

Full application stage scoring rubric for external peer reviewers (max. score 30 without any weighting)

		Score (N.B. these will not be fed back to applicants)				
		1 – 5 = Not fundable			6 – 10 = Fundable	
Criteria	1 - 2	3 - 4	5 - 6	7 - 8	9 - 10	
1 Quality of the proposed work (With or without weighting)	<p>Little to no background information given, little to no reference to the existing literature, not well-related to the themes of the call, poor justification of its need and novelty. The research question(s) are unclear and/or the proposal is poorly written.</p> <p>The overall proposal is duplicative, of poor quality and unlikely to advance the field in terms of knowledge / understanding.</p>	<p>Lacking detail in the background information given, lacking detail in reference to the existing literature, partially related to the themes of the call, some justification of its need and novelty. The research question(s) and/or proposal is lacking detail.</p> <p>The overall proposal lacks merit. It is also unclear how likely it is to advance the field in terms of knowledge / understanding.</p>	<p>Adequate background information given, adequately references the existing literature, adequately related to the themes of the call, adequate justification of its need and novelty. The research question(s) and/or proposal is adequately explained and detailed.</p> <p>The overall proposal is adequate in terms of quality and what it will add to the field in terms of knowledge / understanding.</p>	<p>Generally detailed background information given, generally references the existing literature, related to the themes of the call, generally detailed justification of its need and novelty. The research question(s) and/or proposal is generally credible and detailed.</p> <p>The overall proposal has merit and will add to knowledge / understanding in the field.</p>	<p>Excellent, clear, detailed and well-referenced background information given, highly related to the themes of the call, clear and compelling justification of its need and novelty. The research question(s) and/or proposal is clear, credible and detailed.</p> <p>The overall proposal is novel, excellent and will make a significant contribution to knowledge / understanding in the field.</p>	
2 Methodology and feasibility (With or without weighting)	<p>Flawed scientific and methodological approach.</p> <p>Little to no detail and consideration to risks and contingency plans.</p> <p>The research plan / timescale proposed is over-ambitious and not</p>	<p>Weak scientific and methodological approach.</p> <p>Lacking detail and consideration to risks and contingency plans.</p> <p>The research plan / timescale proposed is ambitious and not</p>	<p>Adequate scientific and methodological approach.</p> <p>Adequate consideration to risks and contingency plans.</p> <p>The research plan / timescale proposed is adequate.</p>	<p>Sound scientific and methodological approach.</p> <p>Generally detailed and considered risks and contingency plans.</p> <p>The research plan / timescale proposed is</p>	<p>Excellent scientific and methodological approach.</p> <p>Excellent, clear, detailed and well-considered risks and contingency plans.</p> <p>The research plan / timescale proposed is</p>	

		at all credible and/or sufficient.	entirely credible and/or sufficient.		generally credible and/or sufficient.	credible and/or sufficient.
3	Research team and environment (With or without weighting)	Not at all appropriate and little to no relevant detail given on their background, expertise and/or track record to carry out the proposed research. And/or the team completely lacks multi-disciplinarity given the nature of the work. The proposal indicates that the research team's access to facilities, equipment, samples and/or resources is entirely inadequate.	Not completely appropriate and lacking details on their background, expertise and/or track record to carry out the proposed research. And/or the team has some multi-disciplinarity given the nature of the work. The proposal lacks detail and consideration of the research team's access to facilities, equipment, samples and/or resources.	Adequate and have given adequate detail on their background, expertise and/or track record to carry out the proposed research. And/or the team has adequate levels of multi-disciplinarity given the nature of the work. The proposal has adequate detail and consideration of the research team's access to facilities, equipment, samples and/or resources.	Generally appropriate and have given appropriate detail on their background, expertise and/or track record to carry out the proposed research. And/or the team has appropriate levels multi-disciplinarity given the nature of the work. The proposal indicates that the research team has appropriate access to facilities, equipment, samples and/or resources.	Exemplary and have given excellent, clear and well-considered detail on their background, expertise and/or track record to carry out the proposed research. And/or the team has exemplary levels of multi-disciplinarity given the nature of the work. The proposal indicates that the research team has excellent, realistic, specific and appropriate access to facilities, equipment, samples and/or resources.

Please provide your comments, which give us the rationale behind all the scores you've given. Please be as detailed and constructive as possible, as your comments may be fed back to the applicants in our final award/rejection letters.

(No word limit)

For this particular research funding call, we offer applicants the opportunity to respond to specific peer reviewer feedback ahead of the decision-making panel meeting. Please summarise here no more than two key questions/issues that, if clarified/addressed fully, would, in your opinion, markedly improve the proposal.

(No word limit)

Optional additional comments and/or potential conflicts and/or feedback on the peer reviewer forms/process (N.B. these will not be fed back to applicants)

(No word limit)