



Transformational Impact Awards: Conflicts of Interest Code of Practice for Peer Review & Scientific Advisory Board

All members of the Prostate Cancer UK Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) and any external peer reviewer must actively adhere to and support this Conflicts of Interest Code of Practice.

External peer reviewers will only be approached if the Research Team at Prostate Cancer UK does not identify any conflicts of interest based on the criteria identified below. All external reviewers must disclose any potential conflict of interest, and if a significant conflict comes to light, then that reviewer shall not be used.

The Prostate Cancer UK Research Team will endeavour to identify potential conflicts of interest prior to allocation of applications to SAB members and will notify all SAB members of their conflicts in advance of the meeting. The aim of circulating conflicts in advance is to give SAB members an opportunity to discuss any conflicts of interest that they believe to be incorrect well before the SAB meeting. Any disputes about the conflicts of interest identified must be raised with the Research Team no later than 4 weeks after this list is circulated. Members must disclose any additional conflict of interests (not identified by the Research Team) in advance of the SAB meeting at which the application in question is to be considered, or as soon as the member's interest in the application becomes apparent. Any declaration of interest in a grant application by an SAB member shall be duly recorded in the minutes of the relevant meeting.

Where a conflict of interest exists, the SAB member will not have access to any of the documentation for that application, nor will they be permitted to participate in the discussion, scoring or final outcome of the application. The SAB member will be required to leave the meeting while discussion and scoring takes place (either leaving the meeting room physically if attending in person, or by being placed into a virtual waiting room if attending remotely).

The Chair of the SAB shall be independent, but in the event of any of the below circumstances applying to the Chair, they will be subject to the same Code of Practice.

Conflict of Interest Definitions:

For Peer Reviewers:

Prostate Cancer UK considers a Conflict of Interest to arise if the potential reviewer:

- Is a named party on the grant application, either as Lead or Joint Lead Applicant, Co-Applicant, Collaborator or Head of Department.

- Has a recent collaboration with any of the grant applicants (excluding collaborators): a recent collaboration is defined as an active funded grant, joint publication or other active working collaboration normally during the previous 5 years. Co-authorship on publications resulting from a large consortium (in excess of 20 authors) will not be considered a conflict of interest as collaboration between the two parties is considered to be minimal unless specified otherwise by the reviewer.
- Has a personal relationship with any of the named parties on a grant application, such as spouse, family member or close friendship.
- Is at the same Research Institute as the Lead Applicant(s) or Co-Applicants of the grant application. If the individual is at the same Research Institute as a Collaborator on the grant it is not considered to be a significant conflict of interest; however, we will take into consideration individual cases if raised by the reviewer.
- For any Centres of Excellence involving multiple institutions, collaboration between research institutions will not be considered a significant conflict of interest. Only when direct personal collaborations have been identified would there be a conflict of interest.

For the Scientific Advisory Board:

Given the scale of the Transformational Impact Awards and the multi-disciplinary, multi-institutional and international nature of the proposals we are likely to receive, the conflicts of interest policy shall be different for SAB members. Prostate Cancer UK considers a Conflict of Interest to arise if a SAB member:

- Is a named party on the grant application, either as a Co-Applicant, Collaborator or Head of Department (NB/ SAB members are not eligible to be Lead Applicants on TIA proposals).
- Is based at the same UK institution as the Lead Applicant(s). If a Co-Applicant or Collaborator is based at the same institution as the SAB member this would not be considered a significant conflict.
- Has a very close working collaboration with the Lead Applicant(s) (to be declared in advance by the SAB member). Close working collaboration to be defined as Co-Lead Investigators on an active, ongoing study with a Lead Applicant.
 NB/ given the multi-disciplinary, multi-institutional and potentially international nature of this scheme, working collaborations with named co-applicants and collaborators will be noted but shall not preclude the corresponding SAB member from participating in the assessment of that proposal.
 NBB/ such a conflict may be relaxed at Prostate Cancer UK's discretion where a SAB member has equally collaborated with all relevant applicants working in their field.
- Has a close personal relationship with any of the named parties on a grant application, such as spouse or family member.

Please note, Prostate Cancer UK may consider relaxing certain conflicts of interest if the fair assessment of an application is jeopardised by a significantly reduced number of assessors involved in the discussion.