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**
 |