

## ASSESSMENT OF A TDR RESEARCH GRANT APPLICATION

CONFIDENTIAL		
<b>1.1 Reviewer</b>		
Surname:		First name(s):
Committee:	Venue:	Date:
Project title:		
Project ID:	Proposal or protocol	Version: Date:

This form is designed to

1. Inform prospective applicants of how applications are reviewed and provide a framework for critical and objective assessment of the proposal
2. Provide comments as feedback to the applicant with a clear indication of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal as appropriate
3. Provide a clear recommendation to WHO/TDR on whether or not to fund the proposed research project or proceed with the implementation of the protocol.
4. Make recommendations / suggestions which will guide the investigator in the development or improvement of the research protocol where the proposed research has enough merit to justify funding

Further to carrying out best practice of independent peer review, it is especially to be noted that for research involving human subjects the WHO Ethics Review Committee (ERC) requires that all research proposals and research protocols undergo extensive scientific and technical review before being submitted to the ERC. This must be undertaken by external reviewers who are **independent** and not in any way involved with the design or execution of the project.

**Respond to each question with YES, NO or Not applicable (N/A) and provide comments using bullet points.**

### *Background*

1. Is the rationale for the study clearly stated in the context of present knowledge? Yes [ ] No [ ] NA [ ]
2. Is a review of literature with references comprehensive and adequate? Yes [ ] No [ ] NA [ ]

### Comments on background information.

Enter text here

### *Goals and objectives*

3. Are the objectives and/or hypothesis clearly stated? Yes [ ] No [ ] NA [ ]
4. Are the objectives realistic (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Resourced within the project and Time bound) ? Yes [ ] No [ ] NA [ ]

### Comments on goals and objectives

Enter text here

### ***Study Design and Methodology***

5. Is the study setting described? **Yes** [ ☐ ] **No** [ ☐ ] **NA** [ ☐ ]
6. Does the proposal provide a clear description of the study design (e.g. whether it is basic science research, social science research, or epidemiological - observational or intervention - research) and the study participants, outcomes and intervention and control groups (if relevant)? **Yes** [ ☐ ] **No** [ ☐ ] **NA** [ ☐ ]
7. Are the study methods clearly outlined for each objective? **Yes** [ ☐ ] **No** [ ☐ ] **NA** [ ☐ ]
8. Is a sample size provided, along with the assumptions on which it is based? **Yes** [ ☐ ] **No** [ ☐ ] **NA** [ ☐ ]
9. Is the sample size adequate? **Yes** [ ☐ ] **No** [ ☐ ] **NA** [ ☐ ]
10. Is the data management and analysis plan adequate? **Yes** [ ☐ ] **No** [ ☐ ] **NA** [ ☐ ]

#### **Comments on study design and methodology.**

Enter text here

### ***Participant safety and other ethical issues***

11. Does the project involve human subjects? **Yes** [ ☐ ] **No** [ ☐ ] **NA** [ ☐ ]
12. Have any risks in participating in the research been identified and does the proposal / protocol state how these will be minimized? **Yes** [ ☐ ] **No** [ ☐ ] **NA** [ ☐ ]
13. In general, does the conduct of the research present any risk or ethical issues (including humane treatment of experimental animals and the safety of the investigators / research staff)? **Yes** [ ☐ ] **No** [ ☐ ] **NA** [ ☐ ]
14. Has the project undergone ethics (animal ethics) review elsewhere? **Yes** [ ☐ ] **No** [ ☐ ] **NA** [ ☐ ]
15. Are there any gender or age issues that need to be addressed? **Yes** [ ☐ ] **No** [ ☐ ] **NA** [ ☐ ]
16. Is the inclusion or exclusion of particular study groups justified? **Yes** [ ☐ ] **No** [ ☐ ] **NA** [ ☐ ]
17. Are the proposed consent forms for human studies adequate?. **Yes** [ ☐ ] **No** [ ☐ ] **NA** [ ☐ ]

#### **Comments on patient safety and other ethical issues.**

Enter text here

### ***Expected outcomes and dissemination of results***

18. Has a plan for the dissemination of results, not only to the research community (through open access online publication, and other journal publications) but also to policy makers (through meetings, reports etc) and back to the research participants and research communities (through community meetings, flyers, leaflets etc) been addressed? **Yes** [ ☐ ] **No** [ ☐ ] **NA** [ ☐ ]

<b>Comments on expected outcomes and dissemination of results.</b>
Enter text here

**Project Management**

19. Is the duration of the project realistic and appropriate? Yes [ ☐ ] No [ ☐ ] NA [ ☐ ]
20. Are the roles and responsibilities of each team member described? Yes [ ☐ ] No [ ☐ ] NA [ ☐ ]
21. Does the team have the competencies needed to undertake this project? Yes [ ☐ ] No [ ☐ ] NA [ ☐ ]
22. Does the institution have adequate facilities/infrastructure for this project? Yes [ ☐ ] No [ ☐ ] NA [ ☐ ]

<b>Comments on project management.</b>
Enter text here

**Budget**

23. Is the budget requested realistic? Yes [ ☐ ] No [ ☐ ] NA [ ☐ ]
24. Is the budget well justified Yes [ ☐ ] No [ ☐ ] NA [ ☐ ]

<b>Comments on budget.</b>
Enter text here

**Partnerships and contribution to knowledge**

25. Does the project address an important/relevant scientific/public health issue? Yes [ ☐ ] No [ ☐ ] NA [ ☐ ]
26. Will the proposed research contribute new knowledge in the subject area? Yes [ ☐ ] No [ ☐ ] NA [ ☐ ]
27. Are the collaborations/partnerships described adequate for the implementation of the research?  
Yes [ ☐ ] No [ ☐ ] NA [ ☐ ]
28. Are the collaborations / partnerships described adequate for the uptake/utilization of the results?  
Yes [ ☐ ] No [ ☐ ] NA [ ☐ ]

<b>Comments on partnerships and contribution to knowledge.</b>
Enter text here

**Research capacity building / strengthening.** (Complete this section **only** if the application is expected to include a

capacity building component).

- 29 Is the justification for capacity building adequate? Yes [ ☐ ] No [ ☐ ] NA [ ☐ ]
30. Will the project strengthen or build new capacity and research competencies in the institution? Yes [ ☐ ] No [ ☐ ] NA [ ☐ ]
- 31 Will the project enhance the institution's research infrastructure/support systems? Yes [ ☐ ] No [ ☐ ] NA [ ☐ ]
32. Does the project include opportunities for developing new human resource for research through graduate training? Yes [ ☐ ] No [ ☐ ] NA [ ☐ ]

**Comments on capacity building.**

Enter text here

**Overall score:** Score each item below on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is the best and 5 is the worse. Projects with a score of 4 or 5 in any one category and an average score above 2.5 can not be considered for funding.

Scientific merit	Relevance for objective of call	Capacity building (if applicable):	Feasibility	Ethical (if applicable)	Average

**RECOMMENDATION**

- 33 Do you recommend this research for funding by TDR? Yes [ ☐ ] No [ ☐ ]
- 30 Do you recommend funding at the proposed budget ? Yes [ ☐ ] No [ ☐ ]
- 34 If answer to 29 is Yes and to 30 is No, please recommend a budget figure \_\_\_\_\_

**OVERALL COMMENTS** (Use additional sheets as required. Where there are deficiencies in the proposal / protocol, your comments should include information on the deficiencies and suggestions on how these may be addressed)

Enter text here