

## Guidance for Peer Reviewers of DMT Research Project Grants

We process research project applications, including peer review, on our Grants Management Portal. An account will have been created for you when you agreed to review for the Trust. Your username is your email address and your password will have been sent to you separately.

### Your account

Once logged in, you can complete your account profile by selecting my account.

The screenshot shows the 'Welcome to Flexi-Grant' dashboard. At the top, it says 'Through this portal, you can keep your account and contact details up to date and make applications to the Dunhill Medical Trust.' Below this is a blue navigation bar with the text 'Click here to start an application' and a search box labeled 'Select a Grant'. The main content area is divided into three columns. The first column is titled 'Update my information' and includes a document icon, the text 'Update your account and contact information using the link below.', and two buttons: 'My account' and 'My applications'. The second column is titled 'Contact Fluent Technology' and includes a question mark icon, a link 'Email us', a question mark icon with the text 'Ask a question', a phone icon with the number '+44 (0) 1234 5678', and social media icons for Twitter and LinkedIn. The third column is titled 'Our work in action' and includes the text 'Find out more about the Dunhill Medical Trust and its work' and a circular icon of an open book.

### My assessments

The screenshot shows the 'My Assessments' section of the Flexi-Grant portal. At the top, there is a dark navigation bar with two tabs: 'My Applications' and 'My Assessments', with 'My Assessments' being the active tab. Below the navigation bar is a large, empty white area. In the bottom left corner, there is a logo for 'The Dunhill Medical Trust' featuring a stylized plant.

Under 'My Assessments', you will see the application(s) that you have agreed to review:

## Dashboard

This page contains a list of applications you have been asked to review.

Awaiting my review:

1

My completed reviews:

0

Select a bulk action ▼

Process

Download all as PDF 

<input type="checkbox"/>	Reference	Grant	Applicant	Required by date ▲	Your score	Priority
<input type="checkbox"/>	 <a href="#">RPGF1810\98</a>	2018-10 Research Project grant FULL	Kimberley Smith University of Surrey			<input type="checkbox"/>

### Downloading the application to work offline

If you wish to work offline, you can download a copy of the application by selecting the below button:

Download all as PDF 

If you have agreed to review multiple applications and you just wanted to download one, you can tick the corresponding box for the application on the left-hand side and then from the dropdown menu, select Download as PDF and then press 'Process':

Awaiting my review: **1**

My completed reviews: **0**

Download as PDF ▼ **Process**

<input type="checkbox"/> (1)	Reference	Grant	Applicant	Required by date ▲	You
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	 <a href="#">RPGF1810\98</a>	2018-10 Research Project grant FULL	Kimberley Smith University of Surrey		

After selecting 'Process', this pop-up box will appear and you should select the third option:

**Select the type of PDF you want to download** ×

 **Application form only**  
Application form and no supporting documents

 **Application Abstract**  
Short summary of the application

 **Application form with supporting documents**  
Includes uploaded Word, PDF and image files

 **Application form, supporting documents and completed reviews**  
As above, including completed reviews

---

Email me a link to download the PDF

Include blank review forms

Include question guidance notes

**Generate PDF** **Cancel**

Downloading applications can take some time and therefore you also have the option of a link to the PDF being emailed to you once the download has finished.

### Completing peer review

Please select the tick box next to the proposal and then from the dropdown list on the left, select 'Record reviews' as shown below and then press 'Process':

Awaiting my review: **1**

My completed reviews: **0**

Record reviews

<input type="checkbox"/> (1)	Reference	Grant	Applicant	Required by date ▲	Your score	Priority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<a href="#">RPGF1810\98</a>	2018-10 Research Project grant FULL	Kimberley Smith University of Surrey			<input type="checkbox"/>

The review form, alongside the peer review scoring criteria, will then be displayed.

Each criterion requires a score and an optional comment. (You can see the scoring criteria at the end of this document). We ask for a summary comment at the end of the form to aid the Research Grants Committee in their discussion and there is also the option of providing feedback to the applicants.

At the end of each criterion and at the bottom of the form there are Save and Resubmit boxes



This button will allow you to save the form as you complete each criterion and to go back and revise any of your scores and comments up to the submission deadline.

While you are scoring, you can view the application by selecting the 'Open application form' button, which will open the application form in a new window. The Budgets tab will show the finance page and any uploaded documents can be found in the Related documents tab.

**Scoring**

---

Use this form to record that the management assessment of the proposal has been completed. Once recorded the proposal will progress to the next stage in the application.

**Applicant:**  
Michael Test

**Organisation:**  
Test Organisation

**Project:**  
Test project

Process stage | Budgets | Assign reviewers | Review form | Related notes | Related documents

Record review - Peer review Peer review

View reviewer's review form: Test Reviewer

Your score: 50      8 out of 8 scored criteria completed.      Review Status: Submitted on 25/04/2017 14:58:18

**Demonstration of clear need for the project**

     Max score: 5  
Weighting: 2

**Remark**

clear need

**Overall summary comments**

**Remark**

summary comments

Date Saved: 25/04/2017 14:58:18      Entered By Fluent Support Date Entered 25/04/2017 14:58:18

**Comments which may be fed back to the applicant**

NB. these are optional and will be anonymised

**Remark**

feedback to applicant

Date Saved: 25/04/2017 14:58:18      Entered By Fluent Support Date Entered 25/04/2017 14:58:18

## Peer Reviewers: Scoring rubric

	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Demonstration of clear need for the project</b>	Addressing a problem of high importance/interest/urgency. Clear and credible description with plans to support how it will make a difference to older people and a reasonable time frame in which it will do so, appropriate to the nature of the work.	Addressing a problem of high importance in the field. Clear and credible description of how it will make a difference to older people and a reasonable time frame in which it will do so, appropriate to the nature of the work but some weaknesses or lack of detail in the plan to do so bring down the overall impact to medium.	Application may be addressing a problem of moderate/high importance with a credible plan about how the project will have impact in the academic community, but weaknesses in the plan or proposal may not be of such relevance or urgency as to have a significant influence on policy or practice bring down the overall impact to low.	Application may be addressing a problem of moderate importance in practice with some consideration of how the project will have impact in the academic community, but significant weaknesses in the pathways to impact statement/plan bring down the overall impact to low.	Application has not sufficiently identified a clear need either within or beyond the academic community.
<b>Novelty of the research proposal</b>	The proposed work is highly original and significant and addresses important scientific questions or will enable them to be addressed through further development	The proposed work is original and significant and addresses important scientific questions or will enable them to be addressed through further development.	The proposed work has merit and meets satisfactory standards of originality and addresses reasonably important scientific questions or will enable them to be addressed through further development.	The work is of modest merit. It is unclear how novel the proposed work is and how likely it is to advance the field.	The proposed work is duplicative and is unlikely to advance the field.
<b>Academic quality of the research proposal</b>	The proposed work meets excellent standards in terms of quality and significance and addresses highly important scientific questions or will make a significant contribution to enabling them to be addressed.	The proposal will add to understanding and is worthy of support, but is of lesser quality or urgency than more highly rated proposals.	The proposal has significant potential academic merit but is not of a consistently high quality, although could result in some useful knowledge.	The proposed work is potentially of some merit but overall is of inconsistent quality or significance.	There are significant concerns about the quality of the proposed work.
<b>Feasibility of the research plan</b>	Clear, achievable and specific objectives, with a sound methodological approach. Has outlined risks and dependencies and provided a reasonable plan	Clear, achievable and specific objectives, with a sound methodological approach. Appears to be some risks and dependencies with limited	Sound methodological approach. Some concerns over how risks are to be addressed and/or some over-ambition regarding objectives.	While the plan seems sound in terms of methodological approach, its objectives seem over-ambitious in relation to proposed resources and timescale	The proposal is flawed in its scientific approach, or is repetitious of other work, or otherwise judged not worth pursuing; or which, though possibly having sound

	as to how these are to be addressed.	information on how these are to be addressed.			objectives, appears seriously defective in its methodology.
<b>Competence of applicant/research team</b>	Experienced and well-regarded Principal Investigator with a track record in the subject matter of the proposed project. Roles of team members clear with a suitable range of skills and expertise.	Less experienced Principal Investigator (may be first-time PI) but with a track record in the subject matter of the proposed project. Roles of team members clear with a suitable range of skills and expertise (including appropriately experienced senior colleague as Co-I if first time PI).	Suitably experienced Principal Investigator but team may lack some breadth or depth of experience appropriate to the project's subject matter.	Inexperienced Principal Investigator. Team roles unclear and/or lacking in breadth or depth of experience appropriate to the project's subject matter.	Principal Investigator/team wholly inadequate for the project's subject matter.
<b>Suitability of research environment</b>	Proposal demonstrates clearly that project team has access to facilities, equipment, samples and resources of the highest quality, appropriate to the project.	Proposal demonstrates clearly that project team has access to facilities, equipment, samples and resources, appropriate to the project.	Proposal demonstrates that project team has access to facilities, equipment, samples and resources, appropriate to the project. May need minor clarification in some areas.	Proposal lacks detail on project team's access to facilities, equipment, samples and resources, sufficient to introduce doubt as to whether the proposal could be delivered.	Team's access to facilities, equipment, samples and resources entirely inadequate.
<b>Value-for-money</b>	Project represents excellent value-for-money when considering proposed deliverables which include both impact and development of research capacity in relation to cost (which is realistic).	Project represents very good value-for-money when considering proposed deliverables - which include either impact or development of research capacity in relation to cost (which is realistic).	Project represents good value-for-money. Costs realistic but impact and/or development of research capacity may be more modest than the highest scoring.	Project's proposed objectives could be delivered at significantly lower cost than that proposed.	Project inadequately costed - e.g. the cost of some essential resources have not been included putting delivery of project in jeopardy.
<b>Clarity of statement of benefit to other researchers in the field and/or in other disciplines within the UK and internationally</b>	Addressing a problem of high importance/interest/urgency in the field, no real weakness detected. Clear and credible description with	Addressing a problem of high importance in the field but some gaps in the dissemination plan bring down the overall impact to	Application may be addressing a problem of moderate/high importance in the field with a credible plan about how the project will have impact in the	Application may be addressing a problem of moderate importance in the field with some consideration of how the project will have impact in	Application has significantly limited/flawed or no credible/feasible plan for impact within the academic community.

	plans to support dissemination.	medium.	academic community, but weaknesses in the plan bring down the overall impact to low.	the academic community, but dissemination approach seems rather generic or non-specific bringing down the overall impact to low.	
--	---------------------------------	---------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--