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**Instructions for completing and submitting this form**

* 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 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. Review**

*Please assess the consortia criteria (1) and the relevance (2) and the quality of the proposed research (3). Comment in your final assessment (4) on the perceived strengths and weaknesses. Grade the proposal concerning the consortia criteria, relevance and quality on a five point scale (5, 6 and 7). More information about the criteria, and the call in general, can be found in the infosheet.*

**2.1. Consortia Criteria**

*Please provide a short assessment of 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

**2.2. 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

**Overall Assessment Relevance Criteria**

*Please provide an overall assessment considering the relevance criteria.*

*Add to your analysis answers to the following questions.*

*a. If successful, what would be the potential impact of the research program on the quality of life of kidney patients?*

*b. What would be the consortium's contribution to the Dutch renal research field?*

**2.3. Quality**

*Please provide an assessment along the specified criteria including argumentation for the perceived strengths as well as the weaknesses. Address the workpackages separately if relevant.*

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

**Overall Assessment Quality Criteria**

*Please provide an overall assessment considering the criteria.*

*Add to your analysis answers to the following questions.*

*a. What is the intrinsic value of the collaborative effort?*

*b. How does the specific expertise of the research teams fit in the proposed research?*

**2.4. Final Assessment**

*Please provide a short assessment of the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the proposal.*

* Strengths
* Weaknesses

**2.5. Consortia Criteria**

*Please give scores (X) based on your own expertise.*

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

**2.6 Relevance**

*Please give scores (X) based on your own expertise.*

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

**2.7 Quality**

*Please give scores (X) based on your own expertise.*

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