

Fellowship:

Scoring Criteria – Peer review

Applicant No.

Total Score:

Score each indicator below on a scale of 1-5 and record any comments to discuss with the reviewers.

(1 = Very Poor; 2 = Poor; 3 = Good; 4 = Very Good; 5 = Excellent)

Score Indicators	Score & Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality and impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research question or knowledge gap of crucial importance to the research area Novel and innovative; robust methodology and design Potential for high health and/or socioeconomic impact 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scientific leadership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent leadership (experience, team environment, support and collaborators) Adequate support available to the fellow and in facilitating their development Opportunities for collaboration clearly defined 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justification of resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sufficient and appropriate staff time allocated to deliver proposed research 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ethical and/or governance issues are fully considered 	

Scoring Guidance

<p>Excellent quality application:</p> <p><i>Top international research or of exceptional national strategic importance:</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research question or gaps in knowledge addressed in the proposed research are of crucial importance to the research area - Level of innovation likely to lead to significant new understanding - Robust methodology and research design: measures for the avoidance of bias; well-balanced control and experimental groups and even sample sizes per group - Project risks identified and appropriately addressed - Sufficient and appropriate resources and staff time to deliver proposed research - Adequate support available to the fellow and in facilitating their development - Collaborative opportunities clearly defined - Significant economic/societal impact of the proposed research: identification of realised potential improvements to child health; contribution to relieving childhood disability and/or improving quality of life; identification of potential impacts of the research outcomes and plans to disseminate these - Ethical/governance issues fully considered
<p>Poor quality application:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Research question poorly defined - Weak methodology - Limited likelihood of successful delivery/contribution to new knowledge - Poor leadership and lack of support - Resources inefficient to deliver the proposed research - Ethical and/or governance issues are somewhat considered