



Sefydliad Cenedlaethol | National Institute
ar gyfer Ymchwil Gofal | for Social Care and
Cymdeithasol ac Iechyd | Health Research

Assessment form for PhD Studentship panel members

Your Name: Professor Ken Jones

Application reference: HS-14-41

Lead Applicant: Dr Arwel Wyn Jones

Please read the application carefully and provide comments and an overall score. For further information on the assessment criteria and scoring system, please see the *Guidance notes for panel members*.

Completed forms should be returned to: NISCHRGrants@Wales.GSI.Gov.UK

Please enter your comments in the box below:

This proposal seeks funding for a studentship to develop personalised Pulmonary Rehabilitation (PR) for patients with COPD. The applicants already have a track record in the area of PR and wish to address issues relating to individual variation in responses to PR. The benefits of PR to patients with COPD is widely acknowledged, however the decline over a 6-12 month period following intervention. The proposed study seeks to improve current protocols for PR by identifying markers of disease severity and patient responses to PR using proteomics and metabolomics. These findings will then be used to specifically tailor PR intervention. Alongside this there will be a study seeking to determine the benefits of repeating PR intervention to maintain the improvements identified following an initial session of PR. The timing and nature of this will be guided by the biomarkers identified in the other aspect of the study.

COPD is a severe and progressive chronic disease of the airways the prevalence of which is increasing. This is particularly so in Wales which has amongst the highest levels in Europe. This places a significant burden on the NHS in Wales and disease and its associated co-morbidities are extremely debilitating and life limiting to those affected. Optimising a proven strategy for improvement and management of symptoms is clearly important.

I did find the project to be a little unfocussed with not enough emphasis on what biomarkers are considered the most important for the various aspects of the study and as such how these will inform these. Also the lead applicant does seem a little inexperienced.

How do you rate this application overall?

Please give a score between 1-8 using the scale set out in the *Guidance notes for panel members*.

6

Guidance notes for panel members

As a NISCHR PhD Studentship panel member, you should read this guidance carefully before completing your assessment.

As indicated by the scoring scale, a score of 1 or 2 indicates that a project is not fundable.

A score of 3 or 4 indicates a project is 'fundable with revisions'. If you score a project 3 or 4, please indicate what revisions you believe are necessary.

A score of 5 or higher indicates a project is fundable without revisions. If you believe a project is fundable without revisions, but nevertheless wish to make suggestions that would further strengthen the project, please do so in the comments box on your assessment sheet.

Assessment criteria and scoring

During your assessment you should consider:

- the scientific quality of the PhD studentship project (focusing on scientific merit, methodology, planning and resources, and, if appropriate, impact and dissemination);
- the expertise and guidance that will be provided by the academic supervisor/s; and
- the suitability of the environment provided by the host institution

You should provide an overall score for the application (between 1-8) as indicated in the table below. Please provide summary comments to explain your score.

Scoring Table

8	Very Good	Scientific quality of the project is very good AND The host institution and lead applicant have a high level of expertise in the relevant subject areas.
7	Very Good	Scientific quality of the project is very good AND The host institution and lead applicant have an adequate level of expertise in the relevant subject areas.
6	Good	Scientific quality of the proposed project is good AND The host institution and lead applicant have a high level of expertise in the relevant subject areas.
5	Good	Scientific quality of the project is good AND The host institution and lead applicant have an adequate level of expertise in the relevant subject areas.
4	Intermediate	The project would be fundable with revisions AND The host institution and lead applicant have a high level of expertise in the relevant subject areas.
3	Intermediate	The project would be fundable with revisions AND The host institution and lead applicant have an adequate level of expertise in the relevant subject areas.
2	Not Fundable	Scientific quality of proposed project is poor or flawed OR The host institution and/or academic supervisor do not possess sufficient expertise in the relevant subject areas to provide an acceptable level of support to the student.
1	Not Fundable	Project has serious deficiencies in multiple areas.

Please ensure that your overall score is a whole number so that the project is clearly placed in one of the eight marked categories.