**REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

Date: July 11, 2023

Re: STUDY00018365: Privacy and User Modeling Implications of Information Retrieval via Conversational Agents

Dear Dr Caat,

Thank you for submitting your application to the Human Subjects Division. Additional information or documentation is needed in order for your application to move forward in the review process.

|  |
| --- |
| **HOW TO RESPOND TO THIS LETTER**  **Most letter points include requests for you to update your submission to incorporate any changes or information as requested below** (see [Respond to HSD](https://www.washington.edu/research/hsd/training/zipline-online-help-library/researcher-submission-guide/submitting-new-studies/respond-to-hsd/)). Some letter points may ask you to provide additional information that does not require updates to the application.  For questions that request additional information or confirmation instead of, or in addition to a revision to a document, please answer in a contrasting font, save, and upload this letter as an attachment to the response action in Zipline.  Here are some helpful tips for responding to this screening letter:   * Use [tracked changes](https://support.office.com/en-us/article/track-changes-in-word-197ba630-0f5f-4a8e-9a77-3712475e806a) when making requested edits to study documents * Upload the revised documents in the appropriate section of the Zipline SmartForms (see [Prepare Other Study Documents](https://www.washington.edu/research/hsd/training/zipline-online-help-library/researcher-submission-guide/submitting-new-studies/filling-out-application/#otherdocs)). * Click “update” to revise study documents in Zipline so that the revised version replaces the previous version in the system. Use ‘add’ **only** for new documents. * Remember to click ‘**Save**’ at the bottom of the SmartForm page whenever you make changes or upload a new document.   **When you are ready to send your response, please attach your response letter to the Supporting Documents section of the Submit Response window. Do not upload it to the Zipline SmartForm.**  *Need more Zipline help? Check out the* [*Researcher Submission Guide*](https://www.washington.edu/research/hsd/training/zipline-online-help-library/researcher-submission-guide) *for Zipline instructions and tutorials.* |

**Graduate Student Requirements:**

Graduate students are required to provide two additional components when submitting a new application: 1) An IRB 101 training module completion certificate, and 2) Ancillary review sign off from their faculty advisor.

* Per point 1 (IRB101 certificate) you can refer to the following link which has step by step instructions on how to access the training module and where to upload the completion certificate in ZIPLINE when done:

<https://www.washington.edu/research/hsd/training/required-training/irb-101-online-tutorial/> (Note: If you've completed this training before, there is no need to re-do the training module to get this certificate -- you can upload the completion certificate from when you first completed this training).

* Per point 2 (Ancillary Review) your faculty advisor, Emily Bender, will be required to review and provide ancillary review sign off on your application. If your faculty advisor is unfamiliar with how to provide ancillary review sign off in ZIPLINE, you can refer them to this following link:

<https://www.washington.edu/research/hsd/training/zipline-online-help-library/faculty-advisor-guide/>

**ZIPLINE**

1. **Local Site Documents, 1. Consent Forms – Consent Form:**  Since this minimal risk study design will qualify for Exempt Research, this means that UW HSD will not be reviewing the consent form process. Therefore, remove the Consent Form document from this section.

NOTE: It sounds like per your study design, you are intentionally trying to not collect identifying information from the participants. Since this study can qualify for Exempt Research, that means that the consent form information you will use does not have the same stringent requirements as a study that does requires IRB review. Studies such as this one that qualify as ‘Exempt Research’ mean that it is ‘Exempt’ from having required consent elements because it fits a pre-approved category of research. Therefore, you **don’t** have to collect the participant signatures when informing them about this study – you can instead just have a ‘Do you agree to participate YES or NO’ checkbox in it’s place. That way the participant won’t reveal their identity by online signature. Here is a link for your reference on Exempt Research guidance that may be helpful:

<https://www.washington.edu/research/hsd/guidance/exempt/#5>

**IRB Protocol**

1. **Question 2.9, Number of subjects:** In the text box section it appears to list the different demographic variables that intend to be collected. This particular information would not be applicable to this specific question about participant group characteristics. This section is meant to explain if there are different population groups you are specifically recruiting for the design of the study (ex. n = 25 people blinded to the test product, n = 25 not blinded to test product). Does that make sense? Therefore, remove these demographic variables from this section.
2. **Question 4.1, Recruiting and screening:** It wasn’t clear to me in this section whether the survey link is sent out directly to the recruited populations via e-mail and posted flyer. Add language to this section to clarify that accessing the survey is provided by a direct link being provided in the recruitment material.
3. **Question 5.1, Study procedures:** Can you clarify in this section which survey platform you will be using to collect this data? Qualtrics? GoogleForms? Clarify the survey platform in this section.
4. **Question 5.6.a (accessed identifiers) and 5.6.b (obtained identifiers):** This question can often confusing to new researchers. It sounds like per the survey design, there won’t be any unique identifiers that will be collected as a part of the study data – no names, e-mail addresses, or any identifiers that would be able to be associated with an individual’s identity. Does that sound correct? If so, you’ll want to change the answer from YES to NO in 5.6.a and 5.6.b and indicate in the sub-question that there will be no identifiers. You’ll want to remove the existing language in the YES comment boxes.
5. **Question 5.6.c (identifier storage):** If there won’t be any identifiers accessed or obtained, that means that this question about how identifiers would be stored doesn’t need to be answered because it wouldn’t be applicable. Therefore, you can uncheck this first checkbox.

Please feel free to contact me with questions. I look forward to receiving your response.

Kind regards,

Greg Wallace, IRB Administrator – Committee B

206.221.7973 – [gkw@uw.edu](mailto:gkw@uw.edu)