



TARPSWG RESEARCH EVALUATION COMMITTEE (REC)

WHY do we need such a committee now?

The Trans-Atlantic RPS Working group now has:

- Over 50 academic centers and is still looking to expand into Asia
- These centers all want to collaborate and benefit
 - From the potential networking this group provides
 - Initiating potential research projects and ideas
 - Collaborating on others research projects and ideas
 - Being part of consensus guidelines published by this group

ROLE

- To oversee all new proposals for new consensus guidelines
- To oversee all new proposals for new studies NOT related to the RESAR registry
- Ensure proper application of the Authorship policy
- Ensure proper application of Data Sharing Agreements

COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

- The committee will consist of **4-6 volunteer members** of TARPSWG
 - The committee will have broad representations with membership from at least **3 countries** from at least **2 continents**
 - Members will complete a 2 year term, that is renewable once
 - The original committee members are tasked to define this committee and its role and create the guidelines for submission of new proposals
 - The committee will meet by teleconference 6 weeks prior to the TARPSWG meeting (SSO and CTOS) to ensure the committee has enough time to review the proposal and provide comments to the PI

1. Who can submit a proposal?

- a. Any TARPSWG member can submit a proposal

2. What is the Process for New Study Proposals?

- a. To submit a proposal, an application form (attached) must be completed explaining the purpose, objectives, methods, statistical analysis etc.
- b. The proposal should identify the Principle Investigator (PI) and Co-Investigator(s) (Co-I)



- c. The PI, based on the *clinical question and histology*, decides whether there is a requirement for **the minimum number of cases contributed**, for a center to be eligible to collaborate on the study.
- d. Once the form is completed it is submitted to the REC via email to tarpswg@gmail.com
- e. The REC reviews the proposal for feasibility and sends feedback to the author for comment – if the study is rejected, it can be reworked for subsequent re-evaluation
- f. The proposal must be submitted at least 6 weeks prior to the TARPSWG meetings (SSO or CTOS) to give the REC enough time to review the proposal
- g. If approved, then the proposal will be presented at the next TARPSWG (SSO or CTOS) meeting to the group via a 5 minute Power Point presentation.
- h. All those interested in participating will fill out a sign-up sheet after the meeting and can directly contact the PI. The PI will then decide if the center meets the eligibility criteria to participate in the study.
- i. After the meeting, the REC will then send out the proposal, with the PI's contact information, to the entire membership to allow those that were not present at the meeting to participate by contacting the PI of their interest.
- j. The PI will keep a list of all members that have committed to contributing to the study with regards to helping with the comments, the editing of the manuscript, the analysis etc. and will keep track of the relevant contributions of all members.
- k. Data sharing agreements between the PI's site and each site should be performed via each centers research contracts office. It is the PI's responsibility that all data sharing agreements are finalized prior to receiving the data from other centers.
- l. If the PI wishes to do so, the REC can provide a Standardized Data Sharing agreement to the PI that they can send to the respective participating centers.

3. WHAT is the Authorship and Publication Policy?

- a. Authorship rules should be established prior to starting any study, so that others can decide if they would like to participate.



- b. The Principal Investigator is the member that came up with the research idea and was identified at the time of the initial proposal that was sent to the Research Evaluation Committee.
- c. The Principle Investigator will be the **LAST** Author on the Publication
- d. The **FIRST** author will be the member who wrote the majority of the manuscript. This will be determined at the time of concept submission. Representation from different institutions is encouraged, but not mandatory.
- e. The collaborating centers can submit a **maximum of 2** author names that contributed significantly to the project.
- f. The **order** of the **collaborating authors** will be based on a pre-determined method of listing.
- g. Following options may be adopted:
 - i. **Alphabetical** Order
 - ii. **Rotating alphabetical** order (forward, backwards etc.)
 - iii. **Number of cases contributed**
 - iv. **Rotating between these options**
- h. With advice from all participating centers, the PI gets to choose which journal he or she would like to submit the manuscript to.
- i. If the PI would like to submit the study for an abstract oral or poster presentation at a National or International meeting, they must advise the participating centers and use the same order of authors as on the manuscript.

The present document has been discussed and approved during TARPSWG Semiannual Meeting held in Chicago on Friday, March 23rd, 2018