Revisions to Ethics Applications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question Specific Comments** | **Applicant’s Response** |
| A7.1 Please provide details of who the research governance sponsor will be:  It is unclear why UoM is not the sponsor.  Can you please provide any regulatory approvals received by the sponsor for the conduct of this research? | I am not entirely clear what a research governance sponsor is or where I would find regulatory approvals for research. However, I have amended this point in the ethics application with the following to clarify why I believe the UKDS is the correct research governance sponsor and that the funding for this research comes from an ESRC research grant.  “UK Data Service. All of the workshop leaders are employed by University of Manchester but work full time with the UK Data Service on an ESRC research grant that is held jointly by several universities. UK Data Service seems to be the primary sponsor as the researcher time and catering is all paid for through the UK Data Service grant, the admin team (meaning the PS staff that booked the room, organised the catering and take the registrations, etc.) work for the UK Data Service, the participants register for the workshop through the UK Data Service website and only one of the two workshops is held at the University of Manchester. “ |
| Prop.5 Please list and justify the exclusion criteria for participants.  You use the phrase 'might be excluded' for these groups which implies that there may be instances where individuals in these groups are recruited. Is this the case? If yes, please specify under what circumstances they will be eligible. If no, can you please clarify that they will definitely not be included? | I have rewritten this point in the ethics application to clarify that the only real exclusion criterion relates to English language and all other potential exclusion criteria will only be applied if the workshop turns out to be oversubscribed.  Thus, the only group to definitely not be included will be those that cannot participate in the workshop due to the fact that it is run in English. |
| Prop.7 Please describe how each group of potential participants will be identified, approached and recruited?  'When they arrive at the workshop, participants will be asked to sign a participant consent form with details about how their data will be collected, stored and used.'  - It is best practice for the participants to have access to this prior to attendance on the day to ensure they to not make a wasted trip. | I have rewritten this point in the ethics application to clarify that all participants will be emailed a copy of the participant information sheet and the consent form prior to attending the workshop to allow them to not make a wasted trip.  Further, printed copies of these will be present when signing in to allow them to consent appropriately when they arrive at the workshop. |
| Prop.7 Please describe how each group of potential participants will be identified, approached and recruited?  Will the advert on the UK Data Service website include detailed information, e.g. PIS, for potential participants? If not, at what point will they receive this information to ensure that their decision to participate or not is based on informed consent? | No, the advert will not include detailed information such as the PIS or consent form. Instead, participants will be emailed these forms in advance of the workshop. We plan to email these when the workshop registration closes either because it has reached capacity or when it gets to 5 days before the workshop. |
| Prop.7 Please describe how each group of potential  participants will be identified, approached and recruited?  The final sentence in this section seems to be incomplete - please check and complete. | This has been corrected. |
| Prop.8 Please attach copies of all advertising material/emails/letters that will be used to approach and recruit your potential participants.  The promo material does not make it clear that this is a research process for which they will be required to consent. | The promo material makes it clear that  “we plan to collect comments, anecdotes, ideas and questions from the workshop for future research publications on unequitable barriers to reproducibility. All such data will be anonymised and/or collected in ways that cannot be attributed to individual participants so that participants can feel free to share perspectives or experiences that may not be well recognised by institutions who set reproducibility policies or targets.”  Further, registered participants will be emailed the participant information sheet and consent form in advance of the workshop to make it abundantly clear that the collection referenced in the promo material relates to a research process that requires consent. |
| Prop.8 Please attach copies of all advertising material/emails/letters that will be used to approach and recruit your potential participants.  Please add a version number and date to the advert. | This has been done. |
| Prop.9 Please describe the specific activities that participants will be asked to undertake (e.g. interviews, focus groups, questionnaires, workshops, experiments in a lab etc) including how many, where they will take place) and the expected duration of each activity.  Those who register for the event through the UKDS registration page will need to provide a large degree of special category and personal identifiable information - this is not described here.  It is unclear why this is being collected prior to participant consent which appears to take place on the day of the workshop. | This is the normal information collected by UK Data Service for all events that we run to allow us to identify (e.g. how many of the people that attend our training seminars, user conferences, etc. are students, how many work in government positions or for voluntary sector organisations, etc. )  These statistics are part of the required reporting the UK Data Service does as part of its funding from the ESRC.  All of this normal information collection is done in accordance with GDPR rules. |
| Prop.9 Please describe the specific activities that participants will be asked to undertake (e.g. interviews, focus groups, questionnaires, workshops, experiments in a lab etc) including how many, where they will take place) and the expected duration of each activity.  'Comments or questions made during the discussions and chit-chat may be noted down for research purposes if useful.'  - please upload the materials that will be used to capture this data. | I am unclear on what this point means. I cannot upload the notebooks (paper or digital) that the workshop organisers will use to jot down comments or questions. Maybe there is a misunderstanding about what we mean by ‘may be noted down for research purposes’.   To clarify, we mean that if someone asks a question or raises a point in the discussion that seems like it identifies an inequitable barrier to reproducibility or a solution to such a barrier, one or more of the organisers will literally write down a paraphrased version of that question or comment in a literal notebook. After the workshop, the organisers will sit together to read through those notes to consolidate them in a single coherent digital format (e.g. a Word document) that will be stored in an online version control repository. Any paper versions of those notes will be destroyed as soon as the coherent digital version is stored in the online repository. |
| Prop.9 Please describe the specific activities that participants will be asked to undertake (e.g. interviews, focus groups, questionnaires, workshops, experiments in a lab etc) including how many, where they will take place) and the expected duration of each activity.  Can you please confirm how many workshops participants will be expected to attend? If it's one as the recruitment advert suggests, are you certain you'll have up to 25 interested people, given that there's just under 3 weeks to the date of the workshop (19th March)? If another workshop is planned for for people who may indicate interest after this date, please add the date of the second workshop to the advert. | Participants are only expected to attend a single, “whole day” workshop. The second workshop is exactly like the first but will be in a different location, on a different date and with entirely different participants. The promo material for the second workshop is identical, apart from the date, location and registration link. A copy of this has been uploaded to the application.  The second workshop came about after the first was organised because researchers at York thought it was a very good idea and meshed nicely with a pre-existing campaign they were running about reproducibility in research. They got in contact to see if we would re-run the workshop in York to allow greater participation from their researchers. Unlike the first workshop, the second workshop is promoted only to York students and staff and so the registration link is private (as opposed to the public facing one used for the first workshop) but the form collects all the same information. |
| Prop.10.1 Please attach either a copy of all of the data collection tools you plan to use  Please add a version number and date to the workshop guide.  29/02/2024 at 09:26 AM Latest Submission  Prop.12.1 Please provide specific details of how consent will be obtained and recorded.  Implied consent is used for anonymous online surveys only.  Please describe exactly when the participants will receive the PIS and why consent is not being obtained prior to sign up and collection of special category and personal identifiable information. | Participants will receive the PIS and consent forms via email when registration closes. Registration will close when the workshop capacity is reached or 5 days before the workshop, whichever happens first. |
| Prop.13 Please attach a copy of your UK GDPR compliant participant information sheet(s)/script/summary of information page.  • A paper copy of participants name, email and consent will be used at registration and this will be retained for 1 year in a locked cabinet on UoM premises for audit purposes.  - it is unclear why contact details are being stored.  - it is also unclear what happens with all of the data provided at registration | All of the data collected at registration is part of the normal, GDPR compliant statistics used by UK Data Service as part of its ESRC grant. This information is used in ESRC reporting.  Names and emails of registered participants are retained to allow us to email them as needed for workshop attendance, e.g. to send out PIS and consent forms, to remind participants the day before, to share slide decks or links immediately after the event, etc.  The names and emails are deleted after the event when they are no longer needed.  The email has been removed from the consent form. This is the paper copy that will be retained in a locked cabinet on UoM premises for audit purposes. |
| Prop.13 Please attach a copy of your UK GDPR compliant participant information sheet(s)/script/summary of information page.  Data Protection and Confidentiality  There is information missing here - please refer back to the UoM IGO approved template and ensure that all GPDR information is provided. | I am unclear on what information is missing. I used the approved template to create my consent form. The only thing I can see is that I have not filled out the details of who has approved this consent form. There seems to be several options and I am meant to delete the irrelevant ones and keep only the relevant one. But I do not know which are irrelevant and which is relevant. The ethics form, the automated emails that come back, and even this letter with changes to make on my ethics application don’t really spell out who is granting ethical approval.  I have highlighted this in the newest version of the consent form and am very happy to update if anyone can tell me what it is that I should put there. |
| Prop.13 Please attach a copy of your UK GDPR compliant participant information sheet(s)/script/summary of information page.  Please add the research team contact details at the end of the PIS. Currently, they are only included in the context of receiving complaints. | I have added my contact email to the section on “who is doing the research”. I could not find an example on the template of where to put contact details outside of the context of receiving complaints so figured it made most sense to include the contact detail near the researcher names. |
| Prop.14 Please attach a copy of your UK GDPR compliant consent form(s)/script(s):  The version of the PIS referenced in Statement 1 of the consent form is wrong. The PIS attached to your application is Version 2, 01/02/2024. Please check this and amend. | This has been corrected. |
| Prop.14 Please attach a copy of your UK GDPR compliant consent form(s)/script(s):  The consent form is missing the signature sections for the participant and the consentor, as well as who will receive copies of the consent form. These would usually be found at the bottom of the form - please check the UoM template and add them back in. | This has been corrected. |
| Prop.14 Please attach a copy of your UK GDPR  compliant consent form(s)/script(s):  Consent statement 2 states that it will not be possible to remove an individual participant's data from the project once it has been anonymised. However, the PIS states that it will not be possible to remove data as specific contributions can't be identified. Can you please make sure this statement is consistent in both documents? | This has been corrected. |
| Prop.16 What do you consider to be the main ethical issues and risks associated with the proposed study and what steps will be taken to mitigate them?  Please consider:  informed consent  confidentiality  data protection | This section of the ethics application has been expanded to provide more details. The three suggested points have been added alongside the actions and plans relevant. |
| Prop.16 What do you consider to be the main ethical issues and risks associated with the proposed study and what steps will be taken to mitigate them?  In view of your response here, is there any chance of disclosures of professional malpractice? If yes, what will you do in such an instance? Reflect on this and see if this needs to be added to the PIS and consent form. | I don’t really understand what is meant by “chance of disclosures of professional malpractice”. Do you mean chance of disclosure (e.g. improperly anonymised data that carries a disclosure risk)? If so, there is no chance of such a disclosure. All data that contains any identifying information is deleted quickly after it no longer needed and all data that is retained for long term use (e.g. the research data) is anonymous from the beginning.  Instead, do you mean there is a chance of professional malpractice? This is harder to estimate as there is, conceivably, a risk that one of the researchers might say or do something that is potentially hurtful for a participant. For example, a researcher might ask “Can anyone think of a reason that traditionally under-represented groups might hesitate to make their research transparent or reproducible?” and a participant might find the term “traditionally under-represented” objectionable or might feel that the question can be interpreted as victim-blaming or similar. To this end, all we can do is be as clear as possible in the promotional material about the topic of the workshop and to declare clearly at the start of the workshop that it is intended to be a safe space where people can feel free to voice their opinions but that any participants are more than welcome to step outside if they need a break or to talk to the organisers if they have concerns. |
| Prop.18 How are you planning on sharing the results of your research with individual participants, groups or communities?  If you plan to retain contact details for the purpose of providing study outcome, retention needs to be described in the PIS and an opinion consent statement should be included in the consent form. | I am unclear on how best to say that results are currently only planned to be shared in academic conference presentations and potentially in academic journals or blogs on the UK Data Service website. I did rewrite this section of the ethics application to make it clear that no results will be directly shared with the participants but that they may encounter the academic or blog publications if they go looking for them. |