**FACULTY OF SCIENCE, AGRICULTURE AND ENGINEERING**

**Ethical Review of a Research Project: Comments from the Reviewers**

**Researcher Name**: *Polly Reichelt (aka Eriol Fox)*

**Academic Unit:** *School of Computing*

**Project:** *Observing Human-centred Design Contributions to Humanitarian/Human Rights Open Source Software: What collaborations, conversations, processes and cultures are at play between designers, OSS projects, humanitarian/human rights organisations and their beneficiaries.*

Faculty Ethics Committee reviewers have considered your application. The following issues need to be addressed in this study:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue/Comment raised by reviewer** | **Researcher’s Response** |
| I have been through and there are a couple of things I am not clear.  Based on the project aim and description, I believe section 6 should be provided with details. At the moment, section is filled in with zero.  Project title needs to be consistent throughout. At the moment, the project title in the consent form and data management are not the same as that in the application. |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

I would be grateful if you could make a response to the comments above in the right hand column, indicating your response or a response such as ‘changed accordingly’ or ‘this section has now been deleted’ etc. Documents should be resubmitted once revised, using track changes to highlight any amendments or additions.

**DECISION:**

Ethical approval is pending subject to a satisfactory response to the comments above.