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

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