title:	
Reviewer's name:	
Declaration of conflict of interest (if any)	

For the following section, please identify whether the applicant has included the information requested.

Application section	Topic	Item	Information provided?			Comments
			Yes	Partly	No	
8 and 10	Rationale	Is the rationale for the review described?				
10	Objectives	Is there an explicit statement of the question the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators and outcomes (PICO)?				
14	Eligibility criteria	Are the study characteristics (e.g. PICO, study design, setting) and report characteristics (e.g. years considered, language bias, publication status) described?				
15	Information sources	Are the information sources listed?				
16	Search strategy	Is at least one search strategy presented?				
17	Data management	Is a mechanism for managing records and data described?				
18	Selection process	Is the process for selecting studies described?				

Application section	Topic	Item	Information provided?			Comments	
			Yes	Partly	No		
19	Data collection process	Is the method for extracting data from reports described?					
20	Data items	Have variables that will be collected from the data been listed and defined?					
21	Outcomes	Have all outcomes been listed and defined?					
22	Risk of bias	Have methods for uncovering bias been described?					
23	Synthesis	Has the criteria for synthesising data, or type of summary if synthesis is not appropriate, been described?					
24	Meta-bias(es)	Has an assessment of any meta-bias(es) been described?	Yes	Partly	No	N/A	
25	Evidence quality	Has the method for assessing the strength of the evidence been described?					

For each of the following sections, please tick the most appropriate box and give comments.

<p>For each of the following sections, please tick the most appropriate box and give comments:</p>				
<p>1. Skills of the applicant</p>				
<p>Does the applicant demonstrate a sufficient level of skills to complete the project described?</p>				
Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Incomplete (0)
<p>Comments:</p>				
<p>2. Fit with RCOT's top ten research priorities</p>				
<p>Is the systematic review topic clearly linked to the Top 10 priorities for occupational therapy research in the UK? (The research priorities can be found here: https://www.rcot.co.uk/top-10.)</p>				
Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Incomplete (0)
<p>Comments:</p>				

3. Inclusion of and impact on people who access services

Does the project have a considered, realistic plan for involvement of people who access services and/or their families or carers in the research? Does it propose an impact that will benefit people who access services and/or their families or carers?

Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Incomplete (0)
---------------	----------	----------	----------	----------------

Comments:

4. Equity, diversity and belonging

Does the proposed project take account of diverse populations, inclusive of socioeconomic groups, and how to include them appropriately in the project?

Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Incomplete (0)
---------------	----------	----------	----------	----------------

Comments:

5. Methodology – overall comments				
Is the proposed methodology sound?				
Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Incomplete (0)
Comments:				
6. Funding and support				
Does the project appear feasible, offer good value for money, and have appropriate support from the host institution?				
Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Incomplete (0)
Comments:				

7. Overall recommendation for support		
Highly recommended	Recommended	Not recommended
Additional comments for the RCOT Research Foundation Advisory Group:		
Comments for feedback to the applicant:		

Please provide a final score from questions 1-6.

Total score: /24

CONSENT REQUEST

RCOT would like to keep a record of Research Foundation reviewers so we know who has reviewed an application in recent years. The information recorded would include your name, email address and the title of the application reviewed and would be kept for three years.

Please tick this box if you consent for this information about you to be collected: ☐

References:

Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Gherzi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M,...the PRISMA-P Group (2015) Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic Reviews*, 4(1). Available at:
<https://systematicreviewsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/2046-4053-4-1>