

Assessment form Scientific Quality *Version November 2021*

This form is not suitable for mobile devices

Special attention is requested for the box 'Explain your scores'. Please always provide your arguments. This enhances the significance of your opinion enormously!

Project number:
Name applicant:
Title of project:

Is there any possible conflict of interest in judging this application?	YES		NO
If yes, please explain briefly:			
Do you agree to have your name mentioned in the reviewers list on the UitZicht website? The list is in alphabetical order, not project related and will only be published if at least 25 reviewers say yes	YES		NO

Criteria (please read the enclosed Remarks first)

Judgment/Score – Give your score from:

1 = excellent: this application belongs to the top 5% of the applications I ever read as a reviewer

2 = excellent/very good: this application belongs to the top 10% of the applications I ever read as a reviewer

3 = very good 4 = very good/good

Please take note: In the past fourteen years of UitZicht applications with a score of 5 to 8 rarely have been given a grant.

5 = good 6 = good/sufficient 7 = sufficient 8 = insufficient

N.A. = not applicable

Aim and study question Consider: clarity; concreteness of the aim; theoretical framework of the study question; originality.	Score
Explain your score (mandatory)*:	
Strategy Consider: clarity; adequacy for the study question; adequacy of the chosen methods and analysis.	Score
Explain your score (mandatory)*:	
Researcher and group Consider: the experience and productivity of the researcher and group in the recent years and the impact of their products.	Score
Explain your score (mandatory)*:	

** Please kindly support your score with a thorough explanation, otherwise UitZicht might feel forced to ignore your review.*

Scientific importance for ophthalmology			Score
Explain your score (mandatory)*:			
Knowledge transfer			Score
Consider: has this topic been adequately addressed?			
Explain your score (mandatory)*:			
Feasibility			Score
Think of: will the aims be reached with this approach?			
Explain your score (mandatory)*:			
Time schedule			Score
Consider: realistic			
Explain your score (mandatory)*:			
Budget	Too high	Realistic	Too low
Place a cross where applicable			
Explain your score (mandatory)*:			
Overall score between 8 (insufficient) and 1 (excellent, top 5%)			Score
How would you rate this project as a whole, considering all of the aspects mentioned above and, if applicable, other aspects that are important according to your opinion			
Please explain thoroughly when there is a discrepancy between your previous scores and your overall score:			
According to your opinion, do you advise the boards of the participating funds to reward this application with a grant (without having seen the other applications and knowledge of the funds budget of course)?		YES	NO
Explain (mandatory)*:			

** Please kindly support your score with a thorough explanation, otherwise UitZicht might feel forced to ignore your review.*

Remarks on the criteria of the assessment form

Aim and study question

This criterion regards the clarity and originality. The study question should be concrete and verifiable. Also judge the importance of the subject. Is there an adequate theoretical or empirical foundation? What knowledge and experience is already available; what does the project add? Finally, there should be no replication of earlier or ongoing projects.

Strategy

The plan is clear and adequate for the study question involved. It describes the chosen methods and analyses, including the theoretical and or empirical foundations. The plan also outlines – when applicable – in what way the factors gender, age, ethnic background and/or other relevant factors are detailed. It details collaboration with intermediate and/or final target group (the patients - / consumer's perspective).

In a *study project* the judgment primarily concerns the study design, study population or data sources, intervention(s), outcome measures, sample size and data analysis.

In a *development project* you judge the end product, the development method or intervention strategy, a possible pre-test, the partners, users or target groups involved in the product development, the degree in which the results/products will be useful elsewhere, and the process and effect evaluation

In a *preliminary* you provide a judgment about study design and the aspects mentioned above at *study project*. You judge in how far the *preliminary* is representative for the pursuing study project and whether the most relevant impeding and promoting factors for the success of the intended *study project* are outlined.

Researcher and group

This concerns the experience and productivity of the researcher and group in the recent years (publications, reports, guidelines, protocols, interventions) and the impact of their products. Success can also be measured by the number and kind of grants obtained, and (inter)national contacts with peers and target groups. But also promising new talent should stand a fair chance.

Scientific importance

The outcome of the study is useful for patients, now or in the long run. Also take into account the urgency for answering the study question, given the state of knowledge in the indicated field.

Knowledge transfer

The evaluation criteria for knowledge transfer of project results vary with the type of project. In case of a *study project* it mainly concerns optimal diffusion of the knowledge gained; in case of *applied study* and *development projects* it concerns implementation of the innovation.

What is requested is:

- clear objectives for knowledge transfer
- good mix of activities for knowledge transfer and implementation
- mentioning impeding and promoting factors
- mentioning user and target groups and their degree of involvement in the project.

Feasibility

This means that the indicated study question can be answered with the available expertise, manpower, and facilities, within the planned time frame.