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| Assessment of proposal: | Master’s |  | Doctoral |  |
| Student Name: | | | | |
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**Role of the reviewer:**

The reviewer is requested to read the proposal critically and comment on each section in the table below. The criteria below serve as a reference.

**Accept:**

* The proposal requires no further revisions and can be submitted as is to the Faculty of Health Science’s (FHS) Research Ethics Committee.

**Accept with minor revisions:**

* In light of only minor revisions required, the proposal can be submitted if the quality of the content and/or writing are revised and the supervisors are satisfied with the changes.
* The supervisor/s provides the student with a set of comments and/or suggestions by each of the reviewers of changes that should be included before re-submitting the proposal to the supervisor/s.
* Following revision, it is critical that the student includes a table of corrections that addresses each of the reviewers’ comments. See the template of the table at the bottom of this document. This table must show evidence of all the comments mentioned and where and how it has been revised and addressed in the revised proposal.
* If the student and supervisor/s choose not to revise the proposal according to a reviewers’ comments or suggestions, a rationale should be provided for that choice in the table of corrections.
* The revised proposal, with the table of corrections included, is then sent to the chairperson of the SoHCS Research and PG studies committee via the supervisor/s, who ascertains that the recommended changes have been made.
* A letter will be sent to the supervisor/s indicating that the proposal was approved by the SoHCS for submission to the FHS Research Ethics Committee.

**Major revisions required**

* This decision means that the proposal has substantive weaknesses in the content and/or methodology that indicate ***submission to the FHS Research Ethics Committee is not approved***.
* This decision is a culmination of all the reviewers’ comments and consensus reached by the members of the SOHCS Research and PG studies Committee.
* If the two reviewers and the committee cannot reach consensus, a 3rd reviewer will be appointed.
* The proposal must be re-submitted to the SoHCS Research and PG Studies Committee for another round of reviews, done by the same reviewers. The use of the same reviewers is justified as they can read the revised proposal with insight to identify if suggested changes were made.
* It is important that the student includes a table similar to the process indicated in the “Accept with minor revisions” section.

**Reviewers, please tick the appropriate box and make detailed comments after each section.**

| **Component and related criteria** | | **Assessment criteria** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Major revisions required** | **Accept with minor revisions** | **Accept** |
| **Abstract** | Within word limits (<350 words) |  |  |  |
| Structured. |  |  |  |
| Clearly stated problem. |  |  |  |
| Inclusive of the methods to be used. |  |  |  |
| Expected outcomes articulated. |  |  |  |
| Alignment of the information provided in the proposal. |  |  |  |
| Changes definitely needed: | | | | |
| Constructive advice: | | | | |
| **Definition of key terms/concepts** | Key terms/concepts as identified in the title are clearly defined, described, and applied |  |  |  |
| Constructive advice: | | | | |
| Changes definitely needed: | | | | |
| **Title** | Concise and inclusive of reporting guidelines if applicable ([**www.equator.com**](http://www.equator.com)) |  |  |  |
| Recommended 15 words |  |  |  |
| Reflect the aim of the study |  |  |  |
| Changes definitely needed: | | | | |
| Constructive advice: | | | | |
| **Introduction, background, literature review** | Current existing knowledge on the topic should be analysed and synthesised. |  |  |  |
| Literature should support the rationale of your study. |  |  |  |
| If applicable, is there a balance between seminal work and recent literature? |  |  |  |
| Identify gaps from the literature, which lead to the problem statement. |  |  |  |
| < 1000 words (2 pages) |  |  |  |
| Changes definitely needed: | | | | |
| Constructive advice: | | | | |
| **Problem statement** | Within the recommended word limit. (>200 words) |  |  |  |
| Focused and logically linked with title and background. |  |  |  |
| Clear and concise statement of the current problem. |  |  |  |
| Changes definitely needed: | | | | |
| Constructive advice: | | | | |
| **Significance** | The significance/contribution of the study is clear and appropriate.  The potential impact of the study is described. Consider your profession, the client, and practice.  Doctoral study: novelty/uniqueness of study is specified. |  |  |  |
| Changes definitely needed: | | | | |
| Constructive advice: | | | | |
| **Research questions** | No yes/no questions.  The following should be considered for inclusion:  PICOT: patient/participant, intervention, comparison, outcome and time OR  SPICE: setting, perspective, intervention/exposure/interest, comparison, and evaluation. |  |  |  |
| Changes definitely needed: | | | | |
| Constructive advice: | | | | |
| **Aim and objectives/ hypothesis** | Answerable aim |  |  |  |
| Feasible in the time frame |  |  |  |
| Aligned with title and problem statement |  |  |  |
| Nil and alternative hypotheses are stipulated in experimental studies (where applicable) |  |  |  |
| Changes definitely needed: | | | | |
| Constructive advice: | | | | |
| **Theoretical/ conceptual framework** *(if applicable)* | Theoretical/conceptual framework is aligned with the research question. |  |  |  |
| Application of the framework is blended throughout the study. |  |  |  |
| Changes definitely needed: | | | | |
| Constructive advice: | | | | |
| **Assumptions** | If it is a qualitative design: Identify the paradigm |  |  |  |
| Assumptions are aligned with paradigm (world view) |  |  |  |
| Master’s – Show how the assumptions, related to the paradigm, influence the data collection, data analysis, and interpretation of results.  < 200 words. |  |  |  |
| PhD - Ontological, epistemological, and methodological assumptions are defined and applied |  |  |  |
| Changes definitely needed: | | | | |
| Constructive advice: | | | | |
| **Research design** | Choice of design is aligned with the topic, problem statement, and assumptions |  |  |  |
| Application of design in the study is clarified |  |  |  |
| Changes definitely needed: | | | | |
| Constructive advice: | | | | |
| **Context/setting** | The context/setting of the study is clear. |  |  |  |
| Describe the physical layout, policies, and human resources impacting your study. |  |  |  |
| Changes definitely needed: | | | | |
| Constructive advice: | | | | |
| **Population/unit of analysis and sampling** | Population/unit analysis is clarified and justified. |  |  |  |
| Sampling technique was described and applied. |  |  |  |
| Inclusion and exclusion criteria are indicated. |  |  |  |
| The sample size is specified, justified, and appropriate. |  |  |  |
| Information on how access will be negotiated is provided. |  |  |  |
| Changes definitely needed: | | | | |
| Constructive advice: | | | | |
| **Data collection and organisation** | Data collection method/technique is justified and appropriate. |  |  |  |
| Procedure of data collection is clearly described. |  |  |  |
| Data collection instrument/interview schedule is appropriate and valid. |  |  |  |
| Describe data collection instrument development (when applicable). |  |  |  |
| Organisation/capturing of data is clarified |  |  |  |
| Pre-test/pilot study is conducted and clearly described. |  |  |  |
| Changes definitely needed: | | | | |
| Constructive advice: | | | | |
| **Data analysis** | Process of data analysis is clear |  |  |  |
| Provide data analysis plan. |  |  |  |
| For quantitative data, variables must be identified, and statistical tests clarified. |  |  |  |
| Changes definitely needed: | | | | |
| Constructive advice: | | | | |
| **Rigour** | Rigour of the study is aligned with the research problem, design, and methodology. |  |  |  |
| Rigour is scientifically applied. |  |  |  |
| Changes definitely needed: | | | | |
| Constructive advice: | | | | |
| **Ethical considerations** | Ethical considerations applied to the specific research design of the study.  < 200 words. |  |  |  |
| Participant information leaflet(s) and informed consent document(s) according to Research Ethics Committee guidelines |  |  |  |
| Data collection procedures adhere to principles of respect, beneficence, justice, |  |  |  |
| Changes definitely needed: | | | | |
| Constructive advice: | | | | |
| **Logistical information** | Time schedule is appropriate and feasible |  |  |  |
| Budget only for the direct research project |  |  |  |
| Changes definitely needed: | | | | |
| Constructive advice: | | | | |
| **Referencing** | References are current, appropriate, and mainly primary sources |  |  |  |
| All references used in text are reflected in the reference list |  |  |  |
| Formatting of references in-text and in reference list according to Harvard / Vancouver guidelines |  |  |  |
| Use an electronic referencing system e.g., EndNote or Mendeley) |  |  |  |
| Changes definitely needed: | | | | |
| Constructive advice: | | | | |
| **Annexures** | Annexures are complete and aligned with the content of the proposal |  |  |  |
| All relevant annexures are attached |  |  |  |
| Changes definitely needed: | | | | |
| Constructive advice: | | | | |
| **General impression, presentation, and communication** | Discussions are clear and coherent, and logical arguments are followed |  |  |  |
| Language and grammar are academic, and jargon is avoided |  |  |  |
| Technical editing is consistent and well done. Layout, alignment, presentation, headings, numbering and referencing |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria for recommendations** | **Your recommendations** |
| Approved |  |
| Accept with minor revisions |  |
| Major revisions required |  |

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewer: Name in PRINT**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Date**

**Example of the table that must be completed by the student, indicating how the comments and/or suggestions from the reviewers have been addressed in the revised proposal.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Comments from reviewers** | **Corrections**  **(or rationale for not integrating comments)** | **Page number** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |