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The assessment of a research proposal concerns:

1. METHODOLOGICAL QUALITY & FEASIBILITY

We kindly request you to assess the methodological quality and feasibility of the following aspects. Please indicate for each category if it is described at least sufficiently:

- Yes
- No (please explain)

1. Rationale and background/Embedding in existing theories
   To what extent have the following items been described: a. existing knowledge, b. still lacking knowledge or gap in knowledge, c) embedding in theory?

2. Research question/aim
   Has this been formulated clearly and concrete? Does the research question fit the motivation/background of the proposal?

3. Study design
   Is study design appropriate for the research question, in other words: is it possible to give an answer to the research question on the base of the chosen study design?

4. Measuring instruments
   a. For quantitative studies: validated primary outcome measure
      Does the chosen primary outcome measure the outcome, as specified in the research question?
   b. For qualitative studies: quality procedure described
      Does the proposal include an adequate quality procedure, which guarantees the validity of the conclusions/results? (member check, triangulation/double coding, saturation)

5. Sample size
   Is the chosen sample size sufficiently founded? For instance, by a power analysis (quantitative studies) or items like ‘sampling’ methods, saturation or the chosen internal target group variety (qualitative studies).

6. Analysis plan
   Can the research question be answered based on the proposed analyses?
   Have the data analyses been formulated clearly and concrete?

7. Planning, timeline and duration
   Is a complete and detailed research plan available (describing e.g. the recruitment procedure of participants; a timeline/planning, specified by activities, described for each phase of the project)? Based on the research plan, the assessors have to assess whether the research proposal is feasible within the proposed timeline.

8. Scientific output
   Does the project lead to scientific articles, presentations, reports and/or a PhD thesis?

9. Personnel
   Is the quantity and quality of the staffing sufficient to perform the proposed research? Has supervision of the primary researcher been provided?
10. Budget

Is the budget (concerning budget height and items) sufficient to perform the proposed research? Have the items presented been specified sufficiently (personnel costs, training costs, material costs etc.)?

11. Feasibility

Please submit an overall assessment referring to the feasibility of the project, taking into consideration items 8 until 10: feasibility to perform the research within proposed timeline, practical feasibility, the feasibility of recruiting participants, feasibility to obtain a doctoral degree, personnel involved, budget). Please also take into account the guaranteed supervision of the primary researcher.

2. GENERAL CONCLUSION

Mark your decision by putting the appropriate line in **bold print**

A. Positive, with recommendations for improvement, if any

The project meets the quality demands for embedding in APH.

B. Negative, can be resubmitted for review after the suggested changes have been made

Essential alterations have to be provided to guarantee the quality of the project, for instance regarding the methodological quality and/or the expected scientific output and/or the necessary conditions for guaranteeing quality and feasibility (i.e. sufficient personnel and budget). The subject can be resubmitted once and will then be reviewed by the same assessors. After a second negative decision, the project cannot be revised and resubmitted to the Science Committee again. The negative decision will be communicated to the Director. The Director takes a final decision on the embedding of the project in APH.

In case of disagreement between the two reviewers’ general conclusion, a member of the Science Committee will assess the proposal as a third reviewer.

Please label any attached files with the WCie number (WC_ ).

The applicants will receive an anonymous copy of your comments.

Please return completed forms within 14 days (due date ) to the Science Committee secretariat, e-mail: wc.emgo@vumc.nl.