NZ-China Biomedical Research Alliance: Assessment criteria and scoring

Applications assessed and scored by external peer reviewers and Assessing Committee members will use the following criteria and anchor point descriptors. The best possible score for any specific application is 35. All assessment and scoring are conducted via HRC Gateway system.

The 7-point scale corresponds to a word ladder of descriptors:

Score	Criteria descriptor
7	Exceptional
6	Excellent
5	Very good
4	Good
3	Adequate
2	Unsatisfactory
1	Poor

Criteria	Score
Fit with RFP	7
Scientific Merit	7
Design and Methods	7
Expertise of the research team	7
Quality of the research partnership	7
Total	**35**

A. Fit with RFP

Score of 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.

Score of 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 the objectives and requirements or does not sufficiently address all 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.

Score of 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

Score of 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.

Score of 4 The rationale for the study is well made. The aims and (where appropriate) hypotheses are acceptable. Original findings may result.

Score of 1 The rationale, aims and hypotheses for the study are poor or absent. Original findings are unlikely to result.

C. Design and methods

Score of 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.

Score of 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.

Score of 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

Score of 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.

Score of 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.

Score of 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

Score of 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.

Score of 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.

Score of 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.