South West - Frenchay Research Ethics Committee
Level 3, Block B
Whitefriars
Lewins Mead,
Bristol BS1 2NT
Email: nrescommittee.southwest-frenchay@nhs.net
Telephone: 01173421387

22 October 2015

Professor Maria Quigley
Professor of Statistical Epidemiology
University of Oxford
Univeristy of Oxford Old Road Campus
Headington
Oxford
OX3 7LF

Dear Professor Quigley

Study title:	**Tracking the Impact of Gestational Age on health, educational and economic outcomes: a longitudinal Record linkage study (TIGAR)**
REC reference:	**15/SW/0294**
IRAS project ID:	**183510**

The Research Ethics Committee reviewed the above application at the meeting held on 09 October 2015. Thank you for attending via telephone to discuss the application.

We plan to publish your research summary wording for the above study on the HRA website, together with your contact details. Publication will be no earlier than three months from the date of this favourable opinion letter. The expectation is that this information will be published for all studies that receive an ethical opinion but should you wish to provide a substitute contact point, wish to make a request to defer, or require further information, please contact the REC Manager Miss Natasha Bridgeman, nrescommittee.southwest-frenchay@nhs.net. Under very limited circumstances (e.g. for student research which has received an unfavourable opinion), it may be possible to grant an exemption to the publication of the study.

Ethical opinion

The members of the Committee present gave a favourable ethical opinion of the above research on the basis described in the application form, protocol and supporting documentation, subject to the conditions specified below. .

Conditions of the favourable opinion

The favourable opinion is subject to the following conditions being met prior to the start of the study.

Management permission or approval must be obtained from each host organisation prior to the start of the study at the site concerned.

Management permission ("R&D approval") should be sought from all NHS organisations involved in the study in accordance with NHS research governance arrangements.

Guidance on applying for NHS permission for research is available in the Integrated Research Application System or at http://www.rdforum.nhs.uk.

Where a NHS organisation's role in the study is limited to identifying and referring potential participants to research sites ("participant identification centre"), guidance should be sought from the R&D office on the information it requires to give permission for this activity.

For non-NHS sites, site management permission should be obtained in accordance with the procedures of the relevant host organisation.

Sponsors are not required to notify the Committee of approvals from host organisations.

Registration of Clinical Trials

All clinical trials (defined as the first four categories on the IRAS filter page) must be registered on a publically accessible database. This should be before the first participant is recruited but no later than 6 weeks after recruitment of the first participant.

There is no requirement to separately notify the REC but you should do so at the earliest opportunity e.g. when submitting an amendment. We will audit the registration details as part of the annual progress reporting process.

To ensure transparency in research, we strongly recommend that all research is registered but for non-clinical trials this is not currently mandatory.

If a sponsor wishes to request a deferral for study registration within the required timeframe, they should contact hra.studyregistration@nhs.net. The expectation is that all clinical trials will be registered, however, in exceptional circumstances non registration may be permissible with prior agreement from the HRA. Guidance on where to register is provided on the HRA website.

The sponsor is asked to provide the Committee with a copy of the notice from the MHRA, either confirming no objection or giving grounds for objection, as soon as this is available.

It is the responsibility of the sponsor to ensure that all the conditions are complied with before the start of the study or its initiation at a particular site (as applicable).

Ethical review of research sites

NHS Sites

The favourable opinion applies to all NHS sites taking part in the study taking part in the study, subject to management permission being obtained from the NHS/HSC R&D office prior to the start of the study (see "Conditions of the favourable opinion" below).

Summary of discussion at the meeting

Ethical issues raised by the Committee in private discussion, together with responses given by the researcher when invited into the meeting

- **Social or scientific value; scientific design and conduct of the study**

The Committee were pleased that Public Patient Involvement has been sought for the study but queried whether the two members of the public that have been consulted represents a wide enough group given that consent would not be sought for the data used in the study.

You explained that there were 10 members of the public at a PPI meeting held in May this year and of those people, 2 of them have children that were born in 2005 and 2006 and could therefore be directly involved in the study. You advised that these 2 members discussed the study based on their personal point of view as parents of children that could be involved in the study. The other members of the group, who were representatives of parents, discussed how they would feel if their children were involved and also the experiences of friends whose children could be included in the study. You confirmed that as a group, they were very supportive of the study.

The Committee noted that the application made reference to schools holding information about their pupils on pieces of paper and asked you whether you were aware that schools employ the use of sophisticated databases to hold pupil records.

You advised that you were not surprised to hear this and confirmed that the reference to schools keeping notes on pieces of paper was a direct quote from one of the parents that you had spoken to who stated that based on her personal experience, she felt happier knowing that the National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit in Oxford would be analysing the anonymous data rather than a school for this reason.

The Committee asked you to confirm what was meant by the 'Overall and Subject Specific Scores'.

You explained that this was the Key Stage 1 test results for reading, writing, spelling and grammar and maths and that you would be looking at overall scores as well as individual subject scores. You advised that the reason for this was that it has been shown that children born very prematurely have lower scores in Maths than those who were not born prematurely.

- **Recruitment arrangements and access to health information, and fair participant selection**

The Committee noted that data provided from ONS would be checked and corrections would be made and queried how you would know what needs to be corrected if the data was anonymised.

You explained that the data would be matched by a 3rd party HSCIC who would try to match the birth records with a NHS number a hospital number. The match will show different levels of accuracy, some would match perfectly but there would be some instances where numbers almost match but might for example have 1 digit different. You explained that in this case, where NHS number might only be slightly incorrect, the record would be checked to see if the date of birth and sex matched in order to have a more complete data set.

The Committee queried how educational data would be obtained and how it would be matched to the child.

You advised that the educational data would not be matched in the first stage of the linkage but HSCIC would link the data to the Personal Demographic Service to obtain the name of the child. This data would then be stored at ONS and would be used with the child's DOB to

match the child to the National Pupil Database. You confirmed that you would have no access to the child's name as ONS will perform the linkage.

The Committee asked for clarification of the confidentiality process and asked who will be responsible for this.

You advised the Committee that the confidentiality would exist at 2 or 3 levels. ONS would hold the original data and the data linked from the hospital number and the National Pupil Database. You confirmed that in addition she would hold an anonymised version of the dataset which would be stored in the National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit in Oxford.

The Committee queried whether the results of the study will be accessible to people who have been part of the study.

You confirmed that the data would not be accessible as it is completely anonymous so it could not be related to the individual however the results would be widely disseminated.

Approved documents

The documents reviewed and approved at the meeting were:

Document	*Version*	*Date*
Covering letter on headed paper [REC covering letter]		24 September 2015
Evidence of Sponsor insurance or indemnity (non NHS Sponsors only) [Letter from sponsor]		24 September 2015
Letter from funder [Award letter from MRC]		15 December 2014
Participant information sheet (PIS) [TIGAR Lay summary for website]	1.0	23 September 2015
REC Application Form [REC_Form_29092015]		29 September 2015
Referee's report or other scientific critique report [Reviewer 1 from funding application]		
Referee's report or other scientific critique report [Reviewer 2 from MRC funding application]		
Referee's report or other scientific critique report [Reviewer 3 from MRC funding application]		
Research protocol or project proposal [TIGAR Protocol]	1.0	23 September 2015
Summary CV for Chief Investigator (CI) [Maria Quigley CV]		
Summary, synopsis or diagram (flowchart) of protocol in non technical language [TIGAR flowchart]		09 September 2015

Membership of the Committee

The members of the Ethics Committee who were present at the meeting are listed on the attached sheet.

The Committee is constituted in accordance with the Governance Arrangements for Research Ethics Committees and complies fully with the Standard Operating Procedures for Research Ethics Committees in the UK.

After ethical review

Reporting requirements

The attached document "After ethical review – guidance for researchers" gives detailed guidance on reporting requirements for studies with a favourable opinion, including:

- Notifying substantial amendments
- Adding new sites and investigators
- Notification of serious breaches of the protocol
- Progress and safety reports
- Notifying the end of the study

The HRA website also provides guidance on these topics, which is updated in the light of changes in reporting requirements or procedures.

User Feedback

The Health Research Authority is continually striving to provide a high quality service to all applicants and sponsors. You are invited to give your view of the service you have received and the application procedure. If you wish to make your views known please use the feedback form available on the HRA website: http://www.hra.nhs.uk/about-the-hra/governance/quality-assurance/

HRA Training

We are pleased to welcome researchers and R&D staff at our training days – see details at http://www.hra.nhs.uk/hra-training/

15/SW/0294	**Please quote this number on all correspondence**

With the Committee's best wishes for the success of this project.

Yours sincerely

Ethical issues raised by the Committee in private discussion, together with responses given by the researcher when invited into the meeting

- **Social or scientific value; scientific design and conduct of the study**

The Committee were pleased that Public Patient Involvement has been sought for the study but queried whether the two members of the public that have been consulted represents a wide enough group given that consent would not be sought for the data used in the study.

Professor Quigley explained that there were 10 members of the public at a PPI meeting held in May this year and of those people, 2 of them have children that were born in 2005 and 2006 and could therefore be directly involved in the study. Professor Quigley advised that these 2 members discussed the study based on their personal point of view as parent of children that could be involved in the study. The other members of the group, who were representatives of parents, discussed how they would feel if their children were involved and also the experiences of friends whose children could be included in the study. Professor Quigley confirmed that as a group, they were very supportive of the study.

The Committee noted that the application made reference to schools holding information about their pupils on pieces of paper and asked Professor Quigley whether she was aware that schools employ the use of sophisticated databases to hold pupil records.

Professor Quigley advised that she was not surprised to hear this and confirmed that the reference to schools keeping notes on pieces of paper was a direct quote from one of the parents she had spoken to who stated that based on her personal experience, she felt happier knowing that the National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit in Oxford would be analysing the anonymous data rather than a school for this reason.

The Committee asked Professor Quigley to confirm what was meant by the 'Overall and Subject Specific Scores'.

Professor Quigley explained that this was the Key Stage 1 test results for reading, writing, spelling and grammar and maths and that she would be looking at overall scores as well as individual subject scores. Professor Quigley advised that the reason for this was that it has been shown that children born very prematurely have lower scores in Maths than those who were not born prematurely.

- **Recruitment arrangements and access to health information, and fair participant selection**

The Committee noted that data provided from ONS would be checked and corrections would be made and queried how the applicant would know what needs to be corrected if the data was anonymised.

Professor Quigley explained that the data would be matched by a 3rd party HSCIC who would try to match the birth records with a NHS number a hospital number. The match will show different levels of accuracy, some would match perfectly but there would be some instances where numbers almost match but might for example have 1 digit different. Professor Quigley explained that in this case, where NHS number might only be slightly incorrect, the record would be checked to see if the date of birth and sex matched in order to have a more complete data set.

The Committee queried how educational data would be obtained and how it would be matched to the child.

Professor Quigley advised that the educational data would not be matched in the first stage of the linkage but HSCIC would link the data to the Personal Demographic Service to obtain the name of the child. This data would then be stored at ONS and would be used with the child's DOB to match the child to the National Pupil Database. Professor Quigley confirmed that she would have no access to the child's name as ONS will perform the linkage.

The Committee asked for clarification of the confidentiality process and asked who will be responsible for this.

Professor Quigley advised the Committee that the confidentiality would exist at 2 or 3 levels. ONS would hold the original data and the data linked from the hospital number and the National Pupil Database. Professor Quigley confirmed that in addition she would hold an anonymised version of the dataset which would be stored in the National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit in Oxford.

The Committee queried whether the results of the study will be accessible to people who have been part of the study.

Professor Quigley confirmed that the data would not be accessible as it is completely anonymous so it could not be related to the individual however the results would be widely disseminated.

P.P. Bridgeman.

Mr Peter Jones (Chair)
Chair

E-mail: nrescommittee.southwest-frenchay@nhs.net

Enclosures: *List of names and professions of members who were present at the meeting and those who submitted written comments*

Copy to: *Ms Heather House*
Confidentiality Advise Team

South West - Frenchay Research Ethics Committee

Attendance at Committee meeting on 09 October 2015

Committee Members:

Name	*Profession*	*Present*
Mr Paul Allen	Consultant Oral Surgeon	Yes
Miss Wendy Bertram	Spine Research Fellow	Yes
Miss Laura Birch	Research Dietician	No
Mrs Angela Clarke	Retired social worker	Yes
Dr Alison Diaper	Research Associate	Yes
Mr Stephen Draper	Retired Head teacher	Yes
Mr Peter Jones (Chair)	Retired Head teacher	Yes
Dr Penny Kehagioglou	Consultant Clinical Oncologist	No
Mrs Kerstin Kubiak (	Solicitor	No
Dr Kristyn Manley	Research Fellow (O&G)	No
Dr Ruth Morse	Senior Lecturer in Molecular Biomedicine	No
Mr Jeremy Ruddock	Osteopath	Yes

Also in attendance:

Name	*Position (or reason for attending)*
Miss Natasha Bridgeman	REC Manager