



**NATIONAL CENTER FOR MENTAL HEALTH  
PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION, TRAINING & RESEARCH OFFICE  
TECHNICAL REVIEW FORM – PROPOSAL**

*PETRO TRF  
Proposal  
Rev. 0  
27 Mar 2024*

**PART I: RESEARCH PROTOCOL INFORMATION**

<b>Research Code:</b> (to be filled out by TRC Secretariat)	NCMH-RES-
<b>Research Protocol Title:</b>	
<b>Principal Investigator:</b>	
<b>Research Protocol Submission Date:</b>	

**PART II: TECHNICAL REVIEW CHECKLIST**

Instructions to the TRC Reviewer:

The technical review should be precise and thorough, inquiring whether each item on the checklist has been done correctly.

Kindly provide your evaluation response in the column on the right. The legend to be followed is as given below.

**Y** (Yes) **N** (No) **NA** (Not Applicable)

The purpose of this checklist is to outline the specific evaluation areas we are seeking your feedback and comments on. If your expertise lies in a specific area, the provided guide should only be used as a reference, and we do not require you to give comments on every evaluation area in case the response is affirmative (**Y**). If there is any part that needs further explanation or changes, kindly provide the reason and/or recommendation. To complete the technical review, ensure that you have thoroughly verified your suggested course of action in Part V and affix your signature in the designated area for the TRC Reviewer.

**PART III: EVALUATION AREAS**

	Y	N	NA	COMMENTS/ RECOMMENDATIONS
<b>(A). Title</b>				
Is the title a good reflection of the study?				
<b>(B). Background</b>				
a. Does the background support the need for the study by providing sufficient information about the underlying clinical problem?				
b. Are there other uncertainties in the clinical problem?				
c. Does the background address issues that are particularly important for its target readers?				
d. Does the study address an important scientific issue?				
e. Will these be meaningful to patients and healthcare providers or the health center in general?				

	Y	N	NA	COMMENTS/ RECOMMENDATIONS
<b>(C). Objectives</b>				
a. Was the main objective of the study specified clearly?				
<b>(D). Methodology</b>				
<b>Study Design</b>				
a. Is the study design clearly stated?				
b. Is the study design appropriate to the objective of the study?				
c. Are confounders controlled in the design and analysis phase? (If applicable)				
<b>Sample Population</b>				
a. Is the selection of study samples stated and suitable to the objectives?				
b. Are the inclusion / exclusion criteria clearly stated and appropriate?				
c. Is the subject recruitment process described and consistent with the study design?				
d. Is the sample size indicated and justified?				
<b>Study Procedures</b>				
a. Are the study procedures described and appropriate to the study objectives and design?				
b. Is the choice of interventions and comparators appropriate?				
<b>(E). Data Analysis</b>				
a. Is the method of data recording, analysis, and reporting clearly described?				
b. Are the techniques appropriate to the study objectives?				
<b>(F). Other comments:</b>				
<b>PART IV: DISCLOSURE-REVIEWERS</b>				
a) Do you have any financial interest (cash or in kind), paid consultancy or shareholding (current or otherwise), <b>with</b> any of the <b>investigators / stakeholders</b> associated with this research? <i>If yes, briefly describe your interests / relationships in the space provided</i>				
b) Are you in <b>any form of personal relationship, with any of the investigators / stakeholders</b> associated with this research? <i>If yes, briefly describe your interests / relationships in the space provided</i>				

**PART V: RECOMMENDED ACTION**

MINOR REVISION

MAJOR REVISION

DISAPPROVED

APPROVED

**JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDATION:**

**TRC REVIEWER**

Signature over Printed Name

Date

**TRC CHAIRPERSON**

Signature over Printed Name

Date