

Author Guidelines: Technical Review of 45 and Up Study Research Outputs

It is a requirement of access to 45 and Up Study data that all research outputs reporting analyses of these data are submitted to the 45 and Up Study Coordinating Centre for technical review prior to publication. Research outputs include, but are not limited to, manuscripts, abstracts for conference presentations or posters, and reports.

What is a technical review?

The technical review of research outputs using 45 and Up Study data ensures the accuracy and consistency of information relating to the 45 and Up Study. **The Study's requirements are detailed in the [Request for Technical Review form](#). Authors must ensure their research outputs conform to these requirements.** Critically, research outputs are reviewed to ensure Study participants' privacy and confidentiality are protected, for example through the obfuscation of small cell sizes. The review also includes the description of the 45 and Up Study, Study variables, Study stakeholders (including data custodians, Study partners and third party data linkage facilities), and the scope of the analyses relative to the approved project protocol.

Additional review may be required by third parties, such as the data custodians of third party data.

Researchers accessing Study data through the Chronic Conditions Umbrella Program Linkage (CUPL) must adhere to the requirements for submission and notification timelines as outlined in their CUPL agreements.

It is not peer review or statistical review.

Technical review process

Submitting a research output for technical review

Researchers initiate technical review by submitting the following documents by email to the Coordinating Centre at 45andUp.research@saxinstitute.org.au

- A completed [Request for Technical Review form](#)
- A final draft of the manuscript, report, conference abstract etc, formatted for submission, and any associated tables or other supplementary materials, in Word format
- A Services Australia coversheet for papers referencing Medicare claims or Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme (PBS) data. A coversheet will be forwarded to researchers by the Coordinating

Centre for completion if not included in the initial email. Research outputs will not be reviewed until the coversheet has been submitted.

Timeframe

Research outputs must be forwarded to the Coordinating Centre a minimum of 20 business days (4 weeks) prior to their intended submission/publication date. Research outputs for CUPL projects must be forwarded a minimum of 30 business days (6 weeks) prior to their intended submission/publication date.

Requests for Technical Review received by the close of business on Thursday will be processed by the Coordinating Centre on the Friday. Where possible, the Coordinating Centre will provide a review outcome within the following periods after that Friday:

- Manuscript or report – 10 business days
- Conference abstract – 5 business days

Research outputs are generally reviewed in order of receipt.

Times are an estimate only and may vary depending on the number of incoming requests for review. Additional time is required for research outputs requiring third party review. These timeframes vary and are outside the Coordinating Centre's control.

For research outputs using Medicare claims or PBS data allow an additional 3 to 4 weeks after the Coordinating Centre's approval for Services Australia review. The Services Australia External Request Evaluation Committee (EREC) meets approximately every two weeks, excluding Christmas and January.

Review

Research outputs are initially reviewed by a member of the Study team, with additional input sought from other team members if required. A written response is provided by email to the authors with the outcome of the review, including any issues of concern. As required, research outputs may need to be resubmitted for further review, or forwarded to a third party reviewer.

On receipt of approval from the Coordinating Centre, the researchers can submit the research output for publication.

Outcomes

No issues raised by reviewer

The researcher may proceed to submit/publish the research output.

Minor amendments required

If issues are identified but deemed minor, the Coordinating Centre may request changes be made prior to submission/publication, but not require further review of the research output.

Corrections and re-review required

If issues are identified that require significant changes to the items covered by the review (e.g. small cell sizes, the scope of the analysis, Study variables, description of Study recruitment or stakeholders) then the researcher will be required to resubmit the research output with tracked changes following amendment.

Third party review

If a research output references use of third party data, such as Services Australia Medicare claims or PBS data, further review may be required by the data custodian or their nominated representative. In these instances, the Coordinating Centre can advise if additional submission information is required. Research outputs will be submitted to Services Australia by the Coordinating Centre on behalf of the researchers.

If required by a project's ethics approval, research outputs with a specific Aboriginal focus must also be submitted to the Aboriginal Health and Medical Research Council (AH&MRC) Human Research Ethics Committee for review. This is the responsibility of the research team.

Publication

Researchers are required to notify the Coordinating Centre when a research output will be published. Without limitation, this includes manuscripts accepted for publication, a presentation or poster abstract accepted for a conference, or publication of a report. Section 4 of the Request for Technical Review form is to be completed and resubmitted with this notification.

NOTE: Per the conditions of access to CUPL, the publication of research outputs for CUPL projects must be advised to the Coordinating Centre a minimum of 3 weeks prior to publication so that the Sax Institute can advise the relevant data custodians.

Proofreading

A reviewer may make suggestions to improve clarity of wording, or identify typographical or other errors, however all proofreading remains the responsibility of the authors.

Figure 1: The technical review process

