

Tool for Supervisors

Is an HDR candidate's project ready for **research ethics review**?

DIRECT PARTICIPANT PARTICIPATION

V1.0 16 May 2020

Consider the matters below. Are they clearly addressed by the project design? If there is more than one possible answer has justification been provided for the selected approach?

A. PROJECT'S FOUNDATION

Thinking separately about the project's Research question; Objective; and selected methodology was this suggested by previous research, the literature or a publicly recognised problem (in Australia see the ethical principle of [Merit and Integrity](#) and [Element 1 of Chapter 3.1](#) of the National Statement)and:

Is the research question clearly stated?

Is it clear why that question is worth asking and answering?

Is it clear that the chosen methods are suitable to generate and answer to that question?

B. PARTICIPANTS

(In Australia see the ethical principles of [Merit and Integrity, Beneficence, Justice and Respect](#) and Elements 2 and 3 in Chapter 3.1)

Bi. Participant definition

Is it clear who will participate in the project? How will the candidate identify them? Does the potential participant pool include any of the categories addressed in Section 4 of the National Statement? If so, has the candidate explained how the vulnerabilities of those participants will be addressed? Is the pool over researched? Has the candidate explained how the selection of the pool is based upon matters discussed at A? Is the identification and involvement of the potential participant pool fair? Could participating expose them potential harm?

Bii. Recruitment

How will participants be recruited? Do the needs of the project necessitate more than one recruitment strategy? Does the recruitment method raise any privacy considerations? Will any other party be aware of the identities of persons approached about participating? Or their decision? Could the recruitment strategies expose anyone to harm?

Biii. Consent

What strategy will be used to seek and gain the consent of participants? Do the needs of the project necessitate more than one consent strategy? Does the consent method raise any privacy considerations? Will any other party be aware of the identities of persons who were asked for their consent? Or their decision? Could the consent strategies expose anyone to harm?

Biv. Duration and needs

Does the duration of a project, its iterative nature, phases or other needs warrant seeking consent more than once?

Bv. Reconfirm consent

Is it necessary to reconfirm consent, such as for use of a quote or photograph in research outputs?

Bvi. Alternatives to express consent

Will any alternatives to explicit consent (such as a waiver of the consent requirement or the opt-out approach) be used? If so, how the requirements of the national arrangements being met (in Australia, [see National Statement Chapter 2.3](#)).

Bvii. Limited disclosure

Will there be some form of limited disclosure to potential participants? Describe and address the requirements in the national arrangements (in Australia, [see National Statement Chapter 2.3](#)).

Tool for Supervisors

Is an HDR candidate's project ready for **research ethics review**?

DIRECT PARTICIPANT PARTICIPATION

V1.0 16 May 2020

Bviii. Existing relationship

Is there an existing relationship between potential participants and the researchers? This includes unequal and captive relationships. Describe and address the requirements in the national arrangements (in Australia, [see National Statement Chapter 4.3](#)).