**School of Health Systems and Public Health**

**Academic Programme Committee (APC)**

**Review: MPH protocol**

Please use the following as guide to assess the MPH protocol. You can expand your comments as widely as possible around the topic. Please distinguish between issues you regard as vital (changes requested are mandatory) and those which could be beneficial, but are not mandatory

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Student name:** | **Student #:** | **Year started:** |
| **Division:** | | |
| **Supervisor:** | | |
| **Reviewer:** | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title of protocol:** |  |

|  | **Changes definitely needed** | | **Constructive advice** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Scope** | | | | |
| 1. Is the scope of the MPH protocol congruent with the relevant degree requirements at UP |  | |  | |
| **2. Title** | | | | |
| * 1. Does the title reflect the primary aim/objective clearly and concisely? |  | |  | |
| **3. Background and motivation** | | | | |
| 1. Is the research problem clearly stated? |  | |  | |
| 1. Does the literature review give a clear picture of:   a) existing knowledge; and  b) gaps in knowledge that need to be addressed? |  | |  | |
| 1. Is the literature review current and relevant? |  | |  | |
| 1. Does the MPH protocol provide sufficient and clear motivation as to why the study is needed? |  | |  | |
| 1. Are the references correct and in Vancouver format? |  | |  | |
| **4. Aims and objectives** | | | | |
| 1. Are they clearly formulated and answerable? |  | |  | |
| 1. Are primary and secondary endpoints needed? |  | |  | |
| **5. Methods** | | | | |
| 1. Are the following components adequately described and correct: *setting, study design, patient or participant selection and measurements* (are the variables of interest adequately described and in sufficient detail [including the measurement tools to be used])? (SOP, as the case may be) |  | |  | |
| 1. Is the questionnaire/data collection tool attached to the MPH protocol (if relevant)? |  | |  | |
| 1. The statistical analyses results are the foundation from which conclusions will be drawn. Is the data analysis and sample size adequately described and appropriate? |  | |  | |
| 1. Is the issue of informed consent and/or other ethical issues addressed? |  | |  | |
| **6. Budget and timelines** | | | | |
| 6.1 Is this project practically feasible to be completed within budget and within 2 years? |  | |  | |
| **7. Spelling and grammar** | | | | |
| 7.1 Checked and correct? |  | |  | |
| **8. Other comments** | | | | |
| 8.1 Are there any other issues that should be taken into account or additional information the student should add? |  | |  | |
| **9. Conclusion** | | | | |
| 9.1 What is your overall opinion of the MPH protocol? |  | |  | |
| 9.2 Ready to submit to Ethics Committee? (mark with **X**) | Yes |  | No |  |
| **10. Type of revision required** | | | | |
| Please indicate (with **X**) whether a **minor** or **major** revision is required for the MPH protocol. | Minor Revision |  | Major Revision |  |
| **11. Recommend/reject MPH protocol** | | | | |
| Please indicate (with **X**) whether you **recommend** or **reject** this protocol | Recommend |  | Reject |  |

Thank you for your review.

**SHSPH Academic Programme Committee**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name - Internal reviewer:** | **Signature:** | **Date:** |

*Document updated on 15 June 2017 by Dr Elize Webb, Division head: Health Measurement Sciences, SHSPH.*