

NRS Funding Guidance: Annex 3

Procedure for Assessing Studies as Extended Review

1. Introduction

The Extended Review process exists to assess potential funders supporting high quality research where they would not ordinarily be identified as a CSO eligible funder. This process applies only to studies receiving funding from an overseas government or charity, or from a company as part of a collaborative research project.

2. Purpose

All studies, regardless of where the study is led from or the location of local sites across the UK which meet the criteria of Extended Review outlined in section 3 should be categorised as “Extended Review” on the project type field within ReDA.

Studies within this category will count towards annual CSO Board allocations as for any non-commercial study. This includes allocations for Service Support Costs and Researcher support and any associated ETCs, as well as inclusion of applicable recruitment activity within the Recruitment Premium.

Extended Review studies may be subject to identification, cross-checking and confirmation by the CMT Information Manager prior to submission of data to the CSO for the allocation data submission.

3. Extended Review Procedure from 1st December 2024

All studies are assessed for eligibility either prior to or just after local R&D approval by health boards. If the funding from the study is in part or in whole from one of the areas below:

- Overseas Government
- Overseas charity
- Funded by a commercial company as collaborative research (or Investigator initiated trial) *

AND is identified as:

- Having high quality peer review
- Been awarded in open competition
- Meeting the definition of research

and regardless of whether sites exist in other UK nations, will meet the criteria for Extended Review.

The study should be categorised as **Extended Review** within the “project type” within ReDA. Further information in table 3 supports the statements above.

Table 3: Provides supporting explanations for the peer review, open competition and definition of research.

Requirements Acknowledged by Health Boards	Supporting Explanation
High Quality Peer Review	Independent- Reviewers must be external to the study's institution, have no conflicts of interest and not be involved within the study.
	Expert- Reviewers should have knowledge of the relevant discipline and the expertise to assess the study's methodological and statistical aspects.
	Proportionate- The level of peer review should be commensurate with the study's size and complexity i.e. larger studies may have more reviewers with broader expertise.
Awarded in Open Competition	Funding is available to all qualified applicants who meet the eligibility criteria
Meets the Definition of Research	Can be found here Refer to Section 2.

* Extended Review studies are defined as non-commercial studies. Occasionally when studies are undertaken as a *collaboration* between multiple commercial and non-commercial entities, the classification may not be clear. The contracting arrangements between the Sponsor/Funder and study sites can be used to determine classification in the first instance, i.e. studies that use a commercial contract will be classed as commercial and all other studies will be classed as non-commercial. If the study is classed as non-commercial this is potentially an Extended Review study.