International Initiative for Impact Evaluation

Application number/name:

Reviewer name:

We ask that reviewers include written comments for each scoring criterion. These comments will be compiled and shared, anonymously, with applicants to help them to improve their replication plans (if selected) or improve future applications to the Replication Programme (if not selected).

Criterion: Qualifications of applicant: 20%										
Description and requirements: Qualifications include the skills and experience of the applicant related to the conduct of replication research. The review should assess the applicant's empirical research training and experience, experience conducting impact evaluations, and knowledge of international development.										
Reviewer comments (not more than 250 words):										
Select a point score based on how well the requirements for this criterion are met.										
o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not met			Weakly met			Sufficiently met			Exceeded	

Criterion: Understanding of study and relevance of proposed replication questions : 30%
Description and requirements: The reviewer should assess the level of the applicant's understanding of the chosen candidate study, including the study's contribution the literature and its influence or potential influence on policy. In addition, the reviewer should consider the relevance of the proposed replication questions to establishing the credibility of the original findings for policy making and program design.
Reviewer comments (not more than 250 words):
Select a point score based on how well the requirements for this criterion are met.

Washington, DC
1029 Vermont Avenue, NW, Suite 1000, Washington, DC 20005, United States of America
3ieus@3ieimpact.org Tel: +1 202 629 3939

o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not met			Weakly met			Sufficiently met			Exceeded	

Criterion: Proposed Replication Plan: 50%
Description and requirements: This plan should identify the proposed categories of replication to be included (pure, statistical, or scientific) and what avenues of inquiry the applicant plans to pursue (alternative measures or indexes, methods of data construction, estimation methodologies, functional form specification, hypotheses, theories of change, etc.) Reviewers should assess the technical quality of the plan.
Reviewer comments (not more than 250 words):
Select a point score based on how well the requirements for this criterion are met.

o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o	o
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not met			Weakly met			Sufficiently met			Exceeded	

Optional additional comments
Description and requirements: This space is provided in the case that the reviewer wishes to provide any additional comments not provided in the categories above.
Reviewer comments (not more than 250 words):

Overall application recommendation:

Reject	Major revisions	Minor changes	Accept