RATINGS GUIDE R6

### This assessment scale will be used by expert reviewers to assess applications and inform recommendations in Round 6 of the National Blood Sector Research and Development Program. Applications will need to achieve a score of 4 (Good) or more in each of the four criteria to be considered for shortlisting.

| Criteria | Information Source | Evaluation Criteria | Poor = 1 | Unsatisfactory = 2 | Marginal = 3 | Good = 4 | Very Good = 5 | Excellent = 6 | Outstanding = 7 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion 1Research scope, focus and potential value | Section CApplication | Addresses Priority area and Impact on patient outcomes or policy | **Does not address any of the priority areas** and will have **no impact** on patient outcomes, product use and/or policy. | Addresses a priority area however, the proposal **raises several concerns** about how the proposed research will impact on patient outcomes, product use and/or policy. | Addresses a priority area and is likely to have a **minor impact** on patient outcomes, product use and/or policy. | Addresses a priority area and is likely to have a **moderate impact** on patient outcomes, product use and/or policy. | Addresses a priority area and is likely to have a **significant impact** on patient outcomes, product use and/or policy. | Addresses a critical priority area and is likely to have a **highly significant impact** on patient outcomes, product use and/or policy. | Addresses a critical priority area and will result in an **exceptional/outstanding impact** on patient outcomes, product use and/or policy with international implications. |
| Criterion 2Quality | Section CApplicationand team member biographies | Study Design | **Poor quality** and has **many flaws.** Is not clearly articulated and viability has **substantial uncertainty.** **Unlikely** to address the question or add to current knowledge. | **Unsatisfactory quality** and has **multiple major flaws.** Is articulated but **uncertainty** remains as to feasibility and objective, and whether the proposal will address the question and add to current knowledge. | **Marginal quality** and has **multiple major weaknesses.** Is **uncertain in its scientific approach** and there is **uncertainty** on how the research will add to current knowledge. | **Good quality.** Research plan is **described** and **appears feasible** **with defined objectives. Likely to answe**r the question and add to current knowledge **but some questions remain** regarding study design. | **Very good quality.**  Research plan is **clearly articulated, feasible plan** with **well-defined objectives** and outcomes that **will most likely answer the question** and add to current knowledge. Likely to be **achieved** within the timeframe. Only **minor questions remain**. | **Excellent quality** Is clearly articulated highly feasible plan with **well-defined objectives** and outcomes that will **definitely answer the question** **and add significantly to current knowledge.** **Highly likely to be achieved** within the timeframe. **No outstanding questions** remain. | **Outstanding quality** and is **Flawless** and if successful will change the direction of the field or will have **very significant impact** on clinical practice and policy within Australia and Internationally. Is clearly articulated **highly feasible plan with well-defined and strongly developed objectives.** |
| Research Institution and Team | **Research Team**   * **Significant deficiencies** in the required areas of expertise * **Insignificant** relevant grants and publications history   **Project Management:**   * **Project manager not identified** * Project management and risks **not addressed** * **No plan**   **For Scholarship grants:**   * **Inexperienced** supervisor * **Highly significant** concerns with referee report | **Research Team**   * **Is deficient** in most areas of required expertise * **Limited** relevant grants and publications history   **Project Management**   * Project manager identified but has **very** **limited experience** * Project management and risks **addressed in part only with major concerns** * Plan is unclear and has **significant** concerns   **For Scholarship grants:**   * Supervisor has **very limited** experience * **Significant** concerns with referee report | **Research Team**   * **Proficiency in some** required areas of expertise but **concerning deficiencies** remain * **Some** relevant grants and publications history   **Project Management**   * Project manager identified and has **some experience** * Project management and risks **addressed but concerning deficiencies remain** * Plan is clear but has **concerning deficiencies**   **For Scholarship grants:**   * Supervisor has **some** experience * Some concerns with referee report | **Research Team**   * **Proficiency in most** required areas * Has had **good success** in grants and publication history * **Emerging recognition in Australia**   **Project Management**   * Project manager identified and has **good experience** * Project management and risks mostly addressed * **Plan is clear but some questions remain**   **For Scholarship grants:**   * Supervisor has **good** experience * **Good** referee report **but some questions remain** | **Research Team**   * **Proficiency in all areas** of required expertisebut **minor concerns** remain * Has had **excellent and consistent success** in grant and publication history * **Recognised internationally**   **Project Management**   * Project manager identified and has **relevant** **experience** * Project management and risks addressed but some **minor concerns** remain * Plan is clear but has **some minor concerns**   **For Scholarship grants:**   * Supervisor has **relevant** experience * Some minor concerns with referee report | **Research Team**   * **Highly proficient** in all areas of required expertise * Has had **outstanding and consistent success** in grant and publication history * **Recognised internationally**   **Project Management**   * Project manager has been identified and **has significant** experience * Project management and risks addressed with a **clear reporting and management structure** * Plan is clear but has **some insignificant concerns**   **For Scholarship grants:**   * Supervisor has **significant** experience * Insignificant concerns with referee report | **Research Team**   * Highly proficient in all areas of required expertise and **specifically targets** the proposed research * Has had **exceptional** success grant and publication history * **Recognised as world leader/s in their field**   **Project Management**   * The Project manager has been identified and **has highly significant** experience * Project management and risks have been addressed with a **highly developed reporting and management structure** * Plan is clear and has **no concerns**   **For Scholarship grants:**   * Supervisor has **highly significant** experience * No concerns with referee report |
| Criterion 3Effective and efficient useof funds | Section CApplication | Effective use of funds | * Financial and non-financial contributions not secured * Funding duplication possible * Agreed to funding agreement and reporting requirements with significant qualification * Budget **not described/significant deficiencies** in budget | * Uncertain that financial and non-financial contributions are secured * Unlikely to be funding duplication * Agreed to funding agreement and reporting requirements with qualification * **Major concerns** over budget | * Financial and non-financial contributions probably secured * No funding duplication * Agreed to funding agreement and reporting requirements with only minor qualification * **Significant concerns** over budget | * Financial and non-financial contributions secured * No funding duplication * Agreed to funding agreement and reporting requirements with only minor qualification * **Some significant concerns** over budget | * Financial and non-financial contributions secured * No funding duplication. * Agreed to funding agreement and reporting requirements with minor qualifications * **Some minor concerns** over budget | * Financial and non-financial contributions secured * No funding duplication. * Agreed to funding agreement and reporting requirements without qualification * Confident that budget is accurate * **Insignificant concerns** over budget | * Financial and non-financial contributions secured * No funding duplication. * Agreed to funding agreement and reporting requirements without qualification * The budget is accurate * **No concerns** over budget |
| Criterion 4Governance and ethics | Section CApplication | Governance | * Research oversight and reporting not described or there are **significant deficiencies** * Data management **not described/significant deficiencies** * Financial governance **not described/significant deficiencies** * **COIs not provided** | * Research oversight and reporting described but there are **major concerns** * Data managementdescribed but there are **major concerns** * Financial governance described but there are **major concerns** * **COIs provided,** but there are **major concerns** | * Research oversight and reporting described but there are **significant concerns** * Data managementdescribed but there are **significant concerns** * Financial governance described but there are **significant concerns** * **COIs provided,** but there are **significant concerns** | * Research oversight and reporting described and **appears appropriate.** * Data managementdescribed **and appears appropriate** * Financial governance described **and appears appropriate** * **COIs provided** and **appears appropriate** * Some **questions remain** | * Research oversight and reporting **is strong and appropriate** * Data managementdescribed **is strong and appropriate** * Financial governance described and **is strong and appropriate** * **COIs provided,** and **strong and appropriate.** * Some **minor questions remain** | * Research oversight and reporting **described in detail** and provides a **strong sense of confidence** * Data management **described in detail** and engenders a **strong sense of confidence** * Financial governance described in detail engenders a **strong sense of confidence** * **COIs provided** and demonstrates a **strong management principles** | * Research oversight and reporting **described in detail** and is **outstanding** * **Expert data management principle and processes** described in detail * **Expert financial governance** described in detail * **COIs provided detailed** and demonstrates expert management of potential, perceived or real interests * **Completely confident** that **all aspects** of governance will be **carefully managed** |
| Ethics | * **Limited or no consideration** of, or plan to, address ethical issues regarding potential risks to the participants, health providers and/or their information | * Some consideration of, or plan to, address ethical issues but **major concerns** remain regarding potential risks to the participants, health providers and/or their information | * Ethical issues considered, but **significant concerns** remain regarding potential risks to the participants, health providers and/or their information | * Ethical issues described **but not in detail** * **Some confidence** that risks to the participants, health providers and/or their information **will be managed** * Some **questions** remain | * Ethical issues and **management approach described in detail** * **Confident** that risks to the participants, health providers and/or their information **will be well managed** | * Ethical issues and **management approach described in detail** * **Highly confident** that risks to the participants, health providers and/or their information **will be well managed** | * Ethical issues and **expert management approach described in detail** * **Certain** that risks to the participants, health providers and/or their information **will be expertly managed** |