

To: Research Fund Secretariat ([rfs@healthbureau.gov.hk](mailto:rfs@healthbureau.gov.hk); Fax: 852-2102 2444)

## **Project Assessment Form**

Reference No.:

Project Title:

---

---

### **PART A: DETAILED REMARKS ON THE INDIVIDUAL ASPECTS OF THE GRANT APPLICATION**

This part, except Question 9, will be forwarded to the applicant for refining and improving the proposal. The identity of the reviewer will not be released to the applicant. Please provide critical and specific comments to assist the applicant and the Grant Review Board.

**Please comment on the proposed project in the following aspects -**

- 1. Innovation and Impact:** What is the importance of the proposed project in terms of its innovation and potential impact in response to the health needs of the target local community? Is the proposed work relevant to the thematic priorities? How will the research findings benefit patients and/or the healthcare system? Will the research findings improve patient care, population health, influence clinical practice and/or health services management, or inform health policy in Hong Kong and elsewhere? Have the potential facilitators and barriers to this impact being achieved been identified?

- 2. Aim, Objectives and Scientific Evidence:** How specific, clearly expressed and realistic are the aim and objectives? Are the aims and objectives informed by scientific evidence? Is the effectiveness of the proposed health promotion activities supported by scientific evidence? Please also provide comments on the following (where applicable):

For Seed Grant proposals (i.e. grant ceiling is HK\$500,000), is the prospect that a successful outcome will enable scale-up to a larger project/trial and/or enhance the efficacy/effectiveness of existing practice clearly stated and feasible?

- 3. Target Group and Implementation Plan:** (i) Are the proposed design, strategies and implementation plan appropriate for the project? (ii) Are the number of targets and/or observations clear, justified, adequate and realistic? (iii) Is it feasible to achieve the stated objectives with the proposed implementation plan? (iv) How feasible is the proposed timeframe? (v) Have potential problems been anticipated and addressed?

- 4. Evaluation Plan:** Inclusion of an evaluation plan according to RE-AIM framework, (<https://re-aim.org/> or <https://www.fic.nih.gov/About/center-global-health-studies/neuroscience-implementation-toolkit/Pages/methodologies-frameworks.aspx>) **is required.** (i) Are the indicators and targets clearly defined for systematic evaluation of project effectiveness? (ii) Are the outcome evaluation tools appropriate and specific to the outcome indicators and targets? (iii) Are there measures to evaluate proper delivery and/or maintenance of the proposed activities? (iv) Is the statistical/analytical method described?

5. **Project Team Capability:** Comment on (i) the project team’s expertise and track record (including principal applicant/project team members/administering institutions), (ii) the existing facilities of the administering institution, and (iii) the cross-sector collaboration, in particular between non-governmental organisations and tertiary institutions.

6. **Budget:** Is the request for personnel, consumables, equipment and overall budget justified and reasonable? (1 USD = 7.8 HKD)

7. **Sustainability:** (i) Is the proposed project sustainable? (ii) Does the proposed project facilitate skills and knowledge transfer on health promotion? (iii) Does it strengthen the target community’s capacity in health promotion? (iv) Does it mobilise local resources to promote health in the community? (v) Is there potential to build a long-term platform for health promotion from this project?

8. **Overall Comments and Conclusion:** It is always helpful for applicants to receive constructive feedback from reviewers. What are the specific strengths and weaknesses of this proposal? Please include a brief overall appraisal of the proposal here, focusing on any areas for improvement and the basis for your comments, e.g. awareness of other work in the field.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

- 9. Confidential Comments to the Research Council (RC) (if any):** Please include here any further information you feel the RC should be aware of but do not wish to be passed to the applicant.

**PART B: OVERALL RATING** (This part will not be forwarded to the applicant)

Please rate this proposal by allocating it a score of 1-4 (“1” being the worst and “4” being the best) according to the descriptions indicated below. Please select the appropriate box. The final rating should be consistent with the comments provided above. Please check the comments and rating to ensure consistency. For proposal rated “4”, please elaborate specifically about its strengths to justify why the proposal is considered to be outstanding.

Score:

Score	Meaning
<b>4</b>	Outstanding health care and promotion project, highly innovative, impressive design and implementation, based on scientific evidence and evaluated in a systematic way. Good potential to help people adopt healthier lifestyles. Strong project team. Good value for money. Nil or very minor issues to address only. <b>Recommended for support</b>
<b>3</b>	High quality health care and promotion project, sound implementation plan with good potential for significant impact in response to the health needs of the target local community. Good project team. Resources appropriate to deliver proposal. Competitive in general but minor revision and clarification required for a successful delivery. <b>Recommended for support subject to clarifications/amendments</b>
<b>2</b>	Proposal which is potentially useful but with major weaknesses in one or more aspects, such as scientific evidence, implementation plan, collaboration partnership and/or value for money. Not likely to make significant impact in response to the health needs of the target local community without major revision. <b>Not recommended for support at present</b> (resubmission possible with significant improvement)
<b>1</b>	Unimportant and largely poor application. Lacking in innovation or unnecessarily repetitious of other work, little contribution in response to the health needs of the target local community. Minimal impact and/or flaw in implementation or reasoning. Incomplete or out of scope application. <b>Not supported</b>

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_