

# ***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<br>Research Office<br>Health, Welfare and Food Bureau<br>18/F, Murray Building,<br>Garden Road, Central,<br>Hong Kong. |
|--|

*August 2006*

## ***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 Health, Welfare and Food 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.hwfb.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.hwfb.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.hwfb.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 Health, Welfare and Food 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*

Please submit 3 copies of Interim Report and its attachment. An electronic version of Interim Report shall be submitted at the same time with the printed versions.

---

1. **Project No.** \_\_\_\_\_
2. **Grant Period: Commencement Date** \_\_\_\_\_ **End Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

3. **Title of Project:**

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <p>4. <b>Applicant (s)</b></p> | <p>5. <b>Administering Institution:</b></p> |
|--------------------------------|---|

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. Achievement/Major findings of the Project so far:

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

10. Applicant (s)' 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. Signature of Principal Applicant

\_\_\_\_\_

(Signature)

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

**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               |      |

\* Please attach an audited account (for Full Grants) or a certified financial statement (for Mini-Grants)

## 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

**Standard Format for Dissemination Reports**

1. Version: Microsoft Word
2. Title (Times New Roman, 14 pt, bold)
3. Maximum of **2000 words** in length (including main text, references, key messages) and a maximum of **3 tables and/or figures**.
4. Authors (Times New Roman, 12 pt) [In both Roman letters and Chinese characters where applicable]
5. Affiliations (Times New Roman, 12 pt)
6. Principal applicant and corresponding author:
  - a. [name]
  - b. [address]
  - c. [Tel / Fax / E-mail]
7. Key messages
  - a. Times New Roman, 12 pt
  - b. Maximum of 5 key messages
8. Body of the text
  - a. Times New Roman, 12 pt
  - b. Text in double spacing and single column
  - c. Page margins 2.54 cm each side
  - d. Align text with left margin, right margin ragged
9. Heading format
  - a. Level 1 heading: Times New Roman, 12 pt, bold  
Leave one line space after heading
  - b. Level 2 heading: Times New Roman, 12 pt, bold and italic  
No space after heading
  - c. Level 3 heading: Times New Roman, 12 pt  
No space after heading
10. Figures and Tables
  - a. Maximum of 3 tables and/or figures (N.B. Reduce total word count if more tables/figures are included)
  - b. Do not insert figures and tables in the text; append them to the end of the text.
  - c. Title: Arial 10 pt bold
  - d. Content: Arial 10 pt
  - e. Footnotes: Arial 8pt
  - f. Enclosed in Box with 0.25 pt borders
11. Acknowledgements
  - a. Times New Roman, 12 pt
12. References
  - a. Times New Roman, 10 pt
  - b. Maximum of 5 references
  - c. Vancouver format
  - d. Superscript references in text after punctuation

**Grant Review Board**  
**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*

---

## Assessment of Final Report

**Title:**

**Principal Investigator:**

**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<br>U/A or<br>No | 2<br>Sat | 3<br>Good<br>or Yes |
|---|-------------------|----------|---------------------|
| <b>1. Literature Review</b>   |                   |          |                     |
| a) Were the literature references reported appropriately?                                 |                   |          |                     |
| <b>2. Objectives</b>  |                   |          |                     |
| a) Were the research questions stated clearly?  |                   |          |                     |
| b) Were the terms used to describe the objectives stated clearly?                         |                   |          |                     |
| <b>3. Study Design</b>  |                   |          |                     |
| a) Was the rationale for choosing the study design described clearly?                     |                   |          |                     |
| b) Were the details of the methods described clearly and consistently?                    |                   |          |                     |
| <b>4. Study Population</b>  |                   |          |                     |
| a) Was the population under study described clearly?                                      |                   |          |                     |
| <b>5. Method</b>  |                   |          |                     |
| a) Are the analytical methods described appropriately?                                    |                   |          |                     |
| <b>6. Validity and reliability</b>  |                   |          |                     |
| a) Was sufficient data provided to determine the validity and reliability of the results? |                   |          |                     |
| <b>7. Results</b>   |                   |          |                     |
| a) Is there sufficient data and analysis to judge the success of the project?             |                   |          |                     |
| <b>8. Discussion</b>  |                   |          |                     |
| a) Are the following addressed appropriately in the discussion                            |                   |          |                     |
| i. execution of research?   |                   |          |                     |
| ii. observations and results?   |                   |          |                     |
| iii. conclusions?   |                   |          |                     |
| <b>9. Limitations</b>   |                   |          |                     |
| a) Are the limitations of the study described appropriately?                              |                   |          |                     |
| <b>10. Implications of the findings</b>   |                   |          |                     |
| a) Have the researchers commented on the relevance of their findings in terms of:         |                   |          |                     |
| i. future research?   |                   |          |                     |
| ii. the provision of services?  |                   |          |                     |
| iii. the management of services?  |                   |          |                     |
| iv. policy?   |                   |          |                     |
| <b>11. Dissemination of Results</b>   |                   |          |                     |
| a) Is 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 revisions, rewriting and re-submission.  |       |
| 3 | Accepted Report quality is accepted conditional to the 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 revisions.                            |       |

## 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 (✓), if the report complies with the original proposal. N/A= not applicable to the project.*

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

|            | Assessment categories  | 1<br>U/A or<br>No | 2<br>Sat | 3<br>Good<br>or Yes |
|------------|--|-------------------|----------|---------------------|
| <b>12.</b> | <b>Study Design</b>  |                   |          |                     |
| a)         | Was the methodology adhered to appropriately?  |                   |          |                     |
| <b>13.</b> | <b>Results and Discussion</b>  |                   |          |                     |
| a)         | Was the analysis carried out appropriately?  |                   |          |                     |
| b)         | Was there sufficient data and analysis to draw conclusions?  |                   |          |                     |
| c)         | Were the conclusions drawn appropriate?  |                   |          |                     |
| d)         | Are the results generalisable to the study population?   |                   |          |                     |
| e)         | Was the discussion appropriate?  |                   |          |                     |
| <b>14.</b> | <b>Overall Impression</b>  |                   |          |                     |
| 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 revisions and re-analysis of the research 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 (✓), if the report complies with the original proposal. N/A= not applicable to the project.*

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