****

**RESEARCH PROJECT APPLICATION (Review Study)**

**SECTION A: GENERAL INFORMATION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of research application** (e.g., larger project, student research, independent project)If applicable: Provide the title of the larger project, the Name of the principal investigator and the original ethics number |  |

**Student Research Project (To be completed by student-researcher)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Student name and surname:**  |  |
| **Student number:** |  |
| **Degree:** |  |
| **Type of review study:**(e.g., scoping review, critical review, systematic review, etc.) |  |
| **Year of first registration for degree:** |  |
| **Current registration date for degree:** |  |
| **Student ORCiD ID:** |  |
| **Study leader/supervisor/promotor:*** Supervisor/promotor research methodology and subject expertise:
* Expiry date of HREC training:
* ORCiD ID:
 |  |
| **Co-leader/co-supervisor/co-promotor:*** Co-supervisor/co-promotor research methodology and subject expertise:
* Expiry date of HREC training:
* ORCiD ID:
 |  |
| **Assistant-leader:*** Assistant-leader research methodology and subject expertise:
* Expiry date of HREC training:
* ORCiD ID:
 |  |
| **Date of small group/critical review group approval:** |  |
| **Small group/critical review group panel members (attach letter from CRG if applicable):** |  |
| **Expected date for student to complete NWU HREC Training/TRREE Training:** |  |
| **Did student and supervisor sign the student agreement document** (please indicate **yes** or **no):** |  |

**Independent Research Project (if not applicable, please remove)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project leader name and surname:**  |  |
| **Staff number:** |  |
| **Date of ethics training and when does it expire?** |  |
| **Information of research team:** (Please provide Institution and if applicable staff number). |  |
| **Date of ethics training and when does it expire for other researchers?** |  |
| **Date of small group/critical review group approval (if applicable):** |  |
| **Small group/critical review group panel members (if applicable):** |  |

**SECTION B: PROPOSAL**

|  |
| --- |
| **The following section includes headings to guide the student in writing their proposal with brief descriptions. These descriptions can be removed. Please ensure to use the headings when compiling the research proposal. Also please ensure that the proposal is formatted according to the chosen referencing style (e.g., APA or Harvard).**  |

1. **Title of Study**
2. **Keywords**
3. **Definitions**
4. **Executive Summary**
* *+/- 150 to 200 words.*
* *Provide a short outline of what you intend to do in the study, why you want to do it, and how you will do it. This can also be used for HREC later in the application process. Refer to problem statement, objectives, review approach. Include guidelines / steps that will be utilised and the analysis method.*
1. **Rationale**
	1. **Contextualisation and Problem Statement**
* *Provide a short contextual description against which the project will be conducted. It must be clearly motivated and supported with literature why the study is necessary. Contextualisation should effectively lead into and inform the problem statement. The contextualisation and problem statement should be formulated in such a way that the need for a review study is evident (instead of rather an empirical study).*
	1. **Theoretical or Conceptual Framework (if applicable)**
1. **Study Contribution and Relevance (community, university, scientific committee, globally)**
* *What is the contribution that this study aims to make to knowledge generation in the subject field? The relevance and value of the study must be clear.*
1. **Review Question(s)**
* *The formulation of the question should be aligned with the type of review approach proposed and should address the problem statement.*
* *Indicate review question framework used.*
1. **Aim(s) and/or Objective(s)**
* *Follow subject specific definitions. Need to see that objectives reflect steps towards the goal / aim.*
1. **Review Approach (e.g., scoping review, critical review, systematic review, etc.)**
* *Specific review approach chosen should be motivated and supported with literature. Thus, clear and compelling justification is provided for why the chosen approach is best suited for the proposed study and formulated research question(s).*
* *Review steps and / or guidelines need to be highlighted and applied appropriately throughout the proposal.*
* *Will your review protocol be registered – if yes – where?*
1. **Search Procedure/Strategy**
* *Clearly indicate which database(s) will be searched (e.g., EBSCOHost). Indicate which databases will be searched and included (e.g. NWU library provides access to more than 70 databases, will all databases be searched via the NWU library or will only specific databases be included).*
* *Provide keywords and Boolean configuration. It is highly recommended to please consider consulting the Faculty Librarian to assist with this.*

**Table**

*Table Name*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **KEYWORDS** (use OR to indicate synonyms and NOT to indicate exclusions) | **FIELD** (Indicate where the key word search should focus on: Title, abstract, or all text) | **BRIEF JUSTIFICATION FOR CHOSEN FIELD** |
| **LEVEL ONE** |  |  |  |
|  | **AND** |  |  |
| **LEVEL TWO** |  |  |  |
|  | **AND** |  |  |
| **LEVEL THREE** |  |  |  |
|  | **AND** |  |  |
| **LEVEL FOUR** |  |  |  |

* *Provide information on whether an initial scope search has been done to determine relevance of literature on the proposed topic.*
* *Clearly indicate the timeframe your search will focus on (e.g., 2010 – 2024) and provide literature justification for specific time range.*
* *Clearly indicate what the target group of participants for your study will be. E.g., studies which include adults aged between 18 and 60 with mood disorder; OR any age, specific conditions not applicable; OR children aged between 2 and 8, within single-parent families; etc. Please provide literature justification for specific conditions and / or age range.*
* *You can also consider adding the relevant frameworks for inclusion (should it be applicable) (e.g.PICO - population, intervention, context, outcome)*
* *Clearly indicate whether the following literature will be included or excluded (does not have to be in table format – just for practicality purposes):*

**Table**

*Table Name*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CRITERIA** | **INCLUDE OR EXCLUDE?**  | **PROVIDE BRIEF JUSTIFICATION** |
| **Full text journal studies** |  |  |
| **Peer reviewed studies** |  |  |
| **Non-peer reviewed studies** |  |  |
| **Grey literature**  |  |  |
| **Books** |  |  |
| **Quantitative studies** |  |  |
| **Qualitative studies** |  |  |
| **Mixed method studies** |  |  |
| **Review studies** |  |  |
| **PhD theses** |  |  |
| **Masters’ dissertations/mini-dissertations** |  |  |
| **Conference proceedings** |  |  |
| **Studies published in languages other than English and/or Afrikaans** |  |  |

1. **Method of Determining Relevance**
* *Briefly explain how you are going to decide what is relevant to your study. For example, explain what criteria you will use and what process you are going to follow. Also indicate and justify who are involved in this process.*
* *Provided clear and concise step-by-step guidelines that align with the proposed review approach to describe process of determining literature relevance.*
* *Inclusion and exclusion criteria should also be described and motivated by means of literature.*
* *Clear indication provided of the individual(s) or group(s) responsible for determining literature relevance.*
1. **Method of Quality Appraisal / Risk of Bias Assessment**
* *If a quality appraisal tool is used, a compelling justification is provided detailing its appropriateness for the review. Also, include appraisal instrument or list of criteria.*
* *If certain steps and/or guidelines will be used to determine the quality of relevant literature, this should be clearly stated and justified. These steps also need to be described in full.*
* *Provided relevant information on all reviewers involved during quality appraisal, as well as what their role and responsibility will be.*
1. **Data Extraction** *(data extraction refers to identifying the specific data / data components you want to extract from each identified study to analyse in order to achieve the aims of the study* **–** *this is not data analysis).*
* *Provide a clear indication of the specific data components you plan to analyse from the identified studies, and briefly motivate why (e.g., study title, author(s), methodology, findings or results, conclusion, etc.).*
* *Clearly indicated all individuals involved in data extraction, delineating their roles and expertise.*
* *Insert / attach data charting table with components that will be used.*
* *Insert PRISMA flowchart that will be used to demonstrate selection and inclusion of final number of studies. Flowcharts can be obtained from* [*http://prisma-statement.org/prismastatement/flowdiagram.aspx?AspxAutoDetectCookieSupport=1*](http://prisma-statement.org/prismastatement/flowdiagram.aspx?AspxAutoDetectCookieSupport=1)
* *Quality assessment / Risk of bias assessment if applicable.*
1. **Data Analysis / Synthesis**
* *Clearly indicate which data analysis / synthesis method will be used as well as justification for its appropriateness.*
* *Chosen analysis method needs to be aligned with the nature of the review study and with the review approach.*
* *Provide a comprehensive description of the data analysis steps / guidelines that will be followed.*
1. **Rigour/Trustworthiness**
* *Provided an exhaustive and comprehensive description of rigour and trustworthiness, ensuring alignment with the specific review approach.*
* *Provided a concise and in-depth justification for each principle applied, highlighting its relevance and importance to the proposed review.*
1. **Ethical Considerations**
* *Briefly indicate any ethical risks that may be involved in your proposed study, as well as which precautions you will put in place (Please study the following publications for guidelines):*
1. *Vergnes, J.N., Marchal-Sixou, C., Nabet, C., Maret, D., & Hamel, O. 2010. Ethics in Systematic Reviews. Journal of Medical Ethics, 36(12), 771-774.*
2. *Wager, E., & Wiffen, P.J. 2011. Ethical issues in preparing and publishing systematic reviews. Journal of Evidence-based Medicine, 130-134. doi 10.1111/j.1756-5391.2011.01122.x*
* *Provide researcher competencies and expertise for all research involved justifying why they can conduct specific study.*
1. **Research Monitoring**
* *Indicate how compliance with the approved research proposal will be maintained.*
* *How will ethics be monitored?*
* *How will any amendments be addressed and managed?*
* *In the instance of adverse event (how will it be reported and managed?)*
1. **Choice and Structure of Report**
* *Indicate if the article format or conventional thesis format will be used (also indicate structure). Keep in mind that research articles have to STRICTLY adhere to publication criteria; this should be built into the proposal - which Journals will be considered for publication.*
* *Indicate Journal, editorial requirements and referencing style followed, accreditation.*
* ***Please note that for a full dissertation two articles are expected.***
1. **Research Budget**
* *Provide a structured budget for the complete project. Include a breakdown of costs for the project, including use of printing, technical assistance and data analysis consultation, transport, editorial assistance, etc.*
* *Indicate funding that will cover the budget.*

**Table**

*Table Name*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Description** | **Estimated Cost(s)** |
| Language Editing |  | R |
| Co-coder |  | R |
|  |  | R |
| **Total Costs:** |  | **R** |

1. **Timeframe**
* *Provide a projected time frame indicating the course of the project.*
* *Sequence to coincide with ethical application.*

**Table**

*Table Name*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Time Frame** |
| Proposal writing | March - April 2024 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

1. **References**