**NOTE:** This is a PDF version of the SR6 Application form and is not meant to be filled. To fill and submit the application please visit: [http://www.3ieimpact.org/en/funding/systematic-reviews-grants/3ie-systematic-review-call-6](http://www.3ieimpact.org/en/funding/systematic-reviews-grants/3ie-systematic-review-call-6)

---

**Systematic Review Round 6 Application Form**

**SR6/1005**

### 1. BASIC PROJECT INFO

**(i) Title of Proposed Review **

Systematic review question.

Title of the study if more focused or broader than the review question selected above

**(ii) Proposed Start and End Date of Project**

Teams should aim to start work shortly after signing of contract

Proposed start date (MM/YYYY e.g. 01/2013) *  

Proposed end date (MM/YYYY e.g. 01/2013) *

**(iii) Organisation Responsible for the Review**

Name *

Type of organisation*  

If other, please specify: [ ]

Division or Department

Country*

Website

What is the organisation’s legal status (e.g. nationally registered NGO)?*  

If other, please specify: [ ]

Eligibility to receive overseas grants - Is the organisation legally eligible to receive overseas grants? *  

Yes [ ]  

No [ ]

Is the organisation a 3ie Member or Associate Member?*  

Yes [ ]  

No [ ]

If yes, please select the name from the Member/Associate Member list

Individual authorised to sign the grant agreement *

First name *

Surname *

Job Title *
We verify that the individual authorised to sign the grant agreement has reviewed 3ie’s grant agreement documents available on 3ie’s website and confirms that the terms and conditions are acceptable. *

☐ Yes

(iv) Plain language summary*

A brief summary in non-technical language of what this systematic review is about and how it will be undertaken (maximum 350 words). This will be posted on the 3ie website if the application is selected for an award.

2. REVIEW TEAM (35 PERCENT)

Principal Investigators and Contact person(s)

Please indicate the Principal Investigators and contact person for project (if different from lead PI). To add a new PI to this table, click the green + icon below.

Please note that all key correspondence related to this application will only be sent to the lead PI and contact person for project (if different from lead PI). A contact person must have their physical address details included. To do so, click on the pencil icon next to the contact person record.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Num of days PI will work on Project?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Review Team Members

Please include names of all team members, noting the job title, e.g., Research Assistant, where an appointment has not yet been made. PLEASE UPLOAD CV(S) OF ALL LISTED PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS ON THE UPLOADS PAGE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/job title</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Number of days?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Team Member Contributions to Review Tasks

Provide information on team member contributions to review tasks and the number of days to be spent at each stage. Note: Please upload CVs of the research team mentioned below including any previous training, experience and skills in SRs and subject matter and citing a list of systematic reviews undertaken to date.
Each CV must be no longer than 3 pages. Please refer to the CV template at http://praxispts/3ieImpact/projectSynthApp6/documents/3ie CV template.doc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Team Member(s) contributing (name1, name2 etc.)</th>
<th>No. of Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Extraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Meta Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Influence Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Conflict of interest declaration *

Are you aware of any interests arising from research, financial or personal reasons which might reasonably lead to biases in your work? List these here alongside any primary studies of relevance for the review to which you have contributed. [maximum 200 words]

(iii) Involvement of Developing Country Researchers (15 percent) *

A developing country researcher is defined as a low or middle income country (LMIC) national who resides in any LMIC. Inclusion of developing country researchers is desirable but not essential. For review groups with members from both developed and developing countries, briefly outline the history of collaboration between the groups and any skills development or capacity building which you envisage in this study [maximum 500 words]

3. APPLICATION (40 PERCENT)

(i) Background to the Project

a) Policy Issue(s) *

Provide a brief outline of the policy or implementation issue(s) that this systematic review will address [maximum 250 words].

b) Existing Evidence *
Indicate the state of existing evidence on this topic including the quantity and quality of the evidence as well as any existing systematic reviews on the topic [maximum 500 words]

(ii) Research Question *

What is the primary question that this systematic review seeks to answer? Are there any secondary questions that you will address? [maximum 200 words]

(iii) Review Methods
Indicate how the review will be undertaken, using the following headings:

Theory or Theories of Change *

Summarize the theory or theories of change underlying the intervention(s), and indicate how this will be incorporated in the review. [maximum 250 words]

Inclusion Criteria *

Specify the scope of this review, using the following PICOS format, by research question [maximum 750 words]

Population: Indicate the Population, and any sub-groups, that will be the focus of this review.

Intervention: Indicate the nature of the Intervention for which evidence will be gathered.

Comparisons: Indicate what comparison interventions will be included in the review. For non-counterfactual evidence, what Contextual features of the interventions will be considered by this review?

Outcome(s): Indicate which intermediate and endpoint outcomes will be included in this review, giving consideration to any adverse or unintended consequences that may occur along the causal chain.

Study designs: Indicate which Study designs you will include in the review, and include examples of includable primary studies you have identified through an initial scoping search.

Searching *

Describe your proposed search strategy for identifying published and unpublished studies [maximum 500 words], which are likely to include, but are not limited to, the following sources:

- Electronic sources (e.g., database, e-library, internet)
- Print sources (e.g., journals, library shelves, hand search)
- Grey literature (e.g., databases, conference proceedings, research funders)
- Reference snowballing from published and unpublished literature

Note the key search terms you expect to use and any restrictions arising from the choice of start date for searches or languages of reporting.

Data extraction and critical appraisal *

Describe how the data from primary studies will be coded, extracted and reconciled. Indicate which quality appraisal tool(s) you will be using, justifying this for the type of evidence to be included [maximum 250 words]
Analysis *

Provide a detailed description of how quantitative and qualitative data (if applicable) will be analysed and synthesised [maximum 250 words]

Report Writing *

Describe a report-writing plan, including contributions of participating team members, the section(s) of the report in which they will be involved, and the approach for communicating in a user-friendly manner (e.g. summary of findings, shorter version of the report)[maximum 250 words].

(iv) Quality Assurance Arrangements *

Please indicate [maximum 250 words]:
- Internal quality assurance: how each of the stages of the SR will be quality assured by the team
- External quality assurance arrangements the team intends to use (e.g. Campbell Collaboration, Cochrane Collaboration, EPPI-Centre, Collaboration for Environmental Evidence etc.)

4. PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET (10 PERCENT)

(i) Accountability *

Indicate [maximum 200 words]:
- the accountability arrangements of the team (who is coordinating the work and who will report to whom)
- the arrangements for team meetings

Timetable

Complete the following table providing timetable information on activities and milestones for the project. You should allow 1 month for title registration and 2 months for peer review at protocol and reports stages. Please note that policy influencing planning will be presumed to start at the beginning of the study. Policy influencing activities may start earlier than report writing, and they are expected to continue through the end of the grant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Week</th>
<th>End Week</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Title registration (if relevant) and development of policy influence plan</td>
<td>Protocol submitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Protocol development *</td>
<td>Protocol submitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**for peer review**

- Search *
- Protocol published *
- Data extraction & critical appraisal *
- Qualitative Analysis *
- Statistical meta-analysis *
- Policy influencing activities *
- Report writing *
- Draft report submitted for peer review *
- Final report published *

#### (ii) Summary of Resources Required *

Download the budget template in excel from the 'Uploads' tab. Complete the budget according to the Budget Guidelines provided in the document and paying careful attention to the 3ie direct and indirect cost policies (click here for [directcostpolicy](#) and [indirectcostpolicy](#)). Upload the budget and the accompanying Budget Narrative document in the 'Uploads' tab. Enter the amounts from the Financial Summary worksheet in the table here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Heading</th>
<th>3ie Contribution ($)</th>
<th>Other Contributions ($)</th>
<th>Total ($)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel cost</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy cost</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel cost</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training cost</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection/Library search cost</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct cost</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub grantee cost</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect cost</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (iii) Other Support Section

Do you already have, or have you applied for, other sources of funding for this or a related review? *

- [ ] Yes  
- [ ] No

If you answer yes, provide details of the project(s) and funder(s) below:

Details of support sought or received from any other source for this or other reviews currently being undertaken in the same field.

---

5. POLICY INFLUENCE PLAN (15 PERCENT)
An important determinant of the study’s potential policy impact will be its policy influence plan (PIP). Awarded grantees will be required to work with 3ie to complete a PIP no later than the disbursement of the second payment tranche.

(i) Policy relevance *

Building on the response in section 3(ii)a, describe the potential policy relevance of the proposed systematic review focusing on the critical knowledge gaps that the study would address and how that aligns with the enduring policy challenges facing the developing world. [maximum 500 words]

(ii) Advisory Group *

Provide details of the role and composition of the advisory group (names, qualifications, experience, reasons for inclusion) [maximum 250 words]. Refer to the IDCG Advisory Group Guidelines for more information and the FAQ.

(iii) Potential policy impact *

Describe the potential policy impact of the systematic review. This should include the policy influence objective(s), the target audiences (especially the policy stakeholders) for the study, and main rationale, strategies and expected outcomes for engaging with each of the target audiences. [maximum 500 words]

6. UPLOADED DOCUMENTS

Only the following file types are to be uploaded: doc, docx, xls, xlsx, pdf, ppt, pptx, dta, sav, txt, tc, msg, oft, html, zip, rar
Also, file sizes must be less than 10MB each.

Methodology

Methodology upload list

Budget and CV(s)

Budget Narrative & Detailed Budget *

CV(s) of all named researchers on the project *
Documents and Templates to Download

- **Download our Budget Template**  Download our budget template. (Excel format)
  Save and upload this template, it will assist you to supply a budget in a standard format suitable for our review teams and the system.

- **Download a very simple guideline CV template.** (Word format)