



ETHICS REQUIREMENTS FOR RESEARCH PUBLICATION

A GUIDE FOR AUSTRALIAN
RESEARCHERS, NGOs, AND
INDEPENDENT
PRACTITIONERS

JUNE 2018



RESEARCH FOR
DEVELOPMENT
IMPACT NETWORK

A collaboration between
the Australian Council for
International Development
and Australian universities

ABOUT RDI NETWORK

The Research for Development Impact (RDI) Network (formerly the ACFID University Network) is a collaboration between the Australian Council for International Development (ACFID) and Australian universities. It is a network of practitioners, researchers, and evaluators working in international development with the objective of linking quality research, policy, and practice for impact in international development.

The Network began in 2009 as a partnership between ACFID member NGOs and Australian universities, when it was co-hosted by ACFID and the Institute of Human Security at La Trobe University. The partnership grew out of a collective desire to widen the debate on international development and to strengthen collaboration between academics and members of ACFID. Since this time, the Network has continued to grow and promote positive relationships and connections between ACFID members and universities, with the overall goal of supporting collaboration and understanding across actors within the Australian development sector.

The Network is supported by the Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.

DISCLAIMER

While all efforts have been taken to ensure the accuracy of this information, it is recommended that readers undertake their own background research to find the most current information and contact points. A good starting place may be the National Health and Medical Research Council [website](#).

The information in this document is accurate to the best of RDI Network's knowledge as of June 2018.

If you have content or information to add to this resource, please be in touch:

RDI Network
rdi@acfid.asn.au

THANK YOU

We acknowledge the work of Tricia Cerone in undertaking the desk research as an intern of the RDI Network to produce this resource. We would also like to thank Tim Vines and Jeremy Kenner of the National Health and Medical Research Council.

MORE INFORMATION

Website: www.rdinetwork.org.au
E-mail: rdi@acfid.asn.au

ETHICS REQUIREMENTS FOR RESEARCH PUBLICATION



RESEARCH FOR
DEVELOPMENT
IMPACT NETWORK

A collaboration between
the Australian Council for
International Development
and Australian universities

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms	3
1. Introduction	4
2. Ethics Review	5
3. Examples	8
4. Conclusion	11
Appendix	12

ACRONYMS

ACFID	Australian Council for International Development
ARC	Australian Research Council
ANU	Australian National University
CSIRO	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation
HREC	Human Research Ethics Committee
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
NHMRC	National Health and Medical Research Council
QA	Quality Assurance
RDI Network	Research for Development Impact Network
UA	Universities Australia



ETHICS REQUIREMENTS FOR RESEARCH PUBLICATION



**RESEARCH FOR
DEVELOPMENT
IMPACT NETWORK**

A collaboration between
the Australian Council for
International Development
and Australian universities



1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE OF THIS GUIDE

This is a practical resource to guide researchers, NGO staff, and independent practitioners who wish to publish research or findings that involve humans within Australia.¹

1.2 WHERE DID THIS GUIDE COME FROM?

In an effort to strengthen our continued work and collaboration with those in the sector, the Research for Development Impact (RDI) Network hosts various workshops. Through our recent [Ethical Practice Workshops](#), we identified that there was a need for clarity surrounding policies about ethics review and approvals, and publishing research within Australia.² As a result of this need, the RDI Network has compiled this guide with the purpose of providing some clarity and to start a dialogue about access to ethics review processes for researchers, NGO staff, and independent practitioners. This guide expands on mapping previously completed by the RDI Network involving ethics approval processes and requirements, and research organisations and existing partnerships within Asia and the Pacific. Both of these resources can be found [here](#).

1.3 WHY ARE WE INTERESTED IN ETHICS AND PUBLICATION?

Research and evaluation within the international development sector is undertaken by a diverse range of researchers: academics, independent practitioners, and NGO staff members. While the avenues and policies for publishing research undertaken by academics within universities are often clear-cut, how independent practitioners and NGO staff go about publishing their findings is less clearly known. It was identified by the Network that independent practitioners and NGO staff alike wish to share their research and evaluation findings with the broader international development sector, to add to and build upon the body of knowledge.

It was, however, highlighted to the Network that sharing these findings widely poses two key conundrums. First, it was identified that although Network members want to publish their findings with the academic community through academic journals, many do not try because they are unaware of the policies regarding ethics approval requirements, or do not know where to find this information. Second, Network members shared that when they self-publish their research and

¹ The [Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research, 2018 \(the 2018 Code\)](#) defines research; “The concept of research is broad and includes the creation of new knowledge and/or the use of existing knowledge in a new and creative way so as to generate new concepts, methodologies, inventions and understandings. This could include synthesis and analysis of previous research to the extent that it is new and creative.” (2018, p. 5). The [National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research 2007](#) explicitly applies to research only and there is a separate document, the [Ethical Considerations in Quality Assurance and Evaluation Activities](#), which addresses evaluation. This RDI Network guidance document focuses on both research and evaluation, noting that the RDI Network considers evaluation to be a type of applied research and that, according to the National Health and Medical Research Council, some evaluation may also require ethics review.

² For more information, please visit our website, at <https://rdinetwork.org.au/effective-ethical-research-evaluation/>.



findings without ethics approval or any formal ethical consideration processes, they consequently worry about receiving criticism. Underlying both conundrums is the issue that many independent practitioners and NGO staff members do not know how or when to seek approval through a Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC), or where to find such information.

1.4 USING THIS GUIDE

This guide is divided into four sections and one appendix, each comprised of various sub-sections:

Section 2. Ethics Review; provides background on ethical considerations, ethical issues related to human research, and HRECs. Section 2 is broken down into 4 sub-sections; 2.1 outlines why researchers might want or need to seek ethics review from an HREC; 2.2 discusses the [National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research 2007](#) to determine when researchers should seek ethics review; 2.3 states the practicalities of where to obtain HREC review and approval; 2.4 unpacks the various levels of risk, and what this means for research and publication.

Section 3. Examples of the Process; outlines the step-by-step process on how to apply for ethics review through two certified and registered HRECs. Section 3 is broken down into 2 sub-sections; 3.1 outlines the ethics application and review process for the University of New South Wales HREC; 3.2 outlines the ethics application and review process for the Bellberry HREC.

Section 4; concludes and provides further information.

Appendix - Publication Requirements; highlights the way in which having ethics approval does or does not affect the publishing of research within Australia. This is achieved through a sampling of publishing requirements for leading Australian academic journals, publishers, grey literature databases, and blogs. As shown, the policies of many academic journals and publishers require authors to declare that ethics approval was received from a HREC. Comparatively, most grey literatures databases do not require authors to make this same declaration. The appendix is broken down in three sections; 1. outlines the requirements for academic journals; 2. outlines the requirements for publishers; 3. outlines the requirements for grey literature databases and blogs.

2. ETHICS REVIEW

2.1 WHY

In order to facilitate greater knowledge transfer and shared learning opportunities, independent practitioners, researchers, and NGO workers may find that they wish to publish their research and evaluation findings in academic settings to be able to reach a wider audience. However, various academic journals and publishers have different policies in place when it comes to ethics approval and publishing research, as shown in the appendix. While grey literature databases, blogs, and self-published publications rarely require authors to declare that they have received HREC approval, research done in an unethical manner runs the risk of a loss to quality relationships with communities, and overall NGO reputation. In the case of NGOs, this could lead to a loss of donor



support. Therefore, doing an ethics review of any research or evaluation involving human participants may prove to be best practice.

2.2 WHEN

The [National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research 2007](#) (the *National Statement*), updated May 2015, was co-authored by the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC), the Australian Research Council (ARC), and Universities Australia (UA) and was designed to promote ethically sound research that involves humans.³ Examples of research that involves humans include, but is not limited to; interviews (structured and semi-structured); focus groups; surveys and/or questionnaires; and clinical trials.

The NHMRC [Ethical Considerations in Quality Assurance and Evaluation Activities](#) (2014) gives guidance in terms of when quality assurance (QA) and evaluations might require ethical review. The introduction states that:

Irrespective of whether an activity is called research or QA or evaluation, those conducting the activity must consider whether the people involved (e.g. participants, staff or the community) will be exposed to any risk, burden, inconvenience or possible breach of their privacy.

Generally, evaluations are of minimal risk which can be dealt with by the appropriate internal policies and oversight, except in several cases including: where the activity potentially infringes on the privacy or professional reputation of individuals or organisations, data or analysis from the evaluation is being used for another purpose, or there is a targeted analysis of data involving minority /vulnerable groups where their data is separated. In these cases, the guidance in the *National Statement* should be followed.⁴

Chapter 4.8 of the *National Statement* refers directly to people in other countries and should be carefully read before any review. Paragraph 4.8.1 states that “Research conducted overseas by researchers from Australian institutions must comply with this National Statement.” Furthermore, “the National Statement sets national standards for use by any individual, institution or organisation conducting human research. This includes human research undertaken by governments, industry, private individuals, organisations, or networks of organisations” (p. 6). Therefore, from the purpose, scope and limits of the *National Statement*, it could also be said that it covers research and certain kinds of evaluation undertaken overseas by Australian based NGOs.

For researchers who are conducting their research overseas, additional in-country ethics approval may also be needed. The RDI Network has compiled several [guides](#) on the ethical approval processes and requirements for countries within the region, which may serve as a good starting point for researchers who require further information.

³ This co-authorship was intended to reflect that the *National Statement* applied to all human research, not just health and medical research.

⁴ For further cases of where ethical review is triggered for evaluations please refer to the [Ethical Considerations in Quality Assurance and Evaluation Activities](#) 2(e).

Under paragraph 5.1.6 (a) and (b), all research that involves more than low risk requires review by an HREC. If it is of low or negligible risk, organisations can use their own internal review processes, such as a committee of peers (5.1.20 (b)). More information on levels of risk can be found in sub-section 2.4 below. Additionally, institutions may choose to exempt from ethics review research which involves the use of existing collections of data or records that contain only non-identifiable data about human beings (5.1.22 (b)).

Chapter 5.2 of the *National Statement* outlines the responsibilities and requirements for researchers in more detail. Ethics review should occur prior to any research being undertaken, and, in the case of an HREC review, retrospective approvals cannot be granted. Therefore, doing an internal review or applying for ethics review through an HREC should be one of the first steps in any research project. As any ethics review process can take an extended period of time, it is recommended that researchers bear this in mind when developing project timelines and methodology.

2.3 WHERE

HRECs are committees established by institutions or organisations and may (or may not – though they usually are) be registered with NHMRC to review and approve human research ethics applications. While HRECs are most commonly established within a university or health facility setting, private HRECs do exist. A list of HRECs registered with NHMRC can be found [here](#).

As stated by the NHMRC, researchers can approach any HREC, there is no need to be affiliated with the university or health facility. However, not all HRECs process non-affiliated researcher applications. To determine whether an HREC will process non-affiliated applications, please refer to their individual Terms of Reference; which can be found on their website. At the time of writing, the below HREC's Terms of Reference state that they do accept applications from non-affiliated researchers:

- ♦ [Australian National University](#)
- ♦ [University of New South Wales](#)
- ♦ [Macquarie University](#)
- ♦ [University of Wollongong](#)
- ♦ [University of Tasmania](#)
- ♦ [University of Sydney](#)

Fees vary between HREC and are dependent on the intended level of risk. As a guidance, fees for non-affiliated ethics review applications range from \$1,650 to \$3,300.

2.4 LEVELS OF RISK

The National Statement outlines that all research falls into three levels of risk: negligible risk, low risk, and more than low risk. As such, many institutions have different ethics review processes in place based on the associated level of potential risk attached to the research being evaluated. Therefore, it is important to understand these various levels of risk, and how these impact applying for ethics review. It may also prove beneficial to consider these different levels of risk when designing research, and subsequently presenting findings - even internally.

Negligible



Negligible risk research is defined as being research with no foreseeable risk of harm or discomfort; and research where any foreseeable risk is no more than an inconvenience (paragraph 2.1.7).

Examples of negligible risk research could include: observational studies observing people in non-sensitive public places, research which involves de-sensitised data sets, and studies based on historical archives or other publicly available information.

Low Risk

Low-risk research is defined as being research where the only foreseeable risk is one of discomfort (paragraph 2.1.6).

Examples of low-risk research could include; interviews which contain non-sensitive and non-controversial topics; surveys which ask about participants thoughts and beliefs.

Research which involves certain participants must be reviewed by a HREC, even if the only foreseeable risk is one of discomfort to the participant. According to the paragraph 5.1.6(b), these participants include, but are not limited to:

- ♦ Pregnant women and the unborn foetus (discussed in detail in chapter 4.1)
- ♦ People highly dependent on medical care who may be unable to give consent (discussed in detail in chapter 4.4)
- ♦ People with cognitive impairment, an intellectual disability, or a mental illness (discussed in detail in chapter 4.5)
- ♦ Some categories of research which includes people who may be involved in illegal activities (discussed in detail in chapter 4.6)
- ♦ Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples (discussed in detail in chapter 4.7)

More than Low Risk

More than low-risk research is determined by judging the likelihood that a harm will occur, and by determining the likely severity of that harm, including its consequences (for more details see chapter 2.1: Risk and benefit). More than low-risk research is also research which involves certain participants, as outlined above (*National Statement*, paragraph 5.1.6). All more than low-risk research requires a full HREC review. While processing times vary between HRECs, full reviews take an extensive amount of time and have a thorough and rigorous application process.

3. EXAMPLES OF THE PROCESS

The steps involved in undergoing ethics review through two HRECs - one within a university and the other a private company - have been outlined below. The University of New South Wales HREC has been chosen as they have specific policies and guidelines in place based on the level of associated risk, and therefore, a comprehensive example of the ethics application and review process is able to be provided. Bellberry HREC has also been chosen as an example, as they are the only private HREC which is both registered and certified as a HREC with the NHMRC.



When applying to a university HREC, it is recommended that researchers contact the preferred HREC with a short summary of the study, to ensure that they are able to process and review the application, prior to putting together the full and complete application. Upon receiving this confirmation, the formal application processes, policies and procedures should then be followed.

3.1 UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES HREC

General information about the University of New South Wales HREC can be found on their [website](#). Further information can be found in their [Human Research Ethics Standard Operating Procedures](#). The University of New South Wales HREC has different policies and procedures dependent on the level of associated risk. For all risk types, the associated forms and templates can be found [here](#).

As outlined above, only research which is more than low risk or involves certain participants requires review by a HREC. For research which is deemed to have negligible or low risk, organisations can use their own internal review processes or a HREC. As this decision is up to the organisation, the HREC processes for each level are detailed below.

Fees charged by the University of New South Wales HREC vary dependent on the level of intended risk and are accessed on a case-by-case basis. It is recommended that researchers contact the HREC with a short summary of their study and inquire about the fees that will be charged to process and review their specific application. For more information on this process, regardless of risk type, please contact: humanethics@unsw.edu.au.

Negligible Risk

Specific information on negligible risk applications can be found [here](#). In order to assist researchers with determining whether their research is negligible or low risk, the HREC has put together a [guidance document](#). To apply, the applicant will need to complete the Negligible Risk Application form and email this to humanethics@unsw.edu.au with 'Negligible Risk Research Application' as the subject line. Negligible risk applications are reviewed on a weekly basis.

Low Risk

Specific information on low risk applications can be found [here](#). In order to assist researchers with determining whether their research is negligible or low risk, the HREC has put together a [guidance document](#). Low risk applications are processed by various panels based on the field of research:

- ◆ Panel A: UNSW Canberra
Website: <https://research.unsw.edu.au/hrea-panel-unsw-canberra>
Contact: humanethics@unsw.edu.au
- ◆ Panel B: Arts, Humanities and Law
Website: <https://research.unsw.edu.au/hrea-panel-b-arts-humanities-and-law>
Contact: hreapanelb.artdesign@unsw.edu.au
- ◆ Panel C: Behavioural Sciences
Website: <https://research.unsw.edu.au/hrea-panel-c-behavioural-sciences>
Contact: humanethics@unsw.edu.au
Please note, Panel C only accepts hard copy applications
- ◆ Panel D: Biomedical
Website: <https://research.unsw.edu.au/hrea-panel-d-biomedical>
Contact: humanethics@unsw.edu.au
- ◆ Panel E: Built Environment

Website: <https://research.unsw.edu.au/hrea-panel-e-faculty-built-environment>

Contact: BEHREAP@unsw.edu.au

- ◆ Panel F: Business School

Website: <https://research.unsw.edu.au/hrea-panel-f-unsw-business-school>

Contact: humanethics@unsw.edu.au

- ◆ Panel G: Health, Medical, Community and Social

Website: <https://research.unsw.edu.au/hrea-panel-g-health-medical-community-and-social>

Contact: humanethics@unsw.edu.au

- ◆ Panel H: Science/Engineering

Website: <https://research.unsw.edu.au/hrea-panel-h-science-and-engineering>

Contact: humanethics@unsw.edu.au

In general, to apply, the applicant will need to complete the forms listed below and email them to the contact listed above with 'Low-Risk Research Application' as the subject line:

- ◆ Completed Low-Risk Application Form
- ◆ Applicable Corresponding Documents
- ◆ Completed Project Description Form

As application requirements vary slightly between panels, it is recommended to check the panel specific websites, found above, to confirm the complete application requirements.

Application deadlines and processing times also vary between panels. Please check the websites for more information. Most panels meet either each week or fortnightly.

More than Low Risk

Specific information on more than low risk applications can be found [here](#). To apply, the applicant will need to complete the below forms and email them to humanethics@unsw.edu.au with 'More than Low Risk Research Application' as the subject line:

- ◆ Completed More than Low Risk Application Form
- ◆ Applicable Corresponding Documents
- ◆ Completed Project Description Form

While the HREC has two committees which review high risk applications, both have the same application process. Committee A meets every fortnight. Committee B meets once a month. Specific application deadlines and meeting dates for the two committees can be found [here](#).

3.2 BELLBERRY HREC

General information about the Bellberry HREC can be found on their [website](#). Further information can be found in their [Terms of Reference](#).

Bellberry applications are processed online through their [eProtocol](#). An eProtocol User Guide can be found [here](#), and further help can be found [here](#). Bellberry has also created a [flowchart](#) of their application process to assist applicants. Further assistance on the application process can be found [here](#).

To apply, the following information needs to be uploaded to eProtocol:

- ◆ Final Protocol (generated through the application process)
- ◆ Investigators Brochure and a current CV



- ◆ Consent Forms
- ◆ Intended interview questions, questionnaires, and/or surveys

Sample forms can be found [here](#). When preparing application documents, please ensure that all files are appropriately named, using a footer, to ensure that the description reflects the contents (i.e. Protocol Number, Version Number, Date).

Bellberry has eight different committees, all with the same application process. As such, the HREC meets weekly, on Wednesdays. The application deadline is two weeks prior to the meeting in which the review is intended to take place. More information on meeting dates, requirements, and times can be found [here](#). Information on Bellberry's fee structure can be found [here](#). General enquiries can be sent to; bellberry@bellberry.com.au.

4. CONCLUSION AND FURTHER INFORMATION

The NHMRC states that all research involving humans should undergo an ethics review, and research that involves more than low risk and/or certain participants requires review by a HREC. As the processing time for HREC ethics reviews can range from a week to several months, it is recommended that researchers factor this into their research design and timeframes. Additionally, as a limited number of university-based HRECs accept applications from external applicants, independent practitioners should contact their preferred HREC prior to applying, to ensure that the HREC is able to review their application.

For low or negligible risk research and certain types of evaluations involving human participants, researchers should still go through an ethics review process with their organisation. The NHMRC has some guidance on considerations for a review. As a way of promoting effective and ethical research and assisting any internal review, the RDI Network has also developed an ethical practice [training module](#) and [Starter Kit](#), designed to be used as a complement to the [Principles and Guidelines for Ethical Research and Evaluation in Development](#) (Updated July 2017).

As shown in the appendix below, certain publishers and publications have no formal policy on ethics review or approval. These publishers and publications assume that any ethical concerns were addressed through peer review or internal processes. Discussion with RDI Network members highlighted that many NGOs do use peer review processes or internal review processes, but that they rarely applied the more formal ethics review processes outlined above. It was further identified that those who had experience with both formal ethics review processes and peer review processes believed that the latter better suited the context in which NGOs and independent practitioners work. Additionally, the extended length of time that formal processes can take can prove prohibitive when NGO projects are time bound due to funding cycles. As a result, the RDI Network will be conducting further work on such peer review systems and processes.



APPENDIX – PUBLICATION REQUIREMENTS

Having identified a need within the Network for clarification around policies regarding ethics approval requirements for publication, this appendix has been provided to document the requirements for various Australian publications, publishers, grey literature databases, and blogs. This Appendix is designed to complement the information contained in the remainder of this Guide. Where it is listed that a journal or publisher requires the author to state that formal ethics approval was received, it is recommended that researchers consult the above guide for further information on how to obtain such approval.

1. JOURNALS

Development Bulletin

Occasional publication of the Development Studies Network, based at the Australia National University, comprised of commissioned and submitted papers from academics, independent practitioners, NGO workers, and more. Each issue focusses on a specific, topical development theme providing a multi-disciplinary range of approaches, opinions and perspectives. Specific focus is on the experience and opinions of those engaged in development practice.

Website: <https://crawford.anu.edu.au/rmap/devnet/dev-bulletin.php>

Contact: Pamela Thomas
Managing Editor
pamela.thomas@anu.edu.au

Ethics Policy: No formal policy on ethics approval.

Australian Journal of Social Issues

Provides an interdisciplinary forum for debate on significant and controversial social policy issues, particularly social justice. Articles discuss specific social issues, review conceptual problems, present empirical studies and debate policy alternatives.

Website: <http://www.aspa.org.au/publications/ajsi.html>

Contact: ajsi@aspa.org.au

Ethics Policy: As part of the article, the author is required to state that ethical approval has been received and discuss any ethical concerns that arose during the research.



Asia Pacific Viewpoint

Publishes academic research on the economic and social development of the Asia Pacific. Particular attention is paid to the interplay between development and the environment, and to the growing interconnections between countries in the region.

Website: [http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/\(ISSN\)1467-8373](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)1467-8373)

Contact: Lisa Law
Editor-in-Chief
lisa.law@jcu.edu.au

Ethics Policy: No formal policy on ethics approval.

Asia and the Pacific Policy Studies

Flagship peer-reviewed, open access journal from Crawford School of Public Policy at the Australia National University (ANU). Targets research in policy studies in Australia, Asia and the Pacific with the goal of breaking down barriers across disciplines to generate policy impact. Publishes research from disciplines which include economics, political science, governance, development and the environment.

Website: <https://asiaandthepacificpolicystudies.crawford.anu.edu.au/>

Contact: Martyn Pearce
Managing Editor
martyn.pearce@anu.edu.au

Ethics Policy: No formal policy on ethics approval.

Solutions

Devoted to showcasing bold and innovative ideas for solving the world's integrated ecological, social and economic problems. The mission is to provide a forum for developing and discussing creative ideas to solve society's most pressing problems in an integrated way.

Website: <https://www.thesolutionsjournal.com/>

Contact: Lorenzo Fioramonti
Editor-in-Chief
lorenzo.floramonti@thesolutionsjournal.com

Ethics Policy: No formal policy on ethics approval.

2. PUBLISHERS

ANU Press

Website: <https://press.anu.edu.au/author-resources>

Contact: anupress@anu.edu.au

Ethics Policy: Author is required to state that appropriate ethics approval has been received. This approval can come from the authors' institution, country, or organisation, and must be able to be provided to publisher upon request.

Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) Publishing

Website: <http://www.publish.csiro.au/journals/publishingpolicies>

Contact: publishing.subscriptions@csiro.au

Ethics Policy: Author is required to provide documentation that ethics approval has been granted.

Monash University Publishing

Website: <http://www.publishing.monash.edu/about.html#authors>

Contact: publishing@monash.edu

Ethics Policy: No formal policy on ethics approval.

Taylor & Francis Publishing

Website: <http://www.tandfonline.com/>

Contact: authorqueries@tandf.co.uk

Associated Journals: Australian Journal of Human Rights
Australian Journal of International Affairs

Ethics Policy: Author is required to be able to provide documented granted ethics approval from an appropriate HREC.

Routledge

Website: <https://www.routledge.com/>

Contact: Please visit <https://www.routledge.com/contacts/editorial> to determine the appropriate contact for your enquiry.

Ethics Policy: Author is required to be able to provide documented granted ethics approval from an appropriate HREC.

3. GREY LITERATURE

Unlike a number of the journals and publishers listed above, the grey literature databases and blogs listed below do not require authors to declare that HREC ethics approval has been granted as a publishing requirement. While countless other online databases and/or blogs exist, those listed below explicitly state their research and/or publishing rigour. Additionally, a majority of those listed below are affiliated in some way with leading Australian universities.

Analysis & Policy Observatory (APO)

Open access database of policy and practice-based research. Major partners include; Swinburne University of Technology, The Australian and New Zealand School of Government, University of South Australia, and the ARC.

Website: <http://apo.org.au/>

Contact: admin@apo.org.au
editors@apo.org.au

The Conversation

Open access to authenticated, high-quality articles on current affairs and complex issues. Members and Founding and Strategic Partners of *The Conversation* are some of Australia's leading research organisations and universities.

Website: <https://theconversation.com/au>

Contact: editorial@theconversation.edu.au

WhyDev

Promotes open and participatory discussion about getting development right.

Website: <http://whydev.org.au/>



Blog: <http://www.whydev.org/home/>

Contact: info@whydev.org

DevPolicy

A platform for development and aid analysis, and research with a focus on Australia, the Pacific and Papua New Guinea.

Website: <https://devpolicy.crawford.anu.edu.au/>

Blog: <http://devpolicy.org/>

Contact: devpolicy@anu.edu.au

