

Criteria for Research that must go to the University's Central REC or an NHS REC

The below list includes research activity that requires review by the University's Central Research Ethics Committee (CREC) or a REC other than a Faculty REC (FREC).

Projects that involve any of these criteria must be reviewed by the Central REC.	
1.	Activity which exposes participants to potential civil, criminal or other proceedings. (e.g. through disclosure of past events or prospective activity)
2.	Administering a substance to participants including drugs, nutritional supplements and challenge agents or other intrusive intervention e.g. hypnotherapy, transcranial magnetic stimulation.
3.	Human exposure to ionising radiation / X-Ray.
4.	A risk of significant ¹ or permanent physical, mental or emotional harm, psychological stress, anxiety or humiliation requiring medical attention, treatment or other amelioration/mitigation/alleviation.
5.	Prisoners and/or young offenders.
6.	Participants without their consent in activity that will have a direct impact upon those participating.
7.	Activity which may bring the reputation of the University or other body into question (eg controversial sources of funding, engaging with issues that may cause offence to groups or individuals, or engaging in areas that might be misconstrued as endorsing illegal practices)
8.	Generation of knowledge that could potentially be weaponisable

The following research activity must be reviewed by an NHS REC.

Projects that meet the following criteria must be reviewed by an NHS REC (refer to the Keele University Health and Social Care Research Webpage)	
9.	The participation of people who legally cannot provide voluntary and informed consent for their participation in research (refer to applicable legislation, for example to the Mental Capacity Act 2005 or Adults with Incapacity (Scotland) Act 2000).
10.	NHS patients, their carers or other service users of the NHS.

The Central REC may review *programmes* of work that involve these criteria. Subsequently, if a specific research project was part of that programme and adhered to the same methodology, that project could to be reviewed by a specified Faculty REC. For example, the dosing of healthy volunteers with caffeine at a specified dose for a range of purposes could be reviewed by the Central REC in the first instance and future activity could operate under that approval plus faculty level review.

¹ Significant is the threshold of harm which justifies compulsory intervention.