



Standard Procedure for the award of The British Pain Society Clulow Award

Advertising and Call for applications:

The BPS will invite applications via its website, social media channels, and its publication *Pain News* in January of every second year until depletion of the Clulow funds.

The current advert stipulating a paper application with supporting CD will be changed to an electronic based application with deadline date and time specified.

The call for applications will go out in the second week of January every other year.

The closing date for applications receipt by email will be 5pm on the first Friday of May of the year.

A special email account will be setup to receive the applications and related correspondence and will be checked daily including the junk folder by the Secretariat member with responsibility for the Science and Research Committee (SRC, which will always have at least 5 members, with a member term of 3 year which can be renewed once, before at least one term of pause is required). One of these is a lay member.

Receiving the applications for funding:

All submissions will initially be the responsibility of the Secretariat member in charge of the SRC; both the Secretariat member and the Chair of the Science & Research Committee will ensure completeness of the applications and correspond with applicants who have accidentally submitted incomplete paperwork.

Only valid applications with complete paperwork at the deadline date will be circulated to the membership of the SRC in full.

Conflicts of Interest:

Members of the SRC will be asked to declare conflicts of interest with regards to the valid applications. This will be done by the BPS administration using a short form listing all members which will be filed. A conflict of interest policy will be used.

Members who are conflicted will step aside from judging the applications for the year.

The same is applicable of the Chair. In case of a conflict of interest by the Chair of the Science & Research Committee, he/she will nominate a deputy Chair who will oversee the judging of the applications.

In case of an unusual number of COI in one year the Chair may co-opt members onto the Science and Research committee to assist with the review process. There should be at least 3 non-conflicted members including the Chair/deputy Chair to provide quorum.

Review Process:

Internal triage

The eligibility of an application as within scope and the basic quality of research will be assessed by the non-conflicted members of the Science and Research Committee with appropriate background in research ('experts'). This is done through a context of a triage meeting. The Chair/deputy and members of the Science and Research Committee will then agree to nominate 1 lead reviewer and 1 second reviewer amongst them for each submission which has passed this internal triage. They will then also agree 2-3 suitable *external peer reviewers* to review the proposal.

External peer review

The external reviewers will be chosen for their expertise in the subject matter and will be asked to declare conflict of interest if any. A conflict of interest policy will be used and will be made available to each peer reviewer. They will be approached by email with the abstract of the application as well as name of the authors.

The nomination of external reviewers, communication with the external reviewer will be the responsibility of the lead and second reviewer with support from the BPS Secretariat. The process should be completed by end of June. Two peer reviews should be available for each application.

External reviews will be allowed till end of July to complete their reviews and return an opinion to lead or second reviewer.

All reviewers will be asked to submit a one sheet of A4 outlining their opinion on the proposed research particularly the following: feasibility, potential impact, finances, expertise of the applicants, and quality of the application. As guide for their rating they will be provided with a 'rating sheet' listing scores between 1-10 and their meanings. They will be required to provide a single, overall rating for the reviewed application. Additionally, the committee lay member will be asked to review the lay summary of all applications for understandability.

All reviews will be circulated and non-conflicted members/including co-opted member as outlined above will be asked to review all submissions. Conflicted members will not review any application.

Committee Meeting September:

The Science & Research Committee shall meet before the September Council meeting.

The Science & Research Committee will be expected to make a final decision on the funded application at the September meeting.

Conflicted members will not attend that meeting unless the application they have declared conflict with has been eliminated from the competition at triage.

Lead reviewers will be responsible for presenting their allocated application with assistance from the 2nd reviewer. The second reviewer will assume that responsibility if the lead reviewer is unable to attend.

A decision on funding will be made based on a ranking that is based both on the results from the external peer reviews, and judgement by the Committee members. Each member will score each application with a score as outlined above taking the peer reviews into account. They will submit their score anonymously to the BPS administrator accompanying this meeting. The applications will be ranked in accordance with the average of the scores from all Committee members.

The administrator will then read out and show the average scores of all reviewed applications. The highest ranking application will go forward, but the Committee will also determine a threshold below which applications are not fundable.

In an otherwise fundable application, a poor rating from the lay reviewer will lead to a request to update the lay section, and only when this has been achieved satisfactorily can funding be awarded. If this is not done by the applicants despite reminder, then the next fundable application will be selected instead.

Council approval:

The SRC choice will be reviewed and as appropriate confirmed by the BPS Council at their September meeting.

Communication of results to applicants:

Lead reviewers will be responsible for drafting a feedback letter to the applicant regarding the application they have responsibility for.

The Chair will with the Secretariat produce templates for successful and unsuccessful applications.

The Chair will communicate with the successful applicant outlining the terms of the BPS and conditions if the grant.

All decisions will be communicated to the applicants within 45 days of the Committee meeting in September.

The date of the Science and Research Committee Meeting will be announced on the BPS website.

The successful application will be displayed on the BPS website and the applicant will be informed.

Dated: October 2020