

## Delegated & Primary Reviewer Guide

### Jurisdiction

- Multi-site review: hospital, school board, university? Researchers should look into this: criteria may differ (e.g., police check, research priorities, teacher time)
- Admin consent: e.g., school principal, NGO, business? Not necessarily required, but should know administration's position—e.g., hostile? risks for participant?
- Community consultation: e.g., aboriginal group? involvement throughout?
- International: local review, host, supervision, support?

### Scholarly Review

- Funded? (Contract appended?) Thesis proposal approved?
- Non-delegatable projects may be held to higher standard.
- Unusual circumstances: high risk may require review by external expert.

### Conflict of interest

- Any co-existing role (e.g., instructor, minister, manager)? Who recruits, who is aware who's in/who's out/what's said during power-over relation?
- Commercial/corporate interests declared/participants informed? Agreements appended? IP office—not researchers—should enter into agreements.
- *In extremis* (sensitive, and conflict unmanageable) abandon one interest?

### Rationale

- Why this group, this topic? Citations? Would a reasonable person consider the scholarly motivation clear enough to justify apparent risks?
- Delegatable: would a reasonable person accuse it of wasting people's time, or giving academia a bad name? (see "Scholarly review as part of ethics review")

### Methods

- Clear, consistent? Is there a disconnect between research question & methods?
- Are instruments appended? Are they appropriate—e.g., does an ostensibly non-clinical study of well-being ask about suicidality and clinical depression?

### Participants

- Inclusion/exclusion criteria clear, consistent? Does the protocol demonstrate adequate grasp of complex constructs—e.g., sex/gender/sexual orientation?
- Sample size reasonable?

### Experience/expertise

- Any vulnerabilities associated with group, or sensitivities associated with data collection, interpretation, action—e.g., clinical expertise required for Beck Depression Inventory?

### Recruitment

- Informed? Ad/flyer/circular/script professional, info appended, appropriate—e.g., affiliation, study title/topic, inclusion/exclusion criteria, procedures, contact?
- Free? Power-over relationships managed? Who approaches? Who knows who's in/out?
- Confidential? —e.g., "snow ball": forward on, versus non-consent-driven disclosure?

### Compensation

- Too much? Too little? Pro-rated? Appropriate form?
- De-brief, report back, courtesy copies?

#### Risks

- Reasonably foreseeable, identifiable harms: physiological, cognitive/emotional, social? Acknowledged and managed appropriately?

#### Benefits

- To participant, community, society, knowledge, student?
- Overstated—e.g., contribution to policy development process?

#### Consent process

- Process—e.g., written, verbal—appropriate to group?
- Language/readability appropriate to group—e.g., general target: middle school?
- Warm tone; clear explanation—not legalistic, contractual (i.e., *not “I understand that . . . the above terms and conditions . . . I the under-signed . . .”*)?
- Free not to participate, not to answer any questions, to withdraw at any time
- Redundant? Brief, first-person sign off (study explained, questions answered, agree to begin)?
- Parental or other proxy consent?
- Age-appropriate child assent?
- Principal and teacher consent?
- Administrative consent (not-for-profits, community orgs, businesses)? *Not required*, but should be discussed. Shouldn't be contractual.
- Additional research/ethics reviews?
- Community consultation? Involvement throughout?
- Consent documents appended? See Guide for informed consent:  
<http://www.research.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/GUIDE-FOR-INFORMED-CONSENT-April-2010.pdf>

#### Privacy and confidentiality

- Waived? Anonymous? Or confidential from start to finish?
- Recruitment: confidentiality maintained—e.g., “snow ball”: forward on, versus non-consent-driven disclosure?
- Data collection: e.g., interview versus focus group, notes versus audio/video?
- Limits: e.g., key informants? focus groups? duty to report? possible subpoena?
- Publication: pseudonyms/generics/aggregates, courtesy copies
- Data management plan: e.g., separate identifiers from data, double lock, retention/destruction plan appropriate given sensitivity & standard for discipline? Identifiable data outside server encrypted? See Data security standards:  
<http://www.research.utoronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/documents/2013/05/datasecurity1.pdf>  
[http://www.utoronto.ca/security/UTORprotect/encryption\\_guidelines.htm](http://www.utoronto.ca/security/UTORprotect/encryption_guidelines.htm)

#### Review type:

- Risk matrix assessment delegatable—i.e., group vulnerability and research risk no greater than low-low, low-medium, or medium-low? Complex, large-scale, or unusual? Second opinion, or escalate to full REB?