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| 1. Significance of the project
 | 1.1 The study addresses an important issue that closely relates to MNU/National Research Priorities. | 5 |  |  |
| 1.2 The research problem is well formulated. | 5 |  |  |
| 1.3 The goals and objectives are clearly stated. | 5 |  |  |
| 1.4 The literature review sufficiently contributes to establishing the background and rationale for the study. | 5 |  |  |
| 1.5 The proposal describes an original and innovative study. | 5 |  |  |
| 1.6 The expected outcomes of the project are clearly identified and are likely to positively impact the wider community. | 5 |  |  |
| 1.7 The proposal has considered follow up or continuing activities that will (or should) occur after project completion. | 5 |  |  |
|  |  | **35 %** |  |  |
| 1. Soundness of the proposed plan and budget
 | 2.1 The research methodology (including design, data collection methods, sampling and analysis procedures) has been well structured and clearly articulated. | 5 |  |  |
| 2.2 The research question(s) and the proposed methodology are feasible.  | 5 |  |  |
| 2.3 There is a clear correspondence between the stated aims of the research and the proposed methodology. | 5 |  |  |
| 2.4 The timeline proposed for the project is realistic and adequate. | 5 |  |  |
| 2.5 The budget proposed for the project includes all major costs, is realistic and has been justified. | 5 |  |  |
| 2.6 Risk management is adequately addressed. | 5 |  |  |
| 2.7 The proposal includes a clear dissemination plan. | 5 |  |  |
| 2.8 The proposal meets the overall requirement of content and format, and is written in appropriate academic language. | 5 |  |  |
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| 3.3 The combination of team members is strong across all areas needed to accomplish the proposed research. | 5 |  |  |
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| 1. Significance of the proposed work to the career development and intellectual growth of the applicant.
 | 4.1 The project includes activities that will contribute to directly enhance the intellectual capacity, professional development and career progression of individual researchers. | 5 |  |  |
| 4.2 Potential opportunities to attend seminars/conferences and networking opportunities have been identified. | 5 |  |  |
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