How to prepare an excellent application

If you read through some of the comments from Selection Panel Members judging OWSD PhD Fellowship Applications you will get a good idea....

Recommended for an OWSD PhD Fellowship

- Research proposal interesting, innovative and up to date, clearly written
- Well prepared project proposal, detailed methodology.
- Strong academic background.
- Good reference/ supporting letters
- Host supervisor's experience and knowledge match project needs; laboratory resources at host institute good
- Research appropriate/beneficial to home country/ region

NOT Recommended

- Weak project proposal based on old ideas and references.
- Reference letters not informative or personalised, could be just a standard form .
- Project proposal not detailed.
- Use of statistics poor.
- Applicant has a strong background but not in the relevant field and does not justify this change or demonstrate how she will get up to speed
- Good project proposal but methodology and timeline missing.
- Good project proposal but timeline unrealistic and results are not reproducible.
- Project proposal interesting but not clear. Looks like a cut and paste from different subjects.
- Weak project proposal, addresses very common topic.
- Interesting project proposal, but outdated methodology. Weak student records.
- Project proposal topic not innovative. Applicant has not made clear if/how laboratory samples will be transported.
- Low scientific originality.
- Project proposal too ambitious.
- Standard of English used in proposal poor.
- Application contains typos/ errors/ inconsistencies.
- Research topic interesting, relevant to home country but structured rather as a survey than research. Weak academic background.
- Basic mistakes in reference letters (addressed to different students) mirror extreme inaccuracy of application.
- Project proposal lacks originality, methodology not clearly described.
- Confused project proposal, combines parts of research which do not seem connected to each other, lacks innovation.
- Weak academic background, weak reference letters.