# Synthesising the Evidence Grant 2025: Reviewer’s feedback form

Note this form is based on the *Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols* (PRISMA-P) (Moher et al 2015).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project title:** |  |
| **Reviewer’s name:** |  |
| **Declaration of conflict of interest (if any)** |  |

**For the following section, please identify whether the applicant has included the information requested.**

| Application section | Topic | Item | Information provided? | | | Comments | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | Partly | No |
| 8 and 10 | Rationale | Is the rationale for the review described? |  |  |  |  | |
| 10 | Objectives | Is there an explicit statement of the question the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators and outcomes (PICO)? |  |  |  |  | |
| 14 | Eligibility criteria | Are the study characteristics (e.g. PICO, study design, setting) and report characteristics (e.g. years considered, language bias, publication status) described? |  |  |  |  | |
| 15 | Information sources | Are the information sources listed? |  |  |  |  | |
| 16 | Search strategy | Is at least one search strategy presented? |  |  |  |  | |
| 17 | Data management | Is a mechanism for managing records and data described? |  |  |  |  | |
| 18 | Selection process | Is the process for selecting studies described? |  |  |  |  | |
| 19 | Data extraction process | Is the method for extracting data from reports described? |  |  |  |  | |
| 20 | Data items | Have variables that will be collected from the data been listed and defined? |  |  |  |  | |
| 21 | Outcomes | Have all outcomes been listed and defined? |  |  |  |  | |
| 22 | Risk of bias | Have methods for uncovering bias been described? |  |  |  |  | |
| 23 | Synthesis | Has the criteria for synthesising data, or type of summary if synthesis is not appropriate, been described? |  |  |  |  | |
| 24 | Meta-bias(es) | Has an assessment of any meta-bias(es) been described? | Yes | Partly | No | N/A |  |
| 25 | Evidence quality | Has the method for assessing the strength of the evidence been described? |  |  |  |  | |

For each of the following sections, please tick the most appropriate box and give comments.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Skills of the applicant** | | | | |
| Does the applicant demonstrate they have a sufficient level of skills to complete the project described or have sufficient support in place to be able to do so? | | | | |
| Yes (2) | | Maybe (1) | | No (0) |
| Comments: | | | | |
| 1. **Fit with RCOT’s top ten research priorities** | | | | |
| Does the systematic review topic clearly link to the top 10 priorities for occupational therapy research in the UK? (The research priorities can be found here: <https://www.rcot.co.uk/top-10>.) | | | | |
| Yes (2) | | Maybe (1) | | No (0) |
| Comments: | | | | |
| 1. **Inclusion of people who access services** | | | | |
| Does the project include a realistic plan for public involvement and engagement in the design, execution and dissemination of the research? | | | | |
| Yes (2) | | Maybe (1) | | No (0) |
| Comments: | | | | |
| 1. **Impact on people who access services** | | | | |
| Does the project propose an impact that will benefit people who access services and/or their families or carers? | | | | |
| Yes (2) | | Maybe (1) | | No (0) |
| Comments: | | | | |
| 1. **Equity, diversity and belonging** | | | | |
| Does the proposed project take account of diverse populations, inclusive of socioeconomic groups, and how to include them appropriately in the project? | | | | |
| Yes (2) | | Maybe (1) | | No (0) |
| Comments: | | | | |
| 1. **Methodology – overall comments** | | | | |
| Is the proposed methodology sound? | | | | |
| Yes (2) | | Maybe (1) | | No (0) |
| Comments: | | | | |
| 1. **Funding** | | | | |
| Does the project appear feasible and offer good value for money? | | | | |
| Yes (2) | | Maybe (1) | | No (0) |
| Comments: | | | | |
| 1. **Institutional support** | | | | |
| Does the project have appropriate support from the host institution? | | | | |
| Yes (2) | | Maybe (1) | | No (0) |
| Comments: | | | | |
| 1. **Overall recommendation for support** | | | | |
| Highly recommended | Recommended | | Not recommended | |
| Additional comments for the RCOT Research and Innovation Fund Panel: | | | | |
| Comments for feedback to the applicant: | | | | |

**Please provide a final score from questions 1-8.**

**Total score: /16**

**CONSENT REQUEST**

RCOT would like to keep a record of Research and Innovation Fund reviewers so we know who has reviewed an application in recent years. The information recorded would include your name, email address and the title of the application reviewed and would be kept for three years. Please tick this box if you consent for this information about you to be collected: □
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