

Assessment Criteria for 2020 HRC-NSFC Biomedical Collaborative Research Fund

Project

2020 HRC-NSFC Biomedical Collaborative Research Fund **Project** proposals assessed and scored by external peer reviewers will utilise the following criteria and anchor point descriptors:

A. Fit with the Request for Proposals (RFP)

- 7 = The applicants have convincingly demonstrated that the proposed research fully aligns with all of the objectives and requirements as stated in the RFP. The proposal clearly conveys a thorough understanding of the objectives and requirements and has outlined how the components of the RFP will be addressed.
- 4 = The applicants have attempted to align the proposed research with the objectives and requirements as stated in the RFP. The proposal does not address all of the objectives and requirements, or does not sufficiently address all of the objectives and requirements to provide the desired outcomes of the RFP. The proposal conveys an understanding of the requirements and has attempted to outline how the components of the RFP will be addressed.
- 1 = The applicants have not aligned the proposed research with the objectives and requirements to provide the desired outcomes of the RFP. The proposal conveys no understanding of the objectives and requirements of the RFP.

B. Scientific Merit

- 7 = The rationale for the proposed research is extremely well made. The aims and (where appropriate) hypotheses are excellent. The proposed research may represent a highly original and innovative approach to addressing the health question. Original findings are highly likely to result.
- 4 = The rationale for the study is well made. The aims and (where appropriate) hypotheses are acceptable. Original findings may result.
- 1 = The rationale, aims and hypotheses for the study are poor or absent. Original findings are unlikely to result.

C. Design and Methods

- 7 = The proposed study design is excellent. The methods and proposed analyses are very comprehensive and clearly appropriate. The applicants demonstrate full awareness of the relevant technical issues. The statistical power (where appropriate) is sufficient to ensure a definitive outcome and the statistical analyses are well-developed. It is difficult to suggest improvements.
- 4 = The study design is adequate. There may be either insufficient detail for parts of the method and proposed analyses, or the study would benefit significantly by improvements in one or more of these areas.
- 1 = The study design is unacceptable as proposed. Either the design is inappropriate, or there is no (or very little) detail on the methodology and proposed analyses.

D. Expertise of the Research Team

- 7 = The research team collectively have outstanding academic qualifications, as well as excellent topic based knowledge and experience to undertake the proposed research. They have an outstanding publication track record in major peer reviewed scientific journals as well as other professional publications, and/or substantial experience in disseminating research results.
- 4 = The research team collectively have the academic qualifications, topic based knowledge, and experience to undertake the proposed research. They have a track record of publication in peer reviewed scientific journals and other professional publications, and/or experience in disseminating research results. There are some areas, however, where this has not been fully demonstrated.
- 1 = The research team collectively have inadequate and/or inappropriate academic qualifications or research backgrounds to undertake the proposed research. They collectively have a weak publication record and there are serious doubts as to whether the research will be completed and disseminated appropriately.

E. Quality of the Research Partnership

- 7 = The partnership will enable a unique research contribution that has the potential to advance the field further due to the collaborative nature. Excellent opportunities for capability building of researchers, including early career researchers, is provided for. Diversity of gender and ethnicity within the team are considered. The partnership will enhance the transfer of new knowledge and/or technologies and build New Zealand research capacity to address global health research priorities. The collaboration will extend the impact and reach of New Zealand research and provide opportunities to advance to higher levels of research excellence.
- 4 = The partnership detailed in this application may provide opportunities for contributions to existing research, training and development of New Zealand researchers and/or collaborative research in this area. There are some areas where the quality of the partnership has not been fully demonstrated or could be strengthened.
- 1 = The proposed partnership detailed in this application is inadequate and/or unacceptable. There is very little detail and/or there are serious doubts as to the quality of this partnership or the opportunities this research may provide.

Emerging Researcher

HRC-NSFC Biomedical Collaborative Research Fund **Emerging Researcher** proposals assessed and scored by external peer reviewers will utilise the following criteria and anchor point descriptors.

A. Suitability of the Applicant

- 7 = The applicant has provided evidence of commitment to establish an independent research career and provided evidence of the applicant's ability to take overall responsibility for the work to be completed, including a plan for developing an independent research programme, stemming from the research proposal. The quality of the applicant's track record is high, based not only on quantity of publications but on the applicant's PhD, prizes and scholarships, and other academic achievements. Track record should be considered relative to opportunity.
- 4 = The applicant has attempted to provide evidence of commitment to establish an independent research career. The quality of applicants track record is adequate.
- 1 = The applicant has not provided evidence of commitment to establish an independent career and does not have a high-quality track record.

B. Fit with the Request for Proposals (RFP)

- 7 = The applicant has convincingly demonstrated that the proposed research fully aligns with all of the objectives and requirements as stated in the RFP. The proposal clearly conveys a thorough understanding of the objectives and requirements and has outlined how the components of the RFP will be addressed.
- 4 = The applicant has attempted to align the proposed research with the objectives and requirements as stated in the RFP. The proposal does not address all of the objectives and requirements, or does not sufficiently address all of the objectives and requirements to provide the desired outcomes of the RFP. The proposal conveys an understanding of the requirements and has attempted to outline how the components of the RFP will be addressed.
- 1 = The applicant has not aligned the proposed research with the objectives and requirements to provide the desired outcomes of the RFP. The proposal conveys no understanding of the objectives and requirements of the RFP.

C. Design and Methods

- 7 = The proposed study design is excellent. The methods and proposed analyses are very comprehensive and clearly appropriate. The applicants demonstrate full awareness of the relevant technical issues. The statistical power (where appropriate) is sufficient to ensure a definitive outcome and the statistical analyses are well-developed. It is difficult to suggest improvements.
- 4 = The study design is adequate. There may be either insufficient detail for parts of the method and proposed analyses, or the study would benefit significantly by improvements in a one or more of these areas.
- 1 = The study design is unacceptable as proposed and lacks originality. Either the design is inappropriate, or there is no (or very little) detail on the methodology and proposed analyses.

D. Research Environment Stability

- 7 = The research environment is well described and suitable for the nature of the proposed research; there is potential for development, training and developing collaborative relationships. The nature and level of support provided by the applicant's mentors and colleagues will ensure the applicant has the opportunity to thrive and succeed.
- 4 = The research environment appears to be adequate and there may be potential for personal career development. The level of support provided by mentors and colleagues could be described in greater detail.
- 1 = The research environment is inappropriate and will not provide adequate support to the applicant.

E. Quality of the Research Partnership

- 7 = The partnership will enable a unique research contribution that has the potential to advance the field further due to the collaborative nature. Excellent opportunities for capability building of researchers, including early career researchers, is provided for. Diversity of gender and ethnicity within the team are considered. The partnership will enhance the transfer of new knowledge and/or technologies and build New Zealand research capacity to address global health research priorities. The collaboration will extend the impact and reach of New Zealand research and provide opportunities to advance to higher levels of research excellence.
- 4 = The partnership detailed in this application may provide opportunities for contributions to existing research, training and development of New Zealand researchers and/or collaborative research in this area. There are some areas where the quality of the partnership has not been fully demonstrated or could be strengthened.
- 1 = The proposed partnership detailed in this application is inadequate and/or unacceptable. There is very little detail and/or there are serious doubts as to the quality of this partnership or the opportunities this research may provide.

Weighting of Scoring Criteria

The objectives of the **Emerging Researcher** awards include developing the health research workforce. Therefore, the emphasis in these applications is on the qualities of the applicant. Applicants are required to clearly demonstrate their suitability for the grant in the 'Suitability of Applicant' section of the Application Form. The Suitability of the Applicant score will be given a 40% weighting and the other four criteria will be worth 15% each.

Criteria	Points	% score
Suitability of the Applicant	7	40
Fit with the Request for Proposals	7	15
Design and Methods	7	15
Research Environment Stability	7	15
Quality of the Research Partnership	7	15
Total Score	35	100