

## **SCIENTIFIC PEER REVIEW TEMPLATES**

### **Health and Disability Ethics Committees**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The following templates are intended as guidance for researchers who are submitting applications for HDEC review.

The reviewer templates listed below may be used or adapted to suit the particular circumstances. However, please keep within the NEAC informed peer review standards described in the guidelines and in the instruction to researchers and reviewers.

For more information on peer review please view appendix 1 of:

Ethical Guidelines for Observational Studies or,  
Ethical Guidelines for Intervention Studies

## SCIENTIFIC PEER REVIEW: Instructions to the researcher

### Introduction

Scientific peer review (hereafter referred to as peer review) in the context of human research refers to the scientific validity of the research project and is a vital step in research project development. Peer review is a requirement of ethical approval and can enhance research project development in a variety of ways through providing an objective perspective from an informed reader.

It is a requirement of the Health and Disability Ethics Committees that all research projects involving humans undergo peer review.

### Standards for peer review

Peer reviewers will consider the following points in order to determine scientific validity. Your proposal/application should ensure these are addressed.

- 1. *The relative merit of the research:*** consideration of whether the proposed work is important, worthwhile and justifiable. The research should address a health issue that is important for health and/or society. The aims, research questions and hypotheses should build on and address gaps in existing knowledge.
- 2. *The design and methods:*** consideration of the quality of study design and the robustness of the methods used. This might include study methodology, a description of sample recruitment and characteristics (including number, gender and ethnicity where relevant) and proposed methods of data analysis. An indication of timelines for the research should be included.
- 3. *The feasibility of the research:*** consideration of whether the overall strategy, methodology and analyses are well reasoned and appropriate to achieve the specific aims of the project. The review will determine whether the research has the likelihood, on balance, of improving scientific knowledge, concepts, technical capacity or methods in the research field, or of contributing to better treatments, services, health outcomes or preventive interventions. The research should be achievable within the specified timeframe and the researcher/research team must have the appropriate experience and expertise to undertake the research.
- 4. *Peer review delivers an informed opinion:*** An effective peer review process provides perspectives from subject matter experts. It may be suitable for informed perspectives to be sought from individuals in the same organisation as the researcher, as long as the requirements of freedom from bias, equity and fairness can be met. An appropriate peer is one who can deliver an informed opinion on some or all of a proposal. Reviewers will be knowledgeable about the topic and/or context for the research, have the appropriate expertise relative to the breadth and scope of research under review and, as a result, will be well placed to make a statement as to whether the research in question has

verifiable scientific merit. Peer review of scientific validity may include consideration of cultural relevance and appropriateness.

- 5. *Peer review delivers an objective opinion:*** Those acting in the capacity of reviewers are charged with delivering a balanced and considered analysis of the research. Generally, the success of the peer review process is determined by the extent to which these evaluations can be considered free of bias, equitable and fair. Objectivity can be compromised if peer reviewers have conflicts of interest, and so appropriate peer reviewers typically will not be materially connected to the researcher(s) in a way that might undermine objectivity, and be free from either positive or negative inducements.
  
- 6. *A consensus opinion on scientific validity is formed:*** An HDEC will need to receive assurance that the peer review process has delivered support for the scientific validity of the proposed research. When a peer review process has engaged a range of experts, there needs to be a process that leads to a consensus opinion about the quality of the research.

## SCIENTIFIC PEER REVIEW:

Date 02\_04\_2020

Research Title Chest X-ray image analysis and classification for pneumonia detection using CNN

Co-coordinating Investigator Terry Gao

Peer Reviewer Name Pip Anderson

Peer Reviewer Position Public Health Physician CMDHB

Independent from study? **Yes** / No

Peer Reviewer signature 

Recommendation: **Approve** / Revise minor / Revise major / Decline

REVIEW GUIDELINE	GUIDELINE PROMPTS	COMMENTS
Relative merit of the research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Important, worthwhile and justifiable.</li> <li>Addresses a health issue that is important for health and/or society.</li> <li>Aims, research questions and hypotheses build on and address gaps in existing knowledge.</li> </ul>	Currently, Machine Learning technology is being implemented in different kinds of fields especially diagnosing diseases and bioinformatics. The use of deep learning technology, such as Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) is a kind of machine learning technology, on medical image processing is a growing concept in the medical field where it is successfully supporting correct and speedy decision making. The general idea is that a set of medical images is used to train a deep learning CNN to be able to distinguish between the noise and the useful information and then uses this training to interpret new images by recognizing patterns that indicate certain diseases in the individual images. In this way, it imitates the training for a doctor, but the theory is that since it is capable of learning from a far larger set of images than any human, could have the potential of being more accurate.
Design and methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quality of study design</li> <li>Robustness of the methods used.</li> <li>Includes a description of sample recruitment and characteristics (including number, gender and ethnicity where relevant) proposed methods of data analysis.</li> <li>Timelines for the research included</li> </ul>	This project is to build a diagnostic system which use historical X-rays data collected at Middlemore Hospital and some open-to-public coronavirus infectors' chest X-ray images for training. The historical data will be split into a training and a validation set. The CNN will then be trained on the training set and the predictive value of the tool, once trained, will be determined by using the validation set. Tests of what parts of the images by which the CNN uses to determine the output is explored to ensure the output is clinically relevant. After this initial analysis, a massive extraction of texture features will be applied, and will serve to provide additional information to the diagnosis of COVID-19.
Feasibility of the research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overall strategy, methodology and analyses are well reasoned and appropriate to achieve the specific aims of the project.</li> </ul>	The research uses these deep learning techniques to build the early diagnosis system for the detection of lung pneumonia diseases by X-ray images. In the future, we can also use the similar system to show signature patterns in other medical image data such as CT, MRI, MEG, et.al.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Likely to improve scientific knowledge, concepts, technical capacity or methods in the research field, or of contributing to better treatments, services, health outcomes or preventive interventions.</li> <li>· Achievable within the specified timeframe</li> <li>· Researcher/research team has the appropriate experience and expertise.</li> </ul>	<p>This research can range from lung disease detection to heart disease or cancer detection, which can help to reduce the work load of doctors and to detect disease at the early stage; also it could even change how we treat early diagnosis</p>
Reviewer Independence /objectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Peer review is considered free of bias, equitable and fair.</li> <li>· Objectivity can be compromised if peer reviewers have conflicts of interest, and so appropriate peer reviewers typically will not be materially connected to the researcher(s) in a way that might undermine objectivity, and be free from either positive or negative inducements.</li> <li>· If the peer reviewer is connected to the study please explain what measures are taken to mitigate conflict of interest.</li> </ul>	<p>I work in the child health area in the population health team at CM Health but have not had any direct involvement in this research and was not involved in the development of this research proposal.</p>
Other comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Any reviewer observations that are not covered in the points above.</li> </ul>	<p>None</p>