****

**HRCI/HRB Joint Funding Scheme 2020**

**(formerly the MRCG/HRB Joint Funding Scheme)**

**Part E**

**Peer Review Form**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Host Institution:** |  |
| **Charity:** |  |
| **Application Ref Code:** |  |
| **Principal Investigator:** |  |
| **Research Institution:** |  |
| **Application Title:** |  |

**Referee Details**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name:** |  |
| **Department:** |  |
| **Institution:** |  |
| **Email:** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *I have read and understood the HRCI/HRB Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest Policy* | I agree (Y/N): |
| *I do not have a conflict of interest in relation to reviewing this research proposal* | I agree (Y/N): |
| *I agree to keep this proposal and any matters relating to it confidential* | I agree (Y/N): |
| *Signature* |  |
| *Date* |  |

The **General Data Protection Regulation** (GDPR) 2018 outlines the legal obligations that are attached to personal data that is held by The Health Research Board and Health Research Charities Ireland (HRCI – formerly Medical Research Charities Group/MRCG). The Health Research Board and MCRG are committed to protecting the rights and privacy of individuals in accordance with this act. All peer reviewers for HRCI/HRB 2020 will be asked to **confirm** that they will (i) only access application data for the purposes of peer reviewing, (ii) not share information contained in the application with anyone else, and (iii) will destroy any copy/record of the application after their review is submitted. The standard HRB rules in relation to confidentiality of the peer review process will continue to apply.

Please confirm your agreement with the below statement before proceeding

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| “I **confirm** that I will (i) only access application data for the purposes of peer reviewing, (ii) not share information contained in the application with anyone else, and (iii) will destroy any copy/record of the application after my review has submitted.” | I agree (Y/N): |
| *Signature:* | |
| *Date:* | |

**Peer reviewers are asked by the research charity to provide feedback and comment on each application taking into account each of the following assessment criteria:**

* **Scientific Quality and Innovation (50% of marks)**
* **Expertise and Research Environment (30% of marks)**
* **Feasibility (20% of marks)**

**Scientific Quality and Innovation (50% of marks)**

* + Important research question
  + Evidence supports need for proposed project

Design and methodology appropriate

|  |
| --- |
| **Strengths** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Weaknesses** |
|  |

**Expertise and Research Environment (30% of marks)**

* + Applicant team expertise and experience relevant for project
  + Supports, infrastructure, environment

|  |
| --- |
| **Strengths** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Weaknesses** |
|  |

**Feasibility (20% of marks)**

* + Project staffing and funding
  + Project plan and risk mitigation for project delivery

|  |
| --- |
| **Strengths** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Weaknesses** |
|  |

**Overall Comment**

After considering all of the above assessment criteria please give a general summary of the application relative to the final score provided below.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Overall Rating**

**Guidelines for scoring applications:**

Using the scale and description below, each reviewer will score the application, using the detailed narrative for each numerical score to guide their decision. Please note only whole numbers are used.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Range** | **Score** | **Description** | **Additional guidelines** |
| Excellent | 9 | Exceptional | *Exceptionally strong research proposal with no weaknesses.* Exceptional Scientific Quality and Innovation.  Exceptionally strong high calibre research team and environment capable of achieving successful results.  Extremely strong feasibility |
| 8 | Outstanding | *Extremely strong research proposal with negligible weaknesses.*  Outstanding Scientific Quality and Innovation.  Extremely strong research team and environment capable of achieving successful results.  Very strong feasibility. |
| 7 | Excellent | *Very strong research proposal with few minor weaknesses.*  Excellent Scientific Quality and Innovation.  Very strong research team and environment capable of delivering results.  Strong feasibility. |
| Good | 6 | Very good | *Very good research proposal.*  Very good Scientific Quality and Innovation.  Very good research team and environment capable of delivering results.  Feasible. |
| 5 | Good | *Good research proposal with one or a few major weaknesses.* Good Scientific Quality and Innovation.  Good research team and environment capable of delivering results.  Potentially feasible. |
| Average | 4 | Satisfactory | *Satisfactory with some strengths and some weaknesses.* Reasonable Scientific Quality and Innovation.  Research team and environment likely to deliver some results.  Modest potential of feasibility |
| 3 | Marginal | *Marginal with only few strengths and major weaknesses.* Modest Scientific Quality and Innovation.  Research team and environment unlikely to deliver results.  Low potential of feasibility |
| Poor | 2 | Weak | *Serious concerns regarding quality, research team and feasibility.* |
| 1 | Poor | *Seriously flawed proposal with no strengths.* |

Please enter your **final score**.

Use whole Numbers only. **Maximum score is 9**:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Score** |  |