Dutch Kidney Foundation
Subsidy Projects
Criteria Set

Version 8 December 2017

This criteria set is a translation of the 'criteriaset' in Dutch. If the English language version contains discrepancies or leads to differences in interpretation, the version in the Dutch language will be decisive.

Basic set relevance and quality criteria
The Dutch Kidney Foundation has a basic set of criteria for the assessment of the relevance and quality of project proposals. Calls for proposals specify the basic criteria that are applicable for projects submitted in the call. Furthermore, a call can add specific criteria (not part of the basic set). Reviewers assess project proposals on the relevance and quality criteria as given by the call.

The rules mentioned above also apply for subsidy projects that are not submitted in a call for proposals.

Relevance Criteria

1. Contribution to the aims of the call
   - 1.1 The project meets the description of the call.
   - 1.2 The project addresses the priorities of the call.

2. Innovative potential
   - 2.1 The project is innovative.
   - 2.2 The project shows originality.
   - 2.3 The project utilizes theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, devices or interventions that are novel to the field or novel in a broad sense.
   - 2.4 The project is a refinement, improvement or new application of theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, devices or interventions.

3. Impact for patients, risk groups and/or the general public
   - 3.1 The project addresses a relevant problem from the perspective of patients, risk groups and/or the general public.
   - 3.2 The intended impact for patients, risk groups and/or the general public is well-described.

4. Clinical/preventive impact
   - 4.1 The project addresses an important problem or a critical barrier for progress in the clinical/preventive field.
   - 4.2 The topic is original, timely and relevant from the clinical perspective and/or the perspective of prevention.
   - 4.3 Successful completion of the project improves clinical practice and/or prevention.
   - 4.4 Successful completion of the project improves treatment, services and/or preventive interventions.

5. Social impact
   - 5.1 The project addresses an important public health problem, clinical problem or problem in patient care.
   - 5.2 The intended project results contribute to solving the social problem.
   - 5.3 The project takes different perspectives of stakeholders into account.

6. Scientific impact
   - 6.1 The project addresses an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the scientific field.
   - 6.2 The research topic is original, timely and relevant.
   - 6.3 Successful completion of the project will improve scientific knowledge and/or (technical)

capability.

6.4 Successful completion of the project will change the concepts, methods and/or technologies within the scientific field.

7. Cost-Benefit
   7.1 There is a proper balance between proposed efforts, input and methods on the one hand and possible results and outcome on the other.
   7.2 The proposed expenditures are proportional to the expected number of people reached and impact for the target group.

8. Choice of target group
   8.1 The chosen target group is relevant given the aims of the project and justified by a target group analysis.
   8.2 The project addresses diversity factors and differentiation of the target group as far as relevant (e.g. sex, ethnicity, age, social economic status, educational status, migration/cultural background). If not, the project provides an argument why these factors are not addressed.

9. Knowledge transfer and follow-up projects
   9.1 The project gives a plan for knowledge transfer directed to relevant target groups.
   9.2 The project identifies opportunities for technology transfer.
   9.3 The project describes possible steps for follow-up projects based upon the anticipated results.

10. Implementation
    10.1 The proposal addresses possibilities for implementation of the anticipated results in line with support of the target group and other stakeholders.
    10.2 The proposal provides an implementation plan set up in interaction with the target group and other stakeholders.

Quality Criteria

1. Rationale and intervention
   1.1 The central problem, (hypothesis) and aims are well described and build on a firm theoretical and/or empirical basis.
   1.2 The (hypothesis and) aims are specific, measurable, acceptable, realistic and timely formulated and well connected to the problem analysis.
   1.3 The intervention and methods are effective and appropriate for the aims and target group.
   1.4 The methodology is well-reasoned and well-described.
   1.5 The anticipated results can be tested and/or quantified.

2. Work Plan
   2.1 The work plan is well connected to the problem and aims (and target group analysis).
   2.2 The work plan is complete, coherent, consistent and well described.
   2.3 The proposed methods, techniques and analyses are appropriate to meet the proposed objectives.
   2.4 The project involves the target group and stakeholders adequately and timely, given the subject and aims.

3. Human studies
   3.1 The target group and features of the target group are described (size, characteristics, regional spread), including stakeholders and stakeholders' perspectives on the problem (target group analysis).
   3.2 Inclusion
      3.2.1 The plans for the recruitment and retention of patients and/or people of the target group are in line with the target group analysis and well described.
      3.2.2 Participants to be included are described in proper detail (in- and exclusion criteria).
      3.2.3 The size of the study population, inclusion method and expected response are well described, acceptable, realistic and justified.
      3.2.4 The inclusion method is focussed on the target group to be included.
      3.2.5 There are arrangements with all stakeholders involved in the inclusion, e.g. hospitals, medical doctors, nurses and social workers.

3.2.6 There is an explicit time schedule for the expected inclusion. The time schedule takes all stakeholders and the target group into account.
3.2.7 The risk factors for the inclusion are clearly described and solutions for possible problems are presented.
3.2.8 The risks and efforts for the participants are justified in terms of the project aims and there is extra attention for minorities such as elderly people and children.

3.3 Numbers
3.3.1 The required number of participants is justified. If necessary, the proposal provides a power calculation.
3.3.2 In case of a clinical trial, a statistician is involved during the set up of the project.

3.4 The timeline of the procedure to obtain METC (Ethical Review Board) permission is realistic.

4. Animal studies

4.1 The need of using animal studies for addressing the problem rather than other research methods (e.g. in vitro studies using cells or cell lines, organoids, computer simulation) is well-described.
4.2 The project provides an overview of relevant, currently available animal models and a motivation for the chosen animal models.
4.3 The proposed animal models are adequately representative for human physiology and disease in relation to the project's topic.
4.4 The proposed models are well described and suitable for the aims of the project.
4.5 The required number of animals is justified. If possible, a power calculation has been provided.
4.6 The procedures are well described (e.g. randomisation, blinding).
4.7 The timeline of the procedure to obtain DEC (Animal Review Board) permission is realistic.

5. Project Group

5.1 The project fits in with the general and specific expertise of the project group.
5.2 The (scientific) environment of the project group is adequate and contributes to the success of the project.
5.3 The project group has (access to) knowledge of implementation and technology transfer.
5.4 Juniors within the project group are adequately supervised.
5.5 The project group is demonstrably active on a theme relevant to the project (earlier activities, publications and products).

6. Approach and Feasibility

6.1 The deployment of human resources and the set up of organisation and management fit in with the aims.
6.2 The necessary collaborative arrangements are prepared, organised and recorded.
6.3 The institutional support, equipment and other physical resources available to the investigators are adequate for the project proposed.
6.4 There is a sound funding plan.
6.5 If co-funding for the project is (will be) applied for or has been awarded, it is clear what is (will be) agreed with the co-funder(s) about contribution, reporting, financial accountability and communication. There are no (potential) conflicts with the grant requirements of the Dutch Kidney Foundation.
6.6 The project presents potential problems and obstacles, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success.
6.7 The proposed time line is realistic.