|  |
| --- |
| ***Specification Reference*** |
| FS101143 |
| ***Specification Title*** |
| Social Science Insights: Food Handlers and Norovirus Transmission |
| **Contract Duration** |
| October 2015 - November 2016 |

This specification, which forms part of the Invitation to Tender (ITT), comprises of three individual sections: -

1. **SPECIFICATION:** An outline of the requirement
2. **PROCUREMENT TIMETABLE:** An estimated timetable for the procurement of the proposed requirement
3. **TENDER REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA:** Provides guidance to applicants on the information that should be included within tenders and on the evaluation criteria and weightings used by appraisers when assessing and scoring tenders

Tenders for FSA funded projects must be submitted through the FSA electronic public procurement system, ePPS, using the following link: <https://fsa-esourcing.eurodyn.com/epps/home.do>. Please refer to the ‘Help’ tab on *ePPS’* before completing the application.Failure to do so may result in the tender response not being processed by the system or the response being automatically disqualified during the evaluation stage of the tender process*.*

**THE SPECIFICATION, INCLUDING PROJECT TIMETABLE**

**AND EVALUATION OF TENDERS**

**SUMMARY**

* L,l
* The FSA wishes to commission a social science study to assess the role of food handlers and catering management staff in the transmission of norovirus in the catering industry, and to identify ways to mitigate the risks of transmission.
* Norovirus, commonly known as the winter vomiting bug, is the most common cause of infectious intestinal disease in the UK. Common symptoms of Norovirus include diarrhoea and vomiting. In 2014 the FSA published an extension to the Second Study of Infectious Intestinal Disease in the Community[[1]](#footnote-1) which estimated that were 74,000 cases of foodborne norovirus infection in the UK.[[2]](#footnote-2) The reduction of foodborne norovirus is a key priority of the FSA’s Foodborne Disease Strategy for 2015-2020[[3]](#footnote-3)
* The FSA has commissioned a study to assess in more detail the contribution made by the food chain to the burden of UK-acquired norovirus (NoV) infection[[4]](#footnote-4). The study consists of a number of work packages which will together provide an indication of the proportion of norovirus infection that is foodborne.
* Work Package 5 (WP5), led by the University of Liverpool, will examine the role of catering premises in the transmission of norovirus through the food chain, and will be conducting studies in premises which have experienced outbreaks of norovirus, as well as those that have had no outbreaks. Details of the testing taking place as part of this study can be found in **Annex A.**  This social science study will work alongside the wider study, potentially using the same sample of business premises.
* This project is likely to be best delivered by a qualitative approach. It is anticipated that the research will be conducted with adults who handle food as part of their work, including both managing and managed staff.
* **Proposals are required by Tuesday 29th September and we intend to appoint a contractor by Friday 16th October, with a view to the project fieldwork starting in November 2015.**

**GENERAL INTRODUCTION**

The Food Standards Agency is a non-ministerial government department governed by a Board appointed to act in the public interest, with the task of protecting consumers in relation to food. It is a UK-wide body with offices in London, Cardiff, Belfast and York.

The Agency is committed to openness and transparency. As well as the final project report being published on the Food Standards Agency website ([www.food.gov.uk](http://www.food.gov.uk) ), we encourage contractors to publish their work in peer reviewed scientific publications wherever possible. Also, in line with the Government’s Transparency Agenda which aims to encourage more open access to data held by government, the Agency is developing a policy on the release of underpinning data from all of its science- and evidence-gathering projects. Underpinning data should also be published in an open, accessible, and re-usable format, such that the data can be made available to future researchers and the maximum benefit is derived from it. The Agency has established the key principles for release of underpinning data that will be applied to all new science- and evidence-gathering projects which we would expect contractors to comply with. These can be found at <http://www.food.gov.uk/about-us/data-and-policies/underpinning-data>

1. **THE SPECIFICATION**

**Background**

Norovirus is the most common cause of infectious diarrhoea and vomiting in the community. The reduction of foodborne norovirus is a key priority of the FSA’s Foodborne Disease Strategy for 2015-2020. In 2014 the FSA published the Costed extension to the Second Study of Infectious Intestinal Disease in the Community[[5]](#footnote-5) which estimated that were 74,000 cases of foodborne norovirus infection in the UK.

As with other microorganisms that affect the gut, norovirus can be transmitted through: person-to-person transmission; contaminated environments; eating food contaminated at source; or by infected food handlers[[6]](#footnote-6). What is not reliably known is exactly how much norovirus infection in the UK is foodborne (contaminated at source) as opposed to by transmission by other means (contaminated environment or infection by food handlers).

Norovirus has frequently been associated with outbreaks of illness linked to raw or lightly cooked shellfish, principally from oysters, as well as fresh produce, particularly soft fruit. However, the introduction of norovirus into food by infected food handlers is thought to be a significant contributor to human infection but evidence of this in the formal literature is limited.

Foodborne disease, including norovirus, can occur if a person with an infection prepares and serves food, whether in catering, food manufacture or in the home[[7]](#footnote-7). Norovirus is highly infectious, this means the organism is likely to be easily spread by food handlers who:

* have been symptomatic (have had diarrhoea and/or vomiting) and return to work while still shedding virus particles.
* are asymptomatic (who are infected but show no symptoms), but are nonetheless shedding virus;
* have an episode of diarrhoea or vomiting, which may have resulted in the spread of virus particles to food, surfaces or furnishings, in the workplace or the home[[8]](#footnote-8).

**The Project**

The FSA has commissioned a study to assess the contribution made by the food chain to the burden of UK-acquired norovirus (NoV) infection. This Norovirus Attribution Study (NoVAS) consists of a number of work packages which will together provide an indication of the proportion of norovirus infection that is foodborne. Work Package 5 (WP5), led by the University of Liverpool, will examine the role of caterers in the transmission of norovirus through the food chain, and in collaboration with Environmental Health Officers (EHOs), will undertake a prevalence survey of NoV in the catering environment in outbreak and non-outbreak premises, allowing us to assess the contribution of food handlers to contamination of the catering environment. Details of the testing taking place as part of this study can be found at **Annex A.**

In order to further inform this research, the FSA wishes to engage with social research to assess specifically the role of food handlers in the transmission of the virus. This research will consider whether cases of NoV could be linked to catering staff, and, if so, to assess where the virus may have been contracted, taking into consideration circumstances within and beyond the workplace, as well as how the transmission could have taken place, and what measures are in place to prevent the transmission of norovirus. The aim of this research is not to audit current processes, but to observe and identify behaviours which might increase the risk of transmission of norovirus, and to understand how these risks might be mitigated in the future. No enforcement action will be taken as a result of this research.

The specific research objectives are:

* to provide contextual information about how food handlers might contract, and transmit, norovirus.
* to investigate food handlers’ awareness of NoV risks, their depth of understanding of these risks and their ownership of responsibility for risk mitigation
* to understand the circumstances which lead to behaviours that would either increase or decrease the likelihood of transmission norovirus.
* to identify any practices which might mitigate these risks of both food-handlers and management staff;
* To understand the extent to which protocols in place are comprehensive, clearly communicated, understood and adhered to by staff, and identify any factors which prevent both staff and management from following best practice[[9]](#footnote-9).

Tenderers should outline any further questions that they believe should be addressed as part of this research.

In order to ensure that this project links to the wider research, the project leaders will be expected to attend the Scientific Steering Committee meetings which have been set up to monitor the project as a whole, and will present their project plan, updates on the fieldwork, and findings after fieldwork is completed.

**Methodology and Sample**

This project lends itself to a qualitative approach, most likely involving in-depth face to face interviews of both staff and management staff. However, other approaches and methodologies will be welcomed provided they are justified with a compelling rationale.

As part of NoVAS Work Package 5, 250 food premises will be tested, in two regions of the UK, with half in boroughs across the North West, and half in London boroughs. The sample includes premises with a mixture of FHRS scores[[10]](#footnote-10). We would recommend using a similar make-up of premises for the sample of this social science project. We would anticipate that a minimum of 30 premises are included in the study, with a minimum of two interviews per premises representing both the staff and the management. Again, we welcome alternative samples and sampling methods that are justified with a compelling rationale. Although the purpose of this research is not to audit current processes, business owners may be reluctant to provide access to researchers. Tenderers should demonstrate experience in gaining access in hard to reach groups, including businesses.

We are currently in the process of gaining ethical approval to visit the same catering premises that have been sampled as part of Work Package 5. We hope to gain a large enough sample of catering premises from WP5, however it is likely that the sample of premises might need to be topped up in order to reach the minimum number needed for this study. In the event that either ethical approval is not granted, or that the sample gained is not large enough, tenderers may need to build their own sample of catering premises. Tenderers should include estimated costs for drawing up a sample of catering premises in its entirety, including any anticipated costs of using an external service to create the sample.

**Catering premises are be defined as a commercial or voluntary organisation that prepares and serves food to the final consumer**. This includes restaurants, public houses, cafes, takeaways, hotels, guesthouses, and caterers. It does not include passenger carrying ships that travel outside the UK, private houses, mobile retailers, manufacturers and suppliers.

**Deliverables and timing**

The following outputs are required:

* A mid-project presentation highlighting research questions and methodology and any fieldwork updates to be presented at the Steering Group Meeting in December 2015
* A draft report of research findings
* A finalised report of research findings with a stand-alone summary
* An end of project presentation summarising the key research findings, to be presented at the Scientific steering committee meeting in March 2016.
* There may also be the opportunity to collaborate with the University of Liverpool on the final report. Tenderers should cost for the possibility of a collaborative report.

Usually reports require two rounds of substantive comments by FSA officials (and any other parties involved in the project as appropriate) and a final round to finalise minor outstanding comments. Unless otherwise agreed, the project manager will co-ordinate comments and provide them to the contractor and all responses will be recorded. The final report will be subject to external peer review, following which further amendments may be required. Contractors should agree the timetable for reporting and publication with the project officer but should note that FSA normally expect two weeks to provide a co-ordinated response. Please confirm in your proposal how you will meet FSA’s requirements for reporting.

The final report will be published by the FSA, and will need to meet minimum accessibility requirements as detailed in the Social Science Research Unit’s style guide, see **Annex B.**

Applications should be submitted as a single tender on ePPS covering all the requirements outlined above.

1. **PROCUREMENT TIMETABLE**

Table 1 details an **estimated** project timetable for the project. Tenderers should however be aware that the Agency needs to acquire the evidence outlined in this ITT in a timely manner and you should justify your timings in your work plan.

|  |
| --- |
| **TABLE 1. ESTIMATED PROJECT TIMETABLE** |
| **EXPECTED DATE** | **INVITATION TO (ITT) TENDER**  |
| Tuesday 1st September | Invitation to Tender (ITT) issued by the Agency  |
| Thursday 3rd September  | ITT Clarification period opens\* |
| Tuesday 22nd September | ITT Clarification period closes\*\* |
| Tuesday 29th September | Closing date for submission of ITT responses\*\*\* |
| Wednesday 1st October – Monday 12th October | Evaluation of ITT responses  |
| Thursday 15th October | Appraisal panel meeting held to consider clarified ITT responses |
| Friday 16th October | Tenderers notified of outcome of appraisal and preferred Tenderer (or Tenderers) identified |
| Monday 2nd November | Clarification meeting with the preferred Tenderer(s). Agreement of Final Specification; Project Plan; Price and Contract Terms |
| Monday 2nd November | Contract awarded and signed |
| Monday 9th November | Project commences |
| November 2016 | Latest date for submission of final report to FSA |

\* If a Tenderer wishes to raise any points of clarification over the procurement process, the actual project objectives or any other query these must be raised through the ePPS system by the date specified.

\*\* Queries will not be answered after this date.

\*\*\* Submissions must be uploaded onto the ePPS system before the closing date and time.

Tenderers must provide a proposed timetable setting out these dates, dates for outputs and other key dates as appropriate. Critical dates must be marked accordingly. The timetable must allow sufficient time for the Agency to comment on draft research materials including questionnaires, approach letters, etc.

Tenderers should also take into account time required to store raw data on the Essex Data Archive (including anonymising of transcripts)[[11]](#footnote-11).

Details of all key personnel who will be working on this project must be given. Should any element of this project be subcontracted, this must also be stated in proposals with details of subcontracted companies, their key personnel and working arrangements with subcontractors.

The tenderer will be required to appoint a Contract Manager who will be fully accountable for the delivery of the project against the contract. They will be required to liaise closely with the Agency’s nominated project officer, Susannah Lederhose.

**Form of Response**

Proposals should include the following information:

* Demonstration of an understanding of the research background and objectives;
* A recommended research design and methodology, including details of sampling methodology for catering premises in the event that ethical approval to use the same sample of WP5 is not granted;
* A named contract manager who will be fully accountable for the delivery of the project against the contract, provide regular verbal updates on progress and issues arising to the nominated FSA project officer**,**Susannah Lederhose**,** and meet the FSA at the start of the project to discuss the proposed approach;
* Evidence of relevant experience and expertise on similar projects (please provide 2/ 3 examples);
* Details of all personnel who will be involved with this project, their grade, daily rate, number of days’ input, relevant skills and experience (including a brief CV). The proposal should also include who would be drafting the report;
* If relevant, details of sub-contractors appointed by the contract manager should be included along with the experience and services of the company sub contracted to;
* A quality plan demonstrating internal quality assurance procedures and how they will achieve high quality outputs to time and budget;
* Summary of how data security and ethical issues will be addressed (see below);
* A risk management plan;
* A timetable of key dates;
* All anticipated costs of conducting the work, providing a breakdown of staff involvements and days dedicated to the project for each staff member, and all other associated overheads and expenses (see below);
* Summary corporate information e.g. contact details, incorporation/ status, registration (VAT and data protection) numbers, profit and loss statements or at least approximate turnover figures for the last 2 years, a list of internal staff and social responsibility polices underpinning your business practices;
* Amendments/ queries on the FSA standard terms and conditions **(see Annex C).**

**Data issues**

Tenders should take account of the data security issues outlined below. Due to changes to data regulations published by the government in June 2008 the following points need to be taken into account, and a response provided in the specification to this project.

The Agency requires a fully documented non anonymised dataset which it can use for its own analysis and research purposes. We will also require sufficient documentation (including syntax of main and derived variables) to allow Agency analysts and external researchers to replicate analysis included in the outputs. The dataset will require encrypted identifiers for each record, with a separate file to link these to names and contact details – which would be held securely by the Agency. Tenderers must set out what documentation they would provide to accompany the dataset.

As the Agency is the data controller, it may wish to use the data for further research at a future date. Re-contact questions and supporting documentation must be phrased in such a way that participants are giving consent for the Agency or its selected agent to re-contact them. The contact data will only be used for research purposes and would only be handled by SSRU and IT Security staff.

The key issue concerns situations when personal information (including sensitive personal data) is being collected and processed on behalf of a commissioning authority. The commissioning authority is known as the ‘data controller’ and the contractor is known as the ‘data processor’. In this instance the ‘data controller’ is the FSA and the ‘data processor’ is the successful contractor. The data controller is responsible for ensuring that the data processor is collecting and processing data in a way that complies with the DPA 1998.

In line with the Data Protection Act (DPA) 1998, any information collected, processed and transferred on behalf of the Agency (the data controller), and in particular personal information, must be held and transferred securely. Tenderers must provide assurances of compliance with the DPA and set out in their proposals details of the practices and systems they have in place for handling data securely including transmission between the field and head office and then to the Agency. Contractors will have responsibility for ensuring that processing or handling of information by themselves, and any sub-contractors on behalf of the Agency, are conducted securely. The preferred contractor for the researcher will need to work closely with the Agency’s IT Security Team to agree the precise arrangements.

The sorts of issues which must be addressed to the satisfaction of our IT Security Team will include:

* procedures for storing both physical and system data;
* data back-up procedures;
* procedures for the destruction of physical and system data;
* how data is protected;
* data encryption software used;
* use of laptops and electronic removable media;
* details of person/s responsible for data security;
* policies for unauthorised staff access or misuse of confidential/personal data;
* policies for staff awareness and training of DPA;
* physical security of premises.

Tenderers must provide a separate cost for archiving the survey data in the Essex Data Archive. Tenderers must also indicate how the data will be made suitable for the Archive. **Tenderers are asked to provide answers to each of these points in their response to the specification.**

**Ethics**

This study raises several ethical concerns. The content of interviews is likely to be sensitive, and participants are likely to be cautious of the impact of their involvement in this study, including a fear of exposure to both their superiors, and also to the FSA.

Tenderers are therefore asked to identify the ethical concerns for this project and to outline how these issues would be addressed. Due to the nature of the work it would be highly advisable to appoint an ethical advisor. Tenders are also asked to consult the Government Social Research Guide for Ethical Assurance for Social Research: <http://www.civilservice.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/ethics_guidance_tcm6-5782.pdf>

**Further Information**

For any technical queries, points of clarification regarding this specification, queries regarding the use of the ePPS system or the procurement procedures please submit through the clarification tab in the electronic Public Procurement System (ePPS).

**Closing Date:**

Tenders should be submitted on the ePPS system **by the date specified on the ePPS System. Tenders received after this time will not be considered or evaluated.** **Please allow sufficient time to upload your tender and all supporting evidence before the closing date.**

**Notification of Submission of Tender**

On successfully submitting your tender you should see a popup box appear on the screen indicating that your tender has been successfully submitted and quoting a reference number. In addition you will receive an automatic email from ePPS with a reference number.

# TENDER REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

# The Tenderers Application consists of the:

# Technical envelope (80% of overall value), in which applicants should detail the approach, the work plan and their ability to undertake the work, and

# Financial envelope (20% of overall value), in which applicants should outline all costs to conduct the proposed work, and

# Any other relevant supporting information

# Tenders will be evaluated by FSA internal appraisers and external experts using a numerical system. The table below shows the weightings that have been allocated to each section of the application form and these will be used by the appraisers:

|  |
| --- |
| **TABLE 2. EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF SUCCESSFUL TENDERER** |
| **CRITERIA** | **PERCENTAGE WEIGHTINGS** |
| TECHNICAL CRITERIA – **80% overall Value** | Made up of |
| 1. Tender summary and objectives
 | 10% |
| 1. The scientific approach/scope of work
 | 20% |
| 1. The plan and deliverables
 | 10% |
| 1. Organisational experience, expertise and staff effort
 | 15% |
| 1. Project management
 | 10% |
| 1. Risk management
 | 5% |
| 1. Quality management
 | 10% |
| FINANCIAL CRITERIA – **20% overall value** | 20% |

## The Technical Envelope

The Technical envelope is split in to 7 sections for evaluation. Guidance on how to complete each section is provided within the actual application form.

A numerical appraisal scoring system will be used to assess the information given in the Technical envelope of the tender. Appraisers will allocate a score of 0, 30, 60, 80 or 100 to each part of the Technical envelope, depending on the quality and relevance of evidence provided. The scores will then be subjected to the weightings given in Table 2.

All technical criteria will be evaluated as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SCORE | DESCRIPTION FOR SCORE OF EACH CRITERIA |
| 100 | Tender fully meets or exceeds the criteria set  |
| 80 | Tender would require minor modification but almost fully meets the criteria with only a few gaps in the evidence remaining  |
| 60 | Tender would require some modification but addresses most of the criteria, but may not be detailed enough and/or has several gaps remaining |
| 30 | Tender would require significant modification due to significant gaps  |
| 0 | Tender does not meet the specification or policy |

## The Financial Envelope

The Financial envelope is split in to 5 sections. Guidance on how to complete each section is provided within the actual application form.

A numerical appraisal scoring system will be used to assess the information given in the Financial envelope of the tender. Appraisers will allocate a score of 0, 30, 60, 80 or 100 to the Financial envelope, depending on the quality and relevance of evidence provided. The scores will then be subjected to the weighting given in Table 2.

**Requirement for the financial envelope**

Please complete the Finance template provided. Costs should be quoted excluding VAT for the purpose of comparison of tenders. The Agency’s financial year runs from 1 April to 31 March. All costings should be recorded in line with this timescale.

**Evaluation of the financial envelope**

**Financial criteria will be evaluated as follows:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SCORE | DESCRIPTION FOR SCORE OF THE CRITERIA |
| 100 | There is full justification for the levels of staffing and the overall resources are appropriate. The tender is the best value for money for the work proposed to meet the specific evidence requirement advertised |
| 80 | There is some justification for the levels of staffing and the overall resources requested. The tender is reasonable value for money for the work proposed to meet the specific evidence requirement advertised. |
| 60 | Limited rational is given for the resources requested and/or the tender does not offer very good value for money, but is not poor value |
| 30 | The tender is relatively poor value for money with little/no justification for costs or resources requested. |
| 0 | The tender costs are not considered value for money and the applicant provided no rationale for costs or resources requested |

**Annex A: NoVAS Work Package 5 Testing**

As part of NoVAS Work Package 5, 250 food premises will be tested, in two regions of the UK, with half in boroughs across the North West, and half in London boroughs. The sample includes premises with a mixture of FHRS scores.

During routine inspections by EHOs environmental surfaces will be swabbed using the virology swabs:

In the kitchen or food preparation area:

* The refrigerator door handle
* A food preparation surface (e.g. chopping board)
* Kitchen sink tap

In the toilets used by members of staff:

* The inside door handle of the toilet
* The toilet flush

Similar areas of the kitchen will be sampled with the bacteriology swabs, as a hygiene indicator. In addition, the hands of up to 5 kitchen staff will be swabbed for virology testing only. Individual level data about staff will not be collected in order to increase compliance with sampling. EHOs will complete a short questionnaire provided including details such as the type of premises (cafe, restaurant, pub, gastropub, takeaway, hotel etc), number of covers (if applicable), number of staff, number of sinks and wash basins for hand-washing in the kitchen, number of toilets designated for staff, type of hand drier. In addition details on food hygiene rating score, confidence in management systems or business food safety culture scores will be recorded.

**Annex B: FSA Style Guide**

Introduction

The information detailed below outlines the main style considerations for social science research reports for the FSA. It is important that our reports meet the minimum accessibility requirements before publication on the website to ensure they are suitable for the widest possible audience. If you have any questions about any of the below please contact the project officer in the Social Science Research Unit (SSRU) for clarification.

Minimum accessibility requirements

* Ensure text is sans serif (e.g. Arial, Helvetica), with a minimum font size of 12 points. Sans serif means there are no additional structures on the ends of letters or symbols (e.g. of a serif font C).
* Ensure the text is left aligned, not justified as justified text leads to 'rivers of white text' being distracting to the reader.
* White space can be just as useful as the text. Over cluttering and complicating the page reduces readability.
* Avoid excessive use of capitalised, underlined or italicised text, consider bold for emphasis.
* Avoid underlining, except for links.
* Hyperlinks should be spelt out so that the full weblink is available (e.g. in a footnote or endnote) because users may only have access to the printed version.
* Use the Styles function in Microsoft word for titles, headings and subheadings. Heading styles ensure consistency; make a document easier to navigate for sighted users (and easier to maintain); and enable automatic tables of contents. They usually also provide the document with a built-in structure that is accessible to screen readers - when a Word document is converted to PDF, for example. Avoid using character formatting techniques such as bolding text and modifying the font and size of text to create the visual appearance of heading levels and other structural elements.
* Use the facilities (if available) in the word processing or authoring application to add meaningful alternative text to any graphics that appear in the document. In Word, double click the image, expand the Size menu and select the ‘Alt text’ tab and enter image description
* Include metadata for the file (this is hidden information but shows up for example in web searches). In the Office button, go to Prepare and Properties, add details for Author and Title as a minimum (the author will usually be Food Standards Agency)

Front cover

Once the final report is agreed, the SSRU will add a front cover, usually to include the GSR (Government Social Research) logo[[12]](#footnote-12).

Report structure

We encourage use of the 1,3, 25 approach to report writing where the main report (excluding annexes) does not exceed 25 pages, there is a three page summary of the background, methodology and results/recommendations and a one page summary of key findings/recommendations. Contractors should discuss an alternative structure for the report with the project manager at the start of the contract.

Stand-alone summary

All reports should have a separate stand-alone summary (unless the three page summary mentioned above is written as a standalone piece) that should provide sufficient detail on the background, methodology and main findings of the project so that it can be read without reference to the full report.

Disclaimer and Crown Copyright

All reports should contain a disclaimer and Crown copyright on the contents page or inner cover of the report.

General style

* Research findings should be written in the past tense.
* Reports should be written in the ‘active’ tense using the third person.
* Materials used during fieldwork should be appended to the main report or included in the technical annex if one is used. This includes recruitment screeners, discussion guides, stimulus material and quantitative questionnaires.
* For Food Standards Agency, use in full or ‘the Agency’ or ‘the FSA’.
* FSA websites should be referred to as food.gov.uk or eatwell.gov.uk

Quantitative research reports specific guidance

* Tables and charts should be numbered and given a title, the base or unweighted base size and the question or question number should be stated.
* Footnotes should be used to give an explanation to help non-technical readers interpret tables (e.g. to explain p values).
* A technical annex should be included that provides details on the methodology and data analysis such as further details on sampling, weighting of data and analysis undertaken.

Qualitative research reports specific guidance

* Quotations - if quotations are used care should be taken to ensure that they are not attributable in any way to an individual. Presentation of quotations should be consistent throughout. Do not use italics, suggested alternatives are to use a different font, use single speech marks and centre the quote on the page.
* Care should be taken in using language that implies any quantification of the results. Words such as most, majority, minority, half and some should be avoided. Alternative wording suggestions: ‘generally within the groups’ or ‘a common view amongst participants was’ or ‘one view amongst participants was x another view was y’ or ‘a different set of attitudes was’.
1. <http://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/IID2%20extension%20report%20-%20FINAL%2025%20March%202014_0.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://www.foodbase.org.uk/results.php?f_report_id=711> or <http://www.food.gov.uk/science/microbiology/norovirus> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <http://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/fsa141105a.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <http://www.food.gov.uk/science/research/foodborneillness/b14programme/b14projlist/fs101040> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. <http://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/IID2%20extension%20report%20-%20FINAL%2025%20March%202014_0.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. <http://www.food.gov.uk/science/research/foodborneillness/b14programme/b14projlist/fs101040> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. <http://www.food.gov.uk/science/microbiology/norovirus/norovirus-more> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. <http://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/multimedia/pdfs/publication/fitnesstoworkguide09v3.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Further details of the testing taking place as part of this study can be found in **Annex A**. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. See paragraph 4.4 [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Members of the SSRU are part of the Government Social Research Unit and abide by its code. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)