

**CHECK-LIST FOR INTERNAL PEER REVIEWERS**

The line of argument, and structure, of the proposal is important. These questions are designed to help you give ***formative feedback*** to grant applicants.

## The importance question: does this proposal ask an important question?

## Title

Does the title reflect what the research is about? Does it help you understand the research proposal? Is it informative and easily understandable?

## Rationale

Is this research important and why? Why it is important now? Has the case been made? (in thinking about this, consider the ‘so what?’ question)

Is there enough written on what is already known about this topic and why the additional research will bring new insight/is important now?

How can the rationale be improved?

## Aim/objectives/research questions

Do the aim, objectives and/or research questions clearly follow from the rationale?

Are they clearly stated/phrased?

How can the aim, objectives and/or research questions be improved?

## The success question: is this project likely to answer the question(s) and address all its objectives?

## Methodology

Is the research design/methodology the right one for the aim/objectives/research questions?

Is it clear that the methodology and methods will clearly address objectives/answer research questions?

Is it clear that the applicants can access the settings and sample (or access documents, archives etc)?

Is it clear that people will be willing to participate (as appropriate)?

Is it clear what data will be collected or how data will be extracted from documents?

Is the approach to analyses described/justified?

Is enough detail provided to convince you that the research can be done well?

Does the research raise any ethical questions?

Will the findings be trustworthy? Have bias and chance been considered? Have rigour of qualitative or documentary methods been sufficiently covered?

## The competence question: are the applicant and team competent to carry out the project described?

## Team

Have the research team made it clear that they have the skills and experience to deliver?

Is the balance of work across the team members reasonable and is it clear what each team member will contribute to the project?

Does it look as if the group will work effectively as a team?

Are there relevant external partners and potential letters of support?

## The value question: is the likely gain from this project worth the resources requested?

## Resources

Have the team asked for sufficient investigator time to address all of the research questions?

Are external non-academic partners adequately funded?

Have the team asked for enough money to deliver the outcomes they promise (and can this be justified)?

## Impact and relevance

Have the team considered all beneficiaries/stakeholders and how they will communicate with them?

Are activities clear? Are sufficient resources attached to delivering the proposed activities?

Has the research been contextualised in terms of the user?

Is it clear how research users will be enabled to benefit from the research?

**Outcomes**

Are the outputs, outcomes and benefits clearly articulated?

Are the proposed outcomes appropriate for a project of this size/duration?

Are the team promising too much?

## The fit question: does the proposal match the requirements of the call?

What expectations - relating to theory, methods, engagement and impact, outputs - have been set out in the research call or brief and does the proposal meet these? Are there elements missing from the proposal?

Does it read as if the applicant has tried, not wholly successfully, to ‘shoe-horn’ their research interest or activity into the response to the call? Would the applicant be better sending their proposal elsewhere if the fit is not good enough?