**Cystinosis Ireland Seedcorn Proposal Evaluation Criteria**

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

1. Scientific Quality and Innovation (40%)
2. Scientific Quality of any Potential Follow Up Research Project that Might Arise from this Seedcorn Project (20%)
3. Expertise and Research Environment (20%)
4. Relevance and Impact of the Proposed Research on Cystinosis Patients and their Families (20%)

**A. Scientific Quality and Innovation (40%)**

What are the Strengths and Weaknesses of the proposal taking into account the following factors:

1. Clarity of the research question.
2. The background to the proposed research, justifying the need for work in this area, drawing particularly on existing evidence.
3. Completeness of the literature review and relevance to study design/research plan.
4. Clarity of rationale for the research approach and methodology.
5. Appropriateness of the research design.
6. Appropriateness of the research methods.
7. Quality of the PPI approach.
8. Feasibility of the research approach (including recruitment of subjects, project timeline, preliminary data where appropriate, etc.).
9. Anticipation of difficulties that may be encountered in the research and plans for management.
10. Originality of the proposed research in terms of hypotheses/research questions addressed, novel technology/methodology and or novel applications of current technology/methodology
11. Potential for the creation of new or advancement of knowledge and evidence of benefit to the area covered by the research.
12. The anticipated outputs, outcomes (e.g. patents) and impacts of the proposed research.

**B. Scientific Quality of any Potential Research Project that Might Arise from this Seedcorn Project (20%)**

What are the Strengths and Weaknesses of the proposal taking into account the following factors:

1. The plan for turning the results of the seedcorn project into a follow-up funding application. Is there a clear and realistic timeline for a grant application?
2. The suitability of the anticipated results of the seedcorn project to underpin a larger grant application. Is the connection between the proposed seedcorn research and the follow-up funding clearly explained? Are the anticipated results of this project essential for the planned follow-up application?
3. Does the proposal mention a target funding institution for follow-up research and is this funder appropriate for the research?

**C. Expertise and Research Environment (20%)**

What are the Strengths and Weaknesses of the proposal taking into account the following factors:

1. Appropriateness of the team of applicants (if more than one applicant) to carry out the proposed research, in terms of complementarity of expertise and synergistic potential.
2. Experience of the applicant(s) in the proposed area of research and with the proposed methodology.
3. Qualifications of the applicant(s), including training, experience and independence (relative to career stage).
4. Expertise of the applicant(s), as demonstrated by scientific productivity over the past five years (publications, books, grants held, etc.). Productivity should be considered in the context of the norms for the research area, applicant experience and total research funding of the applicant.
5. Track record of applicant(s) as demonstrated by the outputs, outcomes and impacts on the health of patients and/or the public arising from previous grants.
6. Availability and accessibility of suitably qualified personnel, facilities and infrastructure required to conduct the research.
7. Suitability of the environment to conduct the proposed research.
8. Ability to successfully and appropriately disseminate research findings, as demonstrated by knowledge translation activities (publications, conference presentations, briefings, media engagements, etc.).
9. Quality of the plan for using and disseminating the knowledge, potential for promoting innovation and clear plans for the management of intellectual property, where appropriate, to ensure optimal use of the project results for the patient and the healthcare system.
10. The extent to which the research team have demonstrated the potential for collaboration with key organisations responsible for implementing or applying the findings;
11. The extent to which public involvement is incorporated into the research proposal

**D. Relevance and Impact of the Proposed Research for Cystinosis Patients and their Families (20%)**

What are the Strengths and Weaknesses of the proposal taking into account the following factors:

1. The need for research in this area. Is there similar or complementary research underway elsewhere?
2. The importance of doing the work now. Whether the proposal realistically sets out the ultimate potential benefits with respect to improving human health
3. To what extent the proposal will contribute, directly or indirectly, to relieving the burden of disease
4. Whether the proposed research is likely to generate results which users will be interested in taking up and if so are the plans for dissemination appropriate

**Guidelines for scoring applications:**

Using the scale and description below, reviewers first decide the range of the application i.e. Excellent, Good, Average or Not Fundable.

Reviewers then use the descriptions within the relevant range to select a score that reflects their comments.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Range** | **Score** | **Description** | **Additional guidelines** |
| Excellent  | 9  | Exceptional  | Exceptionally strong with no weaknesses  |
| 8  | Outstanding  | Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses  |
| 7  | Excellent  | Very strong with few minor weaknesses  |
| Good  | 6  | Very good  | Very good with few minor weaknesses  |
| 5  | Good  | Good with one or few major weaknesses  |
| Average  | 4  | Satisfactory  | Satisfactory with some strengths and some weaknesses  |
| 3  | Marginal  | Marginal with only few strengths and major weaknesses  |
| Not fundable  | 2  | Weak  | Very few strengths and too many major weaknesses  |
| 1  | Poor  | Seriously flawed with no strengths  |