

School Research Review Group Proposal Review Outcome

Project reference number: SHS/17/29
Project Investigators: Anjana Wijekoon (AW), Kyle Martin (KM)
Project Title: Reasoning with Multi-Sensor Stream Data for m-Health Applications
Review number: 1
Date of Review: 19.01.2018
Reviewers: 1st Reviewer Laura Stewart
 2nd Reviewer Anne Wallace

Documentation Presented: *[Please indicate those present]*

Proposal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
RSPER or similar	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Risk assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Participant Information sheets	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Consent forms	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Participant recruitment materials	<input type="checkbox"/>
Copies of data collection tools e.g. questionnaires etc	<input type="checkbox"/>
Copies of data collection protocols e.g. exercise programmes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence of gatekeeper collaboration	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other e.g. CV of external researchers	<input type="checkbox"/>

Review feedback:

Reviewer's Comments	Researcher's Response
General Comment The proposal is outlined succinctly and the area of study appears to be appropriate and valuable to the field.	
Proposal A succinct and direct proposal. Greater clarity could be provided in places to ensure that the background and justification for the study is apparent. The use of abbreviations without full terms being outlined makes it difficult for the reader to fully understand some of the justification.	
RSPER Complete and appropriate	
Risk Assessment Consider an addition to the risk assessment regarding the techniques required for the	

exercises being tested and that these will be demonstrated to the participants by a member of the study team with the opportunity to practice and familiarise themselves (as outlined in the participants information sheet).	
Participant Information Sheets The wording used in the participant information sheet could be a little more user friendly and accessible, with terms such as 'sensor fusion' and 'sensor fusion architecture' not clearly explained so that the participant can understand the purpose of the study. Clarification of these terms would be recommended. In addition, details regarding the exercises being tested should be included in the participant information to allow participants to understand what they are being asked to do. This may also help with recruitment to ensure you recruit individuals that are happy and competent with these exercises. Possible inclusion of visual prompts for these exercises would also be beneficial.	
Consent Forms Complete and appropriate	
Recruitment Materials Not provided	
Gatekeeper Not provided	
Data Collection Tools Not provided	

Review outcome:

[Please indicate the preferred option]

Full approval

☒

Minor amendments required

☐

Major amendments required

☐

Not approved

☐

Outcome guidance:

For studies that receive full approval: SRRG has approved this study which may now progress. Please notify the SRRG Convenor and Administrator of any changes to the proposal or study documentation prior to implementation. These must be approved by SRRG and any other relevant research ethics or research governance body prior to implementation in your study.

For studies requiring minor amendments: Please address the recommendations stated above and confirm these by responding in the 'Researcher's response' column on this form. All amendments should be highlighted in the proposal documentation and returned with this form to the SRRG Convenor and Administrator. You may commence your study only when full approval has been granted.

For studies requiring major amendments: Please address the recommendations stated above and confirm these by responding in the 'Researcher's response' column on this form. Resubmit this form along with your full project paperwork, with all amendments highlighted to the SRRG Convenor and Administrator. A second review will be undertaken following which feedback will be provided.

For studies not approved: The submission cannot be supported since the reviewers' feedback as outlined above indicates that the proposed project is unviable for the stated reasons. The project may not proceed under the aegis of the School. A new submission may be considered.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Kay Cooper". The signature is written in a cursive style with a small dot at the end.

Dr Kay Cooper
Convenor

School Research Review Group
School of Health Sciences
Robert Gordon University
Aberdeen