

Template

Internal Project Review Form for Research Proposals

Part A : PI to complete

Name/s of applicants:
Source of intended funding:
Approximate sum being sought:
Title of project:
Deadline/submission date:
Project proposal – <i>please insert/attach a copy of your proposal (early rough drafts are preferred)</i>
Suggested Reviewers – <i>please suggest two reviewers who might provide appropriate critique (although these may not necessarily be selected for use)</i>
1.
2.
Date submitted for internal review (please allow nn days to the external deadline):

Now please submit the completed form and your draft proposal to NAME (REC) E-mail: @sussex.ac.uk

Your proposal will be sent to two appropriate reviewers to review the proposal and you will receive their comments within 10 days of the submission date.

* * * * *

Part B : For School REC

FOR OFFICE USE:

Deadline for review feedback to be returned to PI:	DATE
--	------

		Date sent out to reviewer:	Date returned:	Date Feedback to PI
Reviewer 1:	NAME			
Reviewer 2:	NAME			

* * * * *

Part C: REVIEWERS to complete

Reviewers response:

In additional to answering the questions on this form, please mark sections of the draft document that:

- need clarification
- where content is confusing or incorrect
- where content seems inconsistent from section to section

(A Checklist is available at the end of the document as a guide)

What are the proposal's strengths?

Describe the three major weaknesses of the proposal (if any):

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Does the proposal raise an important question/problem?

Would the proposed research contribute to resolving the question/problem?

Is the writing clear and concise?

Are the paragraphs organized to allow for intelligent skimming?

Any additional comments:

CHECKLIST

The following is a checklist to aid reviewers in considering areas that are weak and may need additional work:

- importance and originality of the proposed research
- soundness of the study design / appropriateness of the approach
- adequacy / appropriateness of analysis proposed
- appropriateness of references cited
- clarity of presentation
- completeness of presentation
- accurateness or adequacy of the abstract
- are the outputs and deliverables clear and consistent with the study design/description?
- are any risks adequately addressed?
- Is the impact plan clear and appropriate?

Are any sections too long?

- Abstract
- Background/Intro
- Specific Aims
- Significance
- Study Design
- References

Are any of the sections too short?

- Abstract
- Background/Intro
- Specific Aims
- Significance
- Study Design
- References