### Template

**Internal Project Review Form for Research Proposals**

#### Part A: PI to complete

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/s of applicants:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of intended funding:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approximate sum being sought:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title of project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deadline/submission date:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project proposal – please insert/attach a copy of your proposal</strong> <em>(early rough drafts are preferred)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggested Reviewers – please suggest two reviewers who might provide appropriate critique</strong> <em>(although these may not necessarily be selected for use)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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](mailto:@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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer 1:</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Date sent out to reviewer:</th>
<th>Date returned:</th>
<th>Date Feedback to PI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer 2:</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

****

Part C: REVIEWERS to complete

Reviewers response:

In addition 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