



Assiut University Faculty of Medicine Research Grants- Guidelines For Research Proposals

GENERAL NOTES:

- Study these Guidelines carefully and incorporate the instructions in the proposal before submission.
- Pay special attention to the Evaluation Checklist. This will help you evaluate your proposal using similar criteria to those used by the faculty research committee and funding agencies.
- The research proposal should not be too long; nine – ten pages are generally sufficient.
- It is a must to register your research through the department committee and the ethical review board before submission.
- It is not allowed to submit a research proposal to the Grants office without having your department's research plan already approved from the faculty council.
- Confidentiality of your research idea will be taken care all through the process of review.

Eligible researchers:

- Having the research (Part or the whole) to be done in Assiut University
- At least one of the researchers should be a staff member in The Faculty of Medicine Assiut University.
- The department of the principle investigator has approved its research plan from the Faculty Council.

Eligible research areas : (According to the Faculty research plan)

The following topics will receive priority:

- 1- Decreasing disabilities, morbidity and mortality resulting from traumatic Injures.
- 2- Screening early detection of common and serious diseases.
- 3- Introduction of evidence - based, cost effective management strategies in common Health problems.
- 4- Infection control and hospital acquired infection.
- 5- Decreasing maternal and parental morbidity and mortality.
- 6- Family planning and population growth problems.
- 7. Basic researches that may lead to possible / definite improvement in health services and solving the above problems.

NB: The Grants Office has the right to fund distinguished proposals in research fields other than the above listed if the applicant could show in his proposal the importance of this research point and has the approval from the department council.

Types of Grants:

١. Mini grants (less than 10,000 EP).
٢. Medium sized grants (less than 50,000 EP).
٣. Large grants (more than 50,000 EP).

How to apply:

١. Eligible applicants should have the acceptance of their research idea from their pertained Department/s as well as ethical review board and faculty research council.
٢. The principal investigator should apply with a "concept paper" "typed" summary of the study within 1-3 pages, and he will receive a response from the office within 3 weeks to procedure with his application or not. (Application could be by e-mail or in hand).
٣. For medium sized and Large Grants: If the concept paper accepted. Full "typed" research proposal according to the application form enclosed should be submitted with 3 months from the acceptance of the concept paper (otherwise the office will regret to withdraw this proposal).

Time schedule:

- Proposals could be received all over the year.
- Response to concept letter should be expected within 3 weeks.
- Response to research proposal whether accepted or not should be expected within 3 months.
- Receiving half yearly audit from the Grant holders (for medium and large size grants).

How the proposals will be judged:

١. The research proposal will be sent anonymously to 3 evaluators two form the scientific committee of the office and one from the speciality /s sharing in the proposal to numerically evaluate the proposal.
٢. Each reviewers will give one of 4 responses:
 - a. Acceptance (50 or more points in average)
 - b. Acceptance with revision (40-50 points)(will be returned to the applicants with suggestions for improvement)
 - c. Extensive revision needed before decision can be made(30-40 points) (will be returned to applicant with suggestions for improvement)
 - d. Rejection (less than 30 points) (can not be reapplied)
٣. Only accepted proposals will be given total marks out of 70 from each reviewer to have a total mark of 40 from the 3 reviewers. (The average will be taken from 70 points)
٤. The evaluator will judge according on the following points:

EVALUATION	0	1	2	3	4	5
Originality						
Scientific Merit						
Relevance to Assiut/Egypt						
Qualifications of Investigator/s						
Methodology						
Importance of the outcome and liability for publication						
Relevance to department and faculty research plans						
Sample size estimation						

Budget						
Clarity of proposal						
Number of researchers						
*Sharing with other disciplines						
**Including postgraduate students (Point for each included student)						
***Additional points						
Total						

*Sharing with other departments/ disciplines: 1 Point for each sharing department, and 2 points for each sharing faculty other than medicine. 3 points for other universities, and 4 -5 points for multinational studies.

**Including postgraduate students: one point for each included student.

***Additional points: from the department share in the grants budget (1 point will be added for each applicant per each 10,000 pounds from the department.

- . The final reports of the reviewers will be submitted to the Grants office managing board to choose the proposals with highest scores.

Instruction in writing the concept paper:

Principle Researcher Name.

Principle Researcher Department:

Title of the project:

- **Relevance of the project to eligible faculty research plan**
- *NB: The Grants Office has the right to accept distinguished proposals in research fields other than the above listed if the applicant could show the importance of this research point.*
- **Description of the project and its effectiveness.**
- **Liability for international publication.**

(NB: Concept note should not exceed 3 pages)

Instructions in writing the full proposal:

1.2. Title of research project:

The title should be concise, as long titles are cumbersome to accommodate in information retrieval systems. Select appropriate key words or phrases, and avoid rambling and meaningless statements such as: *An investigation into the possibility of conducting research in . . .* Do not start a title with a present participle, such as *Investigating*, or *Analysing*. The title should rather read: *An analysis of ...*

1.4. Type of study design:

- For example: - Randomised controlled trial
- Case- control study.....ect.

1.5. Grant category:

Please specify the grant category you are applying for

2.1. Administrating organization:

Write the details if other than Assiut University.

3.3. Research problem:

This is the heart of the proposal. Normally a sentence, or at most a paragraph, is all that is required to describe exactly what the problem is. Many candidates have difficulty in describing the problem: instead they list the objectives, outcomes, needs or other irrelevant aspects.

If the research problem is not adequately or precisely described, it is likely to be rejected. Applicants should ensure that the problem and their objectives remain the focus of their thinking and writing.

3.4. Project aims:

Clarify the aims and objectives of the research. Where feasible, objectives should be divided into main and subsidiary objectives, and should be numbered. The proposal Review board specifically evaluate whether the objectives are well articulated and whether they are realistic and attainable. In writing the proposal, it is important to remain focused on the objectives.

3.5. Research area:

Specify one of the research area specified in the faculty research plane, write not applicable if other area.

3.6. Background:

Since the statement of the problem should be very brief, it is necessary to explain separately what the background to the problem is. Clarify the area of concern, or what needs justify the research (this could be a sub-heading). Any information that helps the evaluator to understand the problem may be included. Indicate why you believe that it is, in fact, a researchable problem. This section could be combined with the literature review, or form a sub-section of it with a short list of references

3.7. Research Methods and techniques:

This is a cornerstone of the research proposal, and therefore a critically important section. Failure to address it properly can lead to the research proposal's rejection and even to get low points in the final evaluation.

While you may not be able to give final details of your methodology at the research proposal stage, it is important to give a sound provisional indication so that the evaluator is satisfied that your methodology is relevant and acceptable.

Clarify your method of investigation, e.g.:

- § Questionnaires
- § Personal interviews
- § Focus groups
- § Laboratory experiments
- § Mathematical modelling
- § Design techniques, etc.

Indicate your sampling methodology, e.g.:

- § Size of sample
- § Population
- § Experimental and control groups
- § Prevention of bias, etc.

Indicate statistical methods and substantiate why you intend using the proposed specific statistical methods.

Indicate whether ethics approval is required, and apply for ethics clearance through the faculty ethics committee.

3.8 Research and reporting timetable:

Please hash the boxes corresponding to the expected time to finish each part of the research. Generally research proposals should end within 3 years longer proposals should be justified.

3.9 Budget:

This is an important part of your proposal, should be clear and justified with supporting documents in case of buying instruments or materials were required. Other items are the budget may be added as required.

4.1 How will your research extend, contribute to, or improve knowledge and understanding of relevant issues?

- § A new theory
- § A new model
- § A new treatment
- § A solution to a practical problem
- § A specific aid to practitioners in a particular field

What contribution will this research make to the body of knowledge in the particular field of study?

For funding purposes, the review board specifically require that the expected outcomes be clearly defined, as well as the likelihood that the research will achieve the expected results within the stated timeframe.

Part 5: Community support

If an organisation or other body than Assiut University partially funding your proposal

Best wishes

Grants Office:-

Tel: 241/3683

Fax: 2360606

Email: qaunit@yahoo.com

EVALUATION CHECKLIST FOR RESEARCH PROPOSALS

(This checklist incorporates the items used by government funding bodies in their evaluation of research proposals.)

1. Problem identification:

- 1.1 Is the problem clearly defined?
- 1.2 Is the basic research problem well formulated, or is it poorly and vaguely structured?
- 1.3 Is it briefly and concisely stated?

2. Background to the research problem:

- 2.1 Has there been an adequate description of the background to the problem either under a separate heading or as part of the literature?
- 2.2 Has the area of concern regarding the problem been identified, i.e., has the need that exists to research the problem been clarified?
- 2.3 Have the basic terms and concepts been clarified, either under a separate heading, or as a suitable sub-heading?

3. Literature review:

- 3.1 Is there clear evidence of a thorough review of the literature?
- 3.2 Is there a theoretical engagement with the relevant literature?
- 3.3 Does the literature review provide an adequate theoretical framework for the study?
- 3.4 Has appropriate literature been examined in order to provide the background and rationale to the problem and its formulation?
- 3.5 Have relevant sources been used to identify the problem?
- 3.6 Does the literature review correspond with the aims of the research?
- 3.7 Are the cited references acceptable?
- 3.8 Are references and bibliographic citation correct?

4. Conceptual framework:

- 4.1 To what extent are the framework and theoretical assumptions clearly stated?
- 4.2 Has the study been clearly delineated under a separate heading or sub-heading, i.e., have the boundaries of the research been stated?
- 4.3 Has a suitable hypothesis (or hypotheses) been formulated, or has a suitable research question (or research questions) been stated?

5. Objectives:

- 5.1 Have the objectives been stated clearly?
- 5.2 If there are more than three objectives, have they been divided into main and subsidiary objectives?

6. Research design:

- 6.1 Is the project and research design well structured and outlined, or is it poorly articulated?
- 6.2 Has the research methodology been articulated clearly?
- 6.3 Is there a clear correspondence between the stated aims of the research and the chosen methodology?

- 6.4 If measuring instruments were designed in other contexts, have they been suitably evaluated in terms of relevance and appropriateness to the South African context, or tested for their validity before use?
- 6.5 Have the sampling methodology and data collection been adequately clarified?
- 6.6 Is the analysis appropriate to the aims of the research?

7. Significance:

- 7.1 To what extent will the research make an original and creative contribution to knowledge?
- 7.2 Alternatively, to what extent will the research analyse and diagnose a particular problem, set it out logically, arrive at conclusions and make proposals for the solution of the problem?
- 7.3 Why is it important to undertake this research? Whom will it benefit or to whom will it be important?
- 7.4 Is the proposed research likely to promote further investigation within and/or across disciplines and fields?
- 7.5 Has the expected outcome (or outcomes) of the research been clearly identified?

8. Feasibility:

- 8.1 Is the problem researchable and is it feasible? Do the preliminary data and available resources support its feasibility?
- 8.2 Does the applications academic profile or potential support their ability to accomplish the project?

9. Other general comments:

Is the proposal well structured or poorly compiled? If the latter, what should be done to make it a well-structured proposal?

10. Language:

Has the research proposal been proofread and edited?

NB: This questions only to guideline applications to improve their proposal.

Best wishes

Grants Office:-

Tel: 241/3683

Fax: 2360606

Email: qaaunit@yahoo.com