

National Institute for Health Research Cochrane Review Incentive Scheme 2016

PLEASE NOTE IMPORTANT CHANGES TO THE SCHEME FOR 2016

Detailed within this call paper in red.

Note to Coordinating Editors of all Cochrane Review Groups

Background

1. For the past twelve years, the Department of Health in England has funded an annual scheme whereby small incentive payments were offered to Cochrane Review Groups (CRGs) for preparing key new or updated Cochrane reviews by agreed dates. Over the twelve years, over 240 awards have been made.
2. The Department recognises that these awards are insufficient to meet the full costs of conducting reviews. They are intended to be applied at the discretion of Co-ordinating Editors in ways that will facilitate and possibly accelerate activity that is already planned or underway.

Scope of the 2016 Scheme

3. **The budget for the scheme in 2016 will remain at £100,000 however we expect to make around 10 – 20 awards. With higher incentive payments (up to £10,000 maximum) available to reviews of impact, which may or may not be using more complex methodology. Complex reviews can seek to request support from the NIHR Complex Reviews Support Unit (CRSU) by indicating this in their application. Contact with the CRSU should be made only if/when an award offer has been made by NIHR, and not at the application stage.**
4. Co-ordinating Editors may nominate for incentive awards:
 - *review updates; and*
 - *new reviews in progress or ready to commence.*
5. **Co-ordinating Editors are encouraged to submit applications for more comprehensive reviews, and consider what is most useful to the users of the reviews. For example, nominating reviews that consider just one intervention, as opposed to an overview or multiple interventions, will not be favoured in the first instance (dependent on priority).**
6. **Review timelines will remain as 9 months for an update and 12 months for a new review as far as possible. Please ensure this is taken into consideration when submitting nominations.**

Criteria for Review Nominations

7. In the 'scientific/policy justification' section of the form, in no more than 200 words, describe **the potential importance to, and impact of the review topic within the UK healthcare system**, specifically addressing the below points:
 - *the **number of patients affected by the clinical condition and/or intervention being reviewed;***

- *the **degree of uncertainty** that exists in the absence of an up-to-date systematic review, and the **'cost' to policy and practice** of operating in the face of such uncertainty;*
- *the likelihood of a review assisting or **changing policy or practice**;*
- *the **identified need** for a review by policy makers or health care commissioners;*
- *the likely **importance and priority that would be given to the topic by consumers**, such as patients and their carers, and their involvement in the review; and*
- *an **estimate of the number and size of the studies** that are likely to be considered for inclusion in the review (for review updates, give information on the additional studies);*
- ***an indication as to whether the review includes complex methodologies with further justification***
- *any further justification as to why this review would be difficult to complete without an Incentive Award.*
- *Past performance of a CRG previously granted a Cochrane Programme Grant, or Cochrane Incentive Award, specifically their track record in delivering reviews as agreed and within the project timeframe, will be considered when reviewing nominations.*

Nominating candidate reviews and review updates

8. Co-ordinating Editors of all CRGs (not only those whose editorial bases are within the UK, although priority may be given to reviews with an author or editorial base in the UK) are now invited to nominate **up to three** new reviews or review updates that they consider are of importance (see below) and for which they consider the award of an incentive payment would lead to completion of work at a significantly earlier time. These must **not** be reviews or review updates covered by a NIHR Cochrane Programme Grant.
9. Nominations must be received in electronic form by NETSCC by **31st AUGUST 2016** (SRPinfo@southampton.ac.uk). Attached to this paper is a simple proforma that must be used for each nomination. Late proposals and proposals that fail to adhere to the proforma, exceed the word limit or do not address the criteria above will not be considered.
- 10. Slight changes have been made to the application proforma for 2016 to assist with internal processing and coding. Please ensure all sections of the proforma are complete, accurate and within the word limit.**

Selection of reviews and review updates for incentive awards

11. The responses to this call for proposals will be considered by a scientific panel, which will recommend to NIHR which proposals should be offered incentive awards. Decisions are likely to be made in late September. In all cases, a date by which the review or review update must be completed and submitted to The Cochrane Library will be agreed as a condition of the award, and will reflect the needs of the NIHR or others for the review or review update. The latest date to be agreed is likely to be 30 November 2017, i.e. a maximum of one year after the awards are notified (all projects will start on 1st November 2016). Failure to meet the deadline will result in the award being withdrawn.
12. A further condition of the award will be that a pre-publication version of the review or review update is made available upon completion and prior to publication in The Cochrane Library. The pre-publication version may be used to inform policy work but will not be circulated more widely.

Administration

13. Award payments will be made upon completion of the review or review update (if this is by the agreed completion date). It will be extremely unusual for extensions of agreed deadlines to be allowed. Wherever possible, payments will be made to the host institution of the Co-ordinating Editor or to an institution within the UK (which could be the host institution of another of the CRG's editors or a lead author).

14. The pre-publication version submitted upon completion must contain an [NIHR acknowledgement and disclaimer](#). NIHR should also be notified post-award should the review prove to have had an impact. Impact is defined as research that results in a change to activity or understanding arising from that research, specifically through the following avenues:
- Cost effective treatments and services, informing national guidance, NICE guidelines and other additional agencies.
 - Publications and other dissemination activities and the setting of standards for health research.
 - Saving money by stopping ineffective or unnecessarily costly treatments, supporting innovation and enabling a healthier workforce.
 - Review which result in a clear research recommendation, notably contributes to the research portfolio of evidence, or has received particular media attention.

Enquiries

15. Any enquiries relating to this scheme should be referred to Ria Osborne at SRPinfo@southampton.ac.uk with 'Cochrane Incentive Scheme' in the subject/title field.

NIHR Cochrane Review Incentive Scheme 2016

NOMINATION OF REVIEW TOPIC

Name of Cochrane Review Group:

Name of Co-ordinating Editor:

Name/location of Co-ordinating Editor's host institution:

E-mail address for correspondence:

Title of Cochrane review or review update:

Lead author:

Email address of lead author:

Name/location of lead author's host institution:

Is this review identified as a Cochrane priority? (Delete as appropriate) Yes / No

Does this review require consideration of support from the CRSU? Yes / No

Is this a new review or update to an existing Cochrane review? New/Update

Methods and Designs. For internal coding purposes only, please click to select any/all specialist methods covered in this review.

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Diagnostic Review | <input type="checkbox"/> Meta-Analysis | <input type="checkbox"/> Modelling – Economic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Realist Synthesis | <input type="checkbox"/> Overview of Reviews | <input type="checkbox"/> Prognostic Review |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Scoping Review | | |

Scientific/policy justification for review/review update (max 200 words):

[See paragraph 5 in the description of the scheme for criteria that you should address when writing a justification.]

Reason(s) why an incentive payment would facilitate or accelerate completion of this work (max 100 words):