

RFCID/HHSRF

***Research Fund for the Control of Infectious Diseases
Health and Health Services Research Fund***

Guidance Notes - Interim, Final and Dissemination Report

This booklet describes the procedures that should be followed when reporting findings to the Research Council.

Please submit reports to:

Research Fund Secretariat Research Office Food and Health Bureau 18/F, Murray Building, Garden Road, Central, Hong Kong.

July 2010

I. Purpose and Aims

- 1.1 The submission of interim, final and dissemination reports enables the Research Council (Council) to:
- Assess whether the work was carried out in accordance with the approved proposal
 - Evaluate the quality of the research
 - Maintain a track record of investigators' compliance with the standard conditions of research grants
 - Quantify research output
 - Provide public access to research findings
- 1.2 All reports must be submitted by the deadlines specified in the Agreement and conform to the guidelines provided in these Notes. If the reports are not accepted by the Grant Review Board (GRB), principal applicants are obliged to revise them accordingly and submit their response in compliance with the deadlines set in the GRB feedback.
- 1.3 Failure to submit these reports, or to revise and resubmit if required, by the specified deadlines will mean that the project is incomplete. Further actions that may be taken by the Research Fund Secretariat under these circumstances include: 1) withholding the final payment (20% for a Full Grant, 10% for a Mini-Grant) of the approved amount until the reports are submitted and accepted, 2) recovering the reimbursed amount from the administering institution, and 3) marking the track record of the principal applicant, which will adversely affect future grant applications to funds administered by the Food and Health Bureau.

II. Requirements and Procedures

2.1 Interim Reports

Interim reports are required for Full Grant projects only. An interim report should be submitted within 2 months of the first anniversary of the project commencement date.

Interim reports are used to monitor the progress of the projects, flag difficulties encountered, identify areas where the principal applicants may need support and to monitor the expenditure. Interim reports will not be graded but will be studied by the GRB.

An interim report template is appended in Appendix A and can be downloaded from <http://www.fhb.gov.hk/grants>.

2.2 Final Reports

Final reports are required for both Full Grant and Mini-Grant projects. A final report must be submitted, together with a dissemination report, within 6 months for Full Grants and 3 months for Mini-Grants of the project end date.

20 hard copies and 1 soft copy (3.5" floppy disks or CD-ROM preferably in MS Word format) of the final report and dissemination report should be submitted. Hard copies should not be bound. Soft copies of all graphics should be included as

Power Point, Excel, TIFF Bitmap (.tif), windows meta file (wmf), or graphical interface (gif) formats to facilitate their inclusion into other documents for dissemination. The standard format of a final report is appended in Appendix B and can be downloaded from <http://www.fhb.gov.hk/grants>.

Reports of randomised clinical trials should conform to the CONSORT statement (<http://www.consort-statement.org>).

The final report should be approximately 5,000 words (1.5 lines spacing, font size not smaller than Times New Roman 12 point) in length. It must be concise and provide the assessors with sufficient information to evaluate the work. The detailed report should comprise the following:

i. Title Page (Project Title, Reference No., Investigators, Administering Institution, Date of Submission)

ii. Summary

A summary of not more than 300 words should be included with information according to the following categories:

Background

Aims and Objectives

Study Design and Methods

- Setting and subjects
- Study Instruments (if appropriate)
- Interventions (if appropriate)
- Main Outcome Measures

Results

Conclusions

Implications (for health care services, health care delivery, health policy in Hong Kong)

iii. Main Body of the Report

The main body of the report should be written in a style similar to that of a journal article. Submitted reports should be on par with those submitted to refereed journals. For the main report, the text, tables and figures should be included according to the following format:

Introduction

Aims and Objectives

Methods

- Setting and subjects
- Study Instruments (if appropriate)
- Interventions (if appropriate)
- Main Outcome Measures

Results

Discussion

Conclusions

Implications/Relevance (for health care services, health care delivery, health policy in Hong Kong)

Dissemination

Publications

Bibliography

List of Research Workers

Appendix

Introduction: The background / setting of the study should be described clearly. A briefly stated but representative literature review should be included in the introduction as well as the rationale for proceeding with the field of investigation.

Aims and Objectives: The study aims, objectives and research questions should be stated briefly and any deviation or variation from those described in the grant proposal should be justified.

Methods: A brief description of the subjects and methods adopted in the study should be included. If novel methods were developed and used these should be described fully. A statement should be made about the type and amount of data collected. The number of subjects and/or observations made should be described with comments on whether these achieved the expectations cited in the original application. A detailed explanation is required if the number of subjects in the sample or the composition of the sample varied from that described in the grant proposal. If the study involved the validation of an instrument, a copy of the validated instrument must be appended in the appendix.

Results: The results obtained by the investigators should be summarised indicating to what extent the original aims have been fulfilled. The results section can contain both graphics and tables. Summary tables and graphics are most appropriate. Do not include detailed listings or other computer printouts.

Discussion: The implications of the results should be discussed with reference to the stated aims and objectives.

Conclusion: The researchers should state precisely the conclusions drawn from the study.

Implications: The acquisition of new knowledge should be highlighted with particular comments on any implications or applications there may be which could improve health care. The researchers should comment on the relevance of their findings for a) policy makers, b) health service managers, c) service providers, and d) future research.

Dissemination: Plans for dissemination and implementation of the research findings should be described. The researchers should also indicate any other persons or bodies to whom they consider it would be appropriate to send a copy to the final report or present their findings and, if applicable, possible commercial exploitation.

Publications: Publications and other scientific presentations derived from the study should be listed.

Bibliography: Follow the format of “Uniform Requirements For Manuscripts Submitted To Biomedical Journals”. (<http://www.icmje.org/index.html>)

List of research workers: Investigators are to prepare a list of all research workers involved in the project outlining their individual contributions. This should include principal applicant, co-investigators, those employed by the grant and those employed on any other basis but who have given support to the completion of the project. Provide the names in English and Chinese characters, where appropriate.

Appendix: The investigators should include in the appendix tables and figures not included in the text, study instruments, and other documents that were used for the study. Copies of relevant publications by the investigators should be included.

2.3 Dissemination Reports

Dissemination reports are required for both Full Grant and Mini-Grant projects. A dissemination report must be submitted, together with a final report, within 6 months for Full Grants and 3 months for Mini-Grants of the project end date.

The dissemination report is another important tool for the dissemination of research results to policy makers, health service managers and the general public in Hong Kong. The dissemination report is intended to provide a 'snapshot' view of the research. The dissemination report should be readable, relevant and accurate. It should be written in a style suitable for a general as well as an academic readership, be thought provoking and stimulate discussion with regard to the findings and their possible implications. The dissemination report should be self-contained and it should be possible to circulate it without the full research report attached. Therefore, the text should be readily understandable and focus on describing the main results and their potential practical implications for health care and health policy in Hong Kong.

The dissemination report should be a maximum of **2000 words** in length (including main text, references, key messages) and a maximum of **3 tables and/or figures**. The standard format of dissemination report is appended in Appendix C and can be downloaded from <http://www.fhb.gov.hk/grants>. The following headings should be used:

Introduction
Methods
• Study design
• Sample size
• Study instruments
Results
Discussion
References
Acknowledgements

III. Assessment of Final and Dissemination Reports

- 3.1 Final and dissemination reports will be assessed by a two-tier peer review process; first by external referees, and then by the Grant Review Board (GRB). A sample assessment form is appended in Appendix D.
- 3.2 If a report is found to be not acceptable, the GRB may indicate to the principal applicants what amendments and additions are required.
- 3.3 Satisfactory final and dissemination reports (graded 4 or above) will be published by the Council. The final and dissemination reports may be graded at any level and closed at the discretion of the GRB.

IV. Copyright

- 4.1 The Final Report and Dissemination Report may be published on the Secretariat's website or by other methods at the discretion of the Food and Health Bureau.
- 4.2 Copyright in the Final Report and Dissemination Report is co-owned equally by the administering institution and the Hong Kong SAR Government.

- 4.3 The content of the Final Report and Dissemination Report should contain no violation of any existing copyright or other third party material and to the best of the authors' knowledge the dissemination report should not infringe the rights of others, in particular those held by the publishers of peer reviewed journals.

V. Further action that the GRB may recommend

- 5.1 The GRB may comment on any proposals for dissemination made by the researchers and might encourage them to disseminate their findings towards particular target readerships as represented by professional publications.
- 5.2 The Council may also routinely inform relevant policy interest in the final and dissemination reports which have been received along with the GRB's assessment of the report.
- 5.3 The Council may also consult policy interests as to whether and how a particular report might be disseminated. In some cases, it may be more appropriate to disseminate the report in the form of an executive summary, including a contact address for persons wishing to obtain a full copy of the report.
- 5.4 The Council may distribute copies of a final and dissemination report throughout the SAR to bodies of professional and other relevant groups.
- 5.5 The Council may recommend that the principal applicants be invited to submit a version of the final report as a possible article to a particular journal.
- 5.6 In the case of certain studies, it may be appropriate and desirable to organise small or large meetings for the SAR where researchers may present and discuss their findings with policy makers, managers and service providers. The Council may organise such meetings or may encourage other organisations to hold such meetings.

Grant Review Board

Research Fund for the Control of Infectious Diseases

Health and Health Services Research Fund

Interim Report

Important: Please submit 3 printed copies and an electronic version of the Interim Report and any attachments. Complete all sections with sufficient detail to allow review of the progress of the project. Incomplete or insufficiently detailed reports will be returned for revision and resubmission. The principal applicant and all co-applicants are required to sign the Interim Report. Continued funding of the study is dependent upon the submission of an acceptable Interim Report.

1. **Project No.** _____

2. **Grant Period: Commencement Date** _____ **End Date:** _____

3. **Title of Project:**

--

4. **Applicant (s)**

5. **Administering Institution:**

6. **Aims/Objectives of the research:**

List the main objectives as stated in the approved proposal. Approval must be sought for any change to the study objectives.

--

7. **Timetable of Work:**

Document the study progress according to the proposed timetable.

--

Grant Review Board

Research Fund for the Control of Infectious Diseases
Health and Health Services Research Fund

8. Achievements / Major findings of the Project so far:

9. Budget & Expenditure (attach a certified financial statement)

10. Applicants' comments

Describe the potential of further investigations or exploitation of results. May include reflection/feedback of investigators and/or any difficulties encountered during the course of project. Comment of the potential for/current dissemination of research findings

11. Signatures of Project Team

The principal applicant and all co-applicants are required to sign the Interim Report. By signing this Interim Report, the principal applicant and all co-applicants (if any) acknowledge that they have contributed to the Project and agree with the information contained herein.

Signature of Applicant(s)	Name (Capitals)	Date
1. _____	_____	_____
2. _____	_____	_____
3. _____	_____	_____
4. _____	_____	_____
5. _____	_____	_____
6. _____	_____	_____
7. _____	_____	_____
8. _____	_____	_____
9. _____	_____	_____
10. _____	_____	_____

RFCID/HHSRF/HSRF/HCPF
Research Fund for the Control of Infectious Diseases
Health and Health Services Research Fund
Health Services Research Fund
Health Care & Promotion Fund

«TITLE»

Submitted to the Grant Review Board (Date)

Investigator(s)

(Investigators)

Department and Affiliation

(Organisation)

Contents

(Times New Roman 12 pt)

	Page
Acknowledgements	
Summary	
Main Body	
Introduction	
Methods	
Results	
Discussion	
Conclusions	
Implications	
Dissemination	
Publications	
Bibliography	
List of Research Workers	
Financial Statement	
Appendices	

Signatures of Project Team

The principal applicant and all co-applicants are required to sign the Final Report. By signing this Final Report, the principal applicant and all co-applicants (if any) acknowledge that they have contributed to the Project and agree with the information contained herein.

Signature of Applicant(s)	Name (Capitals)	Date
1. _____	_____	_____
2. _____	_____	_____
3. _____	_____	_____
4. _____	_____	_____
5. _____	_____	_____
6. _____	_____	_____
7. _____	_____	_____
8. _____	_____	_____
9. _____	_____	_____
10. _____	_____	_____

Standard Format for Final Reports

1. Version: Microsoft Word
2. Maximum of 5000 words
3. Title Page (see example above)
4. Layout of report
 - a. Page size - A4
 - b. Line Spacing – 1.5 spaces
 - c. Case - Sentence Case
 - d. Single Column
5. Margin
 - a. Top: 2.54 cm
 - b. Bottom: 2.54 cm
 - c. Left: 2.54 cm
 - d. Right: 2.54 cm
6. Layout of the Executive Summary
 - a. Ragged right margin
 - b. Font Type - Times New Roman 12 pt
 - c. Heading Times New Roman 12 pt, bold (e.g. "Objective: To compare the... " in the same line)
 - d. Line Spacing - single space
7. Layout of Text
 - a. Ragged right margin
 - b. Font type
 - Heading 1 - Times New Roman 12 pt, **bold**, 1 line space before and after
 - Heading 2 - Times New Roman 12 pt, ***bold and italic***, 1 line space before and after
 - Heading 3 - Times New Roman 12 pt, *italic*, no space before or after
 - References - superscript all reference numbers
8. Layout of Tables
 - a. Font Type: Arial 10 pt
 - b. Title Table x and wording (Table 1 Causes of perinatal death ...)
 - c. Horizontal and vertical lines 0.25 pt only
9. Layout of Figures
 - a. Font Type: Arial 10 pt
 - b. Title Figure x and wording (Figure 1 Causes of perinatal death ...)
 - c. Border around the Figure 0.25 pt only
10. References
 - a. Font Type: Times New Roman 10 pt
 - b. Use 1,2,3,4 ... to number references
 - c. Vancouver format
 - d. Superscript references in text after punctuation

Grant Review Board**RFCID/HHSRF***Research Fund for the Control of Infectious Diseases**Health and Health Services Research Fund***Assessment of Final Report**

Title: «Project_Title»

Principal Investigator: «Title» «Forenames» «SURNAME»

Overall Recommendation

Please indicate your overall score for the accompanying research report in the box provided. The overall scoring should be based on the following criteria:

1	Rejected	Final report not accepted.
2	Unacceptable	Report should be returned to the investigators for major revisions, including rewriting, re-analysis and re-submission to the committee. The report may be re-graded upon re-submission.
3	Accepted	Report accepted conditional to the revision, re-submission and approval of the committee. Failure to revise may lead to re-grading as a 1 or 2.
4	Satisfactory	Report accepted by the committee. Minor revisions to be made prior to publication of the document; report may be considered for wider distribution.
5	Very satisfactory	The report should be accepted without revision; dissemination report to be prepared for wider distribution.
6	Excellent	The report should be accepted without revision; dissemination report to be prepared for wider distribution.

Summary comments and recommendations

Please complete the table below.

		Yes	No
a	Does the reviewer agree with the conclusions drawn by the author?		
b	Does the study represent value for money?		
c	Does the report merit dissemination to a wider readership?		
d	Does the report comply with the investigators' original proposal?		

Please provide a written assessment of the quality of the report, or any additional or confidential comments, on the last page of this form.

Name _____

Date _____ Signature _____

Report Quality

Focus on the quality of the written report on this page

Please grade the report on a 3-point scale, as follows:

1=Unacceptable (U/A) or “No”(includes items that are poorly written or completely missing),

2= Satisfactory (Sat), 3= Good or “Yes” by marking the appropriate box (✓).

Assessment categories	1 U/A or No	2 Sat	3 Good or Yes
1. Literature Review			
a) Were the literature references reported appropriately?			
2. Objectives			
a) Were the research questions stated clearly?			
b) Were the objectives stated clearly?			
3. Study Design			
a) Was the rationale for choosing the study design described clearly?			
b) Were the methods described clearly and consistently?			
4. Study Population			
a) Was the population under study described clearly?			
5. Method			
a) Were the analytical methods described appropriately?			
6. Validity and reliability			
a) Were sufficient data provided to determine the validity and reliability of the results?			
7. Results			
a) Were there sufficient data and analysis to judge the success of the project?			
8. Discussion			
a) Were the following addressed appropriately in the discussion			
i. execution of research?			
ii. observations and results?			
iii. conclusions?			
9. Limitations			
a) Were the limitations of the study described appropriately?			
10. Implications of the findings			
a) Did the researchers comment on the relevance of their findings in terms of:			
i. future research?			
ii. the provision of services?			
iii. the management of services?			
iv. policy?			
11. Dissemination of Results			
a) Was the plan for the dissemination of the results appropriate?			

Overall Assessment of the Quality of the Report

		Score
1	Rejected Report quality does not meet the standard expected.	
2	Unacceptable Report is returned for major revision, rewriting and re-submission.	
3	Accepted Report quality is accepted conditional to revision and re-submission.	
4	Satisfactory Report quality is accepted; minor revisions are required.	
5	Very satisfactory Report quality is accepted without revision.	
6	Excellent Report quality is accepted without revision.	

Research Quality

Focus on the quality of the research on this page

Please grade the report on a 3-point scale, as follows:

1=Unacceptable (U/A) or “No”, 2=Satisfactory (Sat), 3=Good or “Yes” by marking the appropriate box (✓).

NB: If the report does not comply with the original proposal, please complete the table on the following page.

	Assessment categories	1 U/A or No	2 Sat	3 Good or Yes
12.	Study Design			
a)	Was the methodology adhered to appropriately?			
13.	Results and Discussion			
a)	Was the analysis carried out appropriately?			
b)	Were there sufficient data and analysis to draw conclusions?			
c)	Were the conclusions drawn appropriate?			
d)	Were the results generalisable to the study population?			
e)	Was the discussion appropriate?			
14.	Overall Impression			
a)	With the advantage of hindsight, how would you rate the original research and utility of the findings?			

Overall Assessment of the Quality of the Research

			Score
1	Rejected	Research quality does not meet the standard expected.	
2	Unacceptable	Major revision and re-analysis of the data are required. Rewriting and re-submission are required.	
3	Accepted	Research is accepted conditional to the revision, re-analysis of the data and re-submission of the report.	
4	Satisfactory	Research is accepted; minor revisions in the analysis are required.	
5	Very satisfactory	The research is accepted without revision.	
6	Excellent	The research is accepted without revision.	

For those reports that VARY from the original proposal

Research Quality

Focus on the quality of the research on this page

Please grade the report on a 3-point scale, as follows:

1=Unacceptable (U/A) or “No”, 2=Satisfactory (Sat), 3=Good or “Yes” by marking the appropriate box (✓).

	Assessment categories	1 U/A or No	2 Sat	3 Good or Yes
15.	Rationale for Changes			
a)	Was sufficient rationale provided to support the changes to the proposed research?			
16.	Literature Review			
a)	Was the literature referenced appropriately?			
17.	Objectives			
a)	Were the research questions appropriate?			
18.	Study Design			
a)	Was the study design appropriate?			
19.	Study Population			
a)	Was the population under study appropriate?			
20.	Sample			
a)	Was the sampling methodology appropriate?			
21.	Validity and reliability			
a)	Were sufficient data provided to determine the validity and reliability of the results?			
22.	Results and Discussion			
a)	Was the analysis carried out appropriately?			
b)	Were there sufficient data and analysis to draw conclusions?			
c)	Were the conclusions drawn appropriate?			
d)	Were the results generalisable to the study population?			
e)	Was the discussion appropriate?			

Overall Assessment of the Quality of the Research

			Score
1	Rejected	Research quality does not meet the standard expected.	
2	Unacceptable	Major revisions and re-analysis of the data are required. Rewriting and re-submission are required.	
3	Accepted	Research is accepted conditional to the revision, re-analysis of the data and re-submission of the report.	
4	Satisfactory	Research is accepted; minor revisions in the analysis are required.	
5	Very satisfactory	The research is accepted without revision.	
6	Excellent	The research is accepted without revision.	

Additional Reviewer Comments

Please indicate here if these comments are to be kept confidential. **Yes / No**