

Peer Reviewers: Scoring rubric

	5	4	3	2	1
Demonstration of clear need for the project	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.
Novelty of the research proposal	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.
Academic quality of the research proposal	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 proposed work is likely to be reproducible.	The proposal will add to understanding and is worthy of support, but is of lesser quality or urgency than more highly rated proposals. The proposed work is likely to be reproducible.	The proposal has significant potential academic merit but is not of a consistently high quality, although could result in some useful knowledge. The reproducibility of the work is questioned.	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.

THE DUNHILL MEDICAL TRUST

Registered Charity number 1140372 A company limited by guarantee, registered in England Company number 07472301.
Registered office: 6 New Bridge Street, London EC4V 6AB

Feasibility of the research plan	Clear, achievable and specific objectives, with a sound methodological approach. Has outlined risks and dependencies and provided a reasonable plan as to how these are to be addressed.	Clear, achievable and specific objectives, with a sound methodological approach. Appears to be some risks and dependencies with limited information on how these are to be addressed.	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 objectives, appears seriously defective in its methodology.
Competence of applicant/research team	Experienced Principal Investigator with a track record in the subject matter of the proposed project or a less experienced Principal Investigator (may be a first-time PI) but with a strong track record in the subject matter of the proposed project and tangible examples of support for the PI outlined. 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).	Less experienced Principal Investigator (may be first-time PI) with a track record in the subject matter of the proposed project, but with few tangible examples of support for the PI outlined. 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.
Suitability of research environment	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.
Value-for-money	Project represents excellent value-for-money when considering proposed	Project represents very good value-for-money when considering proposed	Project represents good value-for-money. Costs realistic but impact and/or	Project's proposed objectives could be delivered at significantly	Project inadequately costed - e.g. the cost of some essential resources have

	deliverables which include both impact and development of research capacity in relation to cost (which is realistic).	deliverables - which include either impact or development of research capacity in relation to cost (which is realistic).	development of research capacity may be more modest than the highest scoring.	lower cost than that proposed.	not been included putting delivery of project in jeopardy.
Assessment of statement of benefit to other researchers in the field and/or in other disciplines within the UK and internationally	Addressing a problem of high importance/interest/urgency in the field, no real weakness detected. Clear and credible description with plans to support dissemination.	Addressing a problem of high importance in the field but some gaps in the dissemination plan bring down the overall impact to medium.	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 academic community, but weaknesses in the plan bring down the overall impact to low.	Application may be addressing a problem of moderate importance in the field with some consideration of how the project will have impact in the academic community, but dissemination approach seems rather generic or non-specific bringing down the overall impact to low.	Application has significantly limited/flawed or no credible/feasible plan for impact within the academic community.