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**Instructions for completing and submitting this form**

* This form is for the summarizing assessments by the Scientific Advisory Board using the supplied international reviews, patient reviews and rebuttal.
* Your personal details are registered in our grant management system called MIDAS. You can modifyyour personal details or add information via the system. This review form will be send to the applicant in anonymised form and therefore has no space for your personal details.
* Please convert the completed form, including electronic signatures, in a searchable PDF file. Upload the PDF file to your digital submission form in MIDAS.

**1. Project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project code |  |
| Project title |  |
| Acronym (optional) |  |
| Applicant name |  |

**2. Quality of the Reviews**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Review** | **insufficient** | **sufficient** | **good** | **very good** |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Patient review |  |  |  |  |

*Please add any further explanation below.*

**3. Quality of the Rebuttal**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **insufficient** | **sufficient** | **good** | **very good** |
| Rebuttal |  |  |  |  |

*Please add any further explanation below.*

**4. Scientific Perspective**

*Please assess the consortia criteria (1) and the relevance (2) and the quality of the proposed research (3) from the scientific perspective using the international reviews and rebuttal. Arguments from your own expertise can be added. More information about the criteria, and the call in general, can be found in the infosheet.*

**4.1. Consortia Criteria**

*Please provide an assessment along the specified criteria including argumentation for the perceived strengths as well as the weaknesses.*

* Consortium coherence
* Linking Basic and Applied Research with a Translational Perspective
* Strategic and International Value

**4.2. Relevance**

*Please provide an assessment along the specified criteria including argumentation for the perceived strengths as well as the weaknesses.*

* Innovative potential

* Broad impact (patients, risk groups and/or the general public as well as the impact from a scientific, clinical/preventive and societal perspective)
* Cost-benefit
* Choice of target group(s)
* Knowledge transfer, implementation and follow-up

**4.3. Quality**

*Please provide an assessment along the specified criteria including argumentation for the perceived strengths as well as the weaknesses.*

* Rationale and intervention
* Quality of the individual groups and research environment
* Work plan
* Human studies
* Animal studies
* Approach and feasibility

**5. Patient Perspective**

*Please assess the proposed research from the patient perspective using the patient review and rebuttal. Please provide an assessment along the specified criteria.*

* Relevance for (future) patients / Relevantie voor (toekomstige) patiënten
* Patient reported outcome measures / Patiëntgerichte uitkomstmaten
* Feasibility and Risks / Haalbaarheid en risico’s
* Information and Support / Informatie en begeleiding
* Patient Participation / Patiëntenparticipatie (anders dan deelnemen aan de studie)
* Communication of results / Communicatie van resultaten

**6. Conclusions and Recommendation**

*Please provide a short assessment of the most important perceived strengths and weaknesses of the proposal. Also add a summarizing conclusion and recommendation.*

* Strengths
* Weaknesses
* Conclusion
* Recommendation

**7. Summary Tables**

**7.1 Scientific perspective**

*Please give summarizing scores (X) based on the international reviews, the rebuttal and your own expertise. Scores from the international reviews are indicated as R1, R2 etc.*

**Consortia Criteria**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Consortium coherence | **poor** | **fair** | **average** | **very good** | **excellent** |
| Linking basic and applied research with a translational perspective |  |  |  |  |  |
| Strategic and international value |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Overall Applicant** |  |  |  |  |  |

**Relevance**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **poor** | **fair** | **average** | **very good** | **excellent** |
| Innovative potential |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broad impact |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cost-benefit |  |  |  |  |  |
| Choice of target group(s) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Knowledge transfer, implementation and follow-up |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Overall Relevance** |  |  |  |  |  |

**Quality**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **poor** | **fair** | **average** | **very good** | **excellent** |
| Rationale and intervention |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of the individual groups and research environment |  |  |  |  |  |
| Work plan |  |  |  |  |  |
| Human studies |  |  |  |  |  |
| Animal studies |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach and feasibility |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Overall Quality** |  |  |  |  |  |

**7.2 Patient perspective**

*Please accept the scores of the patient review.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **poor** | **fair** | **average** | **very good** | **excellent** |
| Relevance |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quality |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Overall score** |  |  |  |  |  |

**7.3 Overall score**

*Provide an overall score for the proposal taking the scientific and patient perspective into account.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **poor** | **fair** | **average** | **very good** | **excellent** |
| **Overall score of the proposal** |  |  |  |  |  |