**Guide for the Evaluation of research proposals submitted to REPEM**

**definitiveV1 29.10.19**

(note: for projects where REPEM is involved as a partner only, judge only items 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project title:** |  |
| **Year:** |  |
| **Submissionstage:** | First submission / revised – second stage submission (\*indicate what is applicable) |
| **Reviewer:** |  |
| **Reviewer’s disclosure**  *Please disclose any relations with the research group or the topic for recent projects and whether this may have influenced your judgement* |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Very good** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Sufficient** | **Poor** |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Relevance**
2. Importance of the subject to PEM (how will achieved aims improve patient care, outcome meaningful)
3. Relevance for REPEM (Innovative/additional value to current knowledge, congruent with REPEM research agenda, Multicenter collaboration, what can REPEM offer the study, is REPEM the right group, awareness of ongoing/planned studies conflicting with this proposal)

*Priorities REPEM: conditions*: sepsis, fever, resp infections and trauma, *domains* biomarkers, risk stratification, practice variation

1. **Overall quality**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Very good** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Sufficient** | **Poor** |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Very good** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Sufficient** | **Poor** |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Objective and problem definition**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Very good** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Sufficient** | **Poor** |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Strategy**

Consider: Clarity, Problem definition, Appropriateness of chosen study design, outcome parameters, sample size and analysis

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Very good** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Sufficient** | **Poor** |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Feasibility**

Consider: Objectives to be achieved, Realistic phasing/timetable, Realistic number of patients/institutes/organisations, Recruitment of patients plan

Expected participation of REPEM partners (interest/workload); is the study primary outcome dependent on the number of REPEM sites?

In case of second stage project (revised protocol): quality of recruitment participating centers plan)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Obtained** | **Not obtained but essential** | **Not essential** |
|  |  |  |

1. **Ethics**

Ethics obtained, ethically sound, what is the burden of parental/child involvement in the study

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Very good** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Sufficient** | **Poor** |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Project/ research group**

Consider: Relevant expertise, Familiarity with research area, Prior activities and products

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Obtained** | **Not obtained but essential** | **Not essential** |
|  |  |  |

1. **Budget/Funding:**