

**University of Aberdeen**

**Suggested Internal Peer Review Proforma**

|  |
| --- |
| * This Proforma can be used as a guide to help provide **consistent, structured feedback** on a proposal in a format used by external funders. It can be used where the Internal Peer Review Process is applicable – however it is not mandatory to use the Proforma -reviews can be provided in any format. * Copies of completed Proformas should be sent to the lead applicant who will upload these into Worktribe. Applicants should respond to the internal peer review comments, as relevant. * Internal authorisers will consider the peer reviews, and any responses from the applicant(s), before approving a proposal for submission. * Where possible all parts of the application, not just the Case for Support should be reviewed. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Lead Applicant |  |
| School |  |
| Funder |  |
| Scheme |  |
| Deadline |  |
| Title of application |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Peer Reviewer name |  |
| School |  |

**Please indicate which of the following was reviewed:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Case for Support |  |
| Complete Application Form |  |
| Incomplete Application Form |  |
| Costs |  |
| Justification of Resources |  |
| Data Management Plan (if UKRI) |  |

**Please rate your suitability to review this application (where 1 is lowest):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Scientific area |  |
| Funder |  |

**Assessment key:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6. Exceptional** | Excellently defined, highly coherent, strongly developed, flawless, feasibility without question |
| **5. Excellent** | Well defined, well designed, highly feasible |
| **4. Very Good** | Very clear, minor concerns, feasible |
| **3. Good** | Clear, several concerns, generally feasible |
| **2. Not Competitive** | Somewhat unclear, several concerns, unfeasible in places |
| **1. Unfundable** | Not clear, major concerns, completely unfeasible. |

**Scientific Excellence and Novelty**: Please comment on the following, selecting an assessment from the drop down based on the key above:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Area** | **Assessment** | **Comments** |
| Hypotheses, aims, objectives |  |  |
| Experimental design |  | Strengths:  Weaknesses: |
| Feasibility |  |  |
| Track record of applicants with respect to this application |  |  |

**Relevance and Impact**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Area** | **Assessment** | **Comments** |
| Relevance to funder’s strategy/remit |  |  |
| Relevance to the field, including industry |  |  |
| Economic and Social Impact |  |  |
| Impact plans, including public engagement, relevant and described |  |  |
| Plans for Patient and Public Involvement (PPI), where relevant |  |  |

**Planning and Value**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Area** | **Assessment** | **Comments** |
| Timelines appropriate |  |  |
| Risks identified and/or mitigated |  |  |
| Value for money |  |  |
| Staff training potential |  |  |

**Ethical and technical issues**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Area** | **Assessment** | **Comments** |
| Ethical issues identified |  |  |
| Animal usage appropriately justified |  |  |
| Data management plans described |  |  |

If there are any “2” or “1” assessments in any area, further comments should be provided here.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Any other comments** |  |

**Overall assessment** (click to select based on overall opinion using they key above)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 6. Exceptional (Fundable) | 5. Excellent  (Fundable) | 4. Very Good  (Fundable) | 3. Good  (Fundable) | 2. Not Competitive  (Not Fundable) | 1. Unfundable |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |