

## Appendix A

### The Scholarly Review Process at Holland Bloorview Kids Rehabilitation Hospital

A science or scholarly review is an assessment of the scientific merit of the research by a qualified expert in the field. In the case of *grant* or *REB* submission at Holland Bloorview, it is the responsibility of the Principal Investigator (PI) to provide evidence that an appropriate scholarly review has been conducted and the proposal is scientifically sound.

#### A. STEPS FOR A SCHOLARLY REVIEW PRIOR TO GRANT SUBMISSION

Step	Grant Submission
1	As soon as the PI is aware that he/she will be applying for funding, the PI must inform the BRI research administration office;
2	The PI* is responsible for selecting the reviewer and organizing the scholarly review;
3	Reviewer(s) completes the Science Review Form (track changes can also be included) and returns comments to the PI;
4	The PI provides a written response and revised proposal to the Reviewer(s);
5	When satisfied with the response and revised proposal, the Reviewer(s) signs off (email form acceptable);
6	The PI provides the BRI with a copy of the Science Review Form and revised proposal;
7	Submissions are due <b>10 days</b> before the grant deadline.

\*In the case of students, the Supervisor is responsible for selecting the reviewer(s) and organizing the review; the supervisor and student work together to respond to reviewer(s).

#### B. STEPS FOR A SCHOLARLY REVIEW PRIOR TO REB SUBMISSION:

The default scholarly review documentation acceptable for an REB submission is an approved BRI Science Review Form. However, other types of scholarly reviews may be accepted. **It is strongly recommended that researchers consult with the REB Office before submission.**

- *All science reviews conducted as part of the grant submission process can be submitted to the REB to satisfy the science review requirement of a REB submission. The REB submission must include a response to the key concerns raised by peer reviewers.*
- *If the protocol was peer reviewed by the funding agency, the funding agency review can take the place of a science review. However, a subproject with a specific protocol within network/team/program/Foundation Scheme grants require subproject-specific science review at the time of REB submission unless the protocol of the subproject was subjected to peer review in its final form during the grant review process.*

If the REB submission is related to an unfunded research study or a sub-project within a network/team/program/ Foundation Scheme grant, the study must undergo science review as outlined below.

<b>Step</b>	<b>REB Submission</b>
1	The Local PI is responsible for selecting the reviewer and organizing the review;
2	Reviewer(s) completes the Science Review Form (track changes can also be included) and returns comments to the PI;
3	The PI provides a written response and revised proposal to the Reviewer(s);
4	When satisfied with the response and revised proposal, the Reviewer(s) signs off (email form acceptable).
5	Science Review should be included in REB application package and submitted to the BRI operations office for Departmental approval one week before REB submission deadline.

**The number of Scholarly Reviews varies depending on the following criteria:**

<b>Type of Protocol</b>	<b>Number of Reviewers</b>
<b>&lt;\$50,000</b>	<b>1-2</b>
<b>&gt;/=\$50,000</b>	<b>2-3</b>
<b>Clinical Trials</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Students</b>	<b>Determined by Supervisor*</b>

\* If the student has a Supervisory Committee, the committee's review can be used as the Scholarly Review for minimal risk studies. A response to the recommendations made by the supervisory committee must accompany the REB submission. For Clinical Graduate Students or equivalent, a protocol review by the research course instructor or teaching assistant will be acceptable for minimal risk studies. A response to the comments made by the reviewer must accompany the REB submission.

If the student does not have a Supervisory Committee or the protocol is greater than minimal risk, a Scholarly Review by a qualified expert who is not involved in teaching or supervising the student or student team is required. The supervisor is responsible for selecting the reviewer(s) and organizing the review; the supervisor and student work together to respond to reviewer(s).