Medical Research Foundation

Changing Policy and Practice Award 2026/27

Guidelines for Applicants: Full Application

Summary

This document guides you through the preparation and submission of an application for the Medical Research Foundation's Changing Policy and Practice Award.

Submissions will take place via a two-stage process. Expression of Interest (EoI) applications will be accepted from eligible researchers who will be asked to provide a short overview of planned dissemination activities.

Full applications will be by invitation only, applicants who have not submitted an EoI application will not be able to submit a full application.

Deadline for full submission:

12:00 Thursday 18 June 2026

Additional Co-Investigators and Collaborators can be added at the full application stage, including those listed in the EoI application, by invitation from the Lead Applicant.

Full applications must be submitted and approved by all signatories and the application received in its entirety by this deadline. All applications must be submitted via our online grants management system (https://medicalresearchfoundation.flexigrant.com/). Paper application forms will not be accepted.

We advise that you prepare your application in good time to allow for your Research Organisation's checks and approvals to take place in accordance with its internal timelines. You will not be able to submit applications after this deadline. We recommend that you submit your application in advance of the deadline so that any technical issues can be resolved in good time.

The Medical Research Foundation is committed to making this application process accessible to all and will provide assistance where needed. Please do not hesitate to get in touch with our Research Team if you have any questions or concerns about the application process.

Email: research@medicalresearchfoundation.org.uk Tel: +44 20 4581 2403.

Overview

The Medical Research Foundation invites` applications from MRC and Foundation-funded researchers for the Changing Policy and Practice Award. This scheme is designed to support the dissemination of research findings beyond the scientific peer reviewed press, with the aim of maximising the impact of medical research by taking the results directly to the patients, healthcare practitioners and policy makers intended to benefit.

The scheme is designed to support researchers in disseminating a specific research finding/message to a specific audience to inform and influence healthcare policy or practice, or to change patient and public behaviour and opinion.

All areas of medical research will be considered in this funding competition and applications can focus on any justified target group outside of the scientific press.

The Funder

The Medical Research Foundation is an independent charitable foundation. Formed by the Medical Research Council (MRC) over 100 years ago, we grow and nurture people and ideas wherever we see research opportunities with great potential.

Support for this funding competition comes from the Fleming Memorial Fund for Medical Research, which was established in 1959 in memory of Sir Alexander Fleming.

The Funding

Applicants may apply for up to £50,000 over a flexible time period, usually up to two years.

Who can apply

This competition will run twice a year and is open to MRC and Foundation-funded grant and fellowship holders based at eligible institutions, as well as MRC-funded and MRC core-funded researchers in MRC research institutes, units and centres. To be eligible, the MRC or Foundation funding supporting the research should be within one-year prior to the grant finishing or within two years after the grant has finished. This time restriction may be reconsidered in exceptional circumstances i.e. for large scale clinical trials which take longer to publish their findings. Applicants must hold a PhD, DPhil or MD.

The specific research finding forming the basis of the dissemination work must have been published in a peer reviewed journal prior to applying to the scheme and must have been funded by their MRC or Medical Research Foundation grant. The MRC or Medical Research Foundation funding supporting the research should be acknowledged in the publication.

To be eligible for funding the applicant should be listed as either the PI or as a Co-Investigator on the original MRC or Medical Research Foundation grant forming the basis of the research.

To assess eligibility, applicants are required to complete a short Expression of Interest application enquiry form. Applicants who do not meet the eligibility criteria will not be invited to submit a full application.

Only one application will be accepted per applicant per funding round, though individuals can hold more than one Medical Research Foundation grant at any one time.

Applicants who had their eligibility for an award confirmed in a previous round but did not apply should contact the Medical Research Foundation Research Team to check whether they are eligible to apply for this round.

Please note applicants who previously applied but were not successful may not re-apply unless invited by the Expert Review Panel. Resubmissions should be a substantially revised proposal, and applicants should submit a list of changes made.

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion

The Medical Research Foundation is committed to achieving equality of opportunity for all funding applicants and aims to create an inclusive environment that encourages excellence in research through good equalities practice. Diversity is important to the Medical Research Foundation, and we are working to ensure that the ways in which we fund research embraces a diversity of thought, people, geographical locations and ideas.

We strongly encourage applications from under-represented groups including female and ethnic minority researchers, and researchers with disabilities or long-term health conditions. We will support our researchers and their teams to work flexibly and in a way that meets their personal circumstances. Guidance on the Medical Research Foundation's flexible working policies can be found in our Terms and Conditions. Please contact the Research Team if you have any questions about flexible working:

research@medicalresearchfoundation.org.uk.

The Medical Research Foundation encourages lead applicants to consider the diversity of the research team, as well as area of expertise, when inviting Collaborators to support their application.

Environmental Sustainability

At the Medical Research Foundation we know that we need to protect planetary health if we are to deliver our vision of a world with better health. We aim to reach net-zero in our activities as soon as possible and influence the activities of others whom we work with and fund.

As supporters of the concordat for Environmental Sustainability in Research and Innovation Practice we recognise the need to change how the research and innovation we fund is conducted and our part in promoting solutions. We are taking shared action now and into the future to reduce and eliminate our own environmental impacts and emissions and achieve the transition to sustainable practices.

Applicants are encouraged to design their dissemination activities to use the most sustainable approaches available to them, describe these measures within their grant application and provide a rationale for the choices made. For example, if you are considering attending an event, outline whether you plan to participate online to reduce travel or attend in person. You should explain why this option is the most appropriate and worthwhile for your research or professional development. Please see our tips and resources for improving the environmental impact of your research for further suggestions.

Applicants may include direct costs in their budget to support the adoption of sustainable practices, where relevant. All costs associated with environmentally sustainable options such as purchasing more sustainable materials or equipment, or choosing lower-carbon travel options should be fully justified within the application, even if these options incur a higher upfront cost.

We recognise that researchers based in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) may face infrastructure and resource constraints which make it more challenging to meet the same sustainability standards as those in high-income settings. However, we still expect LMIC-based applicants to consider environmental sustainability in their design, adapted appropriately to their local context and available resources.

Responsibilities of the Lead Research Organisation and the Principal Investigator

Principal Investigator (PI)

The PI is responsible for the intellectual leadership of the dissemination project and for the overall management of the dissemination activities. They will be the Medical Research Foundation's main contact for the proposal. There can only be one PI on any proposal.

The PI must be based at the RO at which the award will be administered.

Lead Research Organisation

By submitting an application, a Lead Research Organisation (RO) indicates their formal acceptance of the proposal, approval of the salaries and resources sought and, if the application is successful, acceptance of the terms and conditions of a Medical Research Foundation award.

Administrative authorities have responsibility for ensuring that salaries and resources cited in the proposal are sufficient to undertake the proposed research, attract sufficiently experienced and skilled staff and represent good value-for-money.

Application process

Full applications will be assessed by a panel of independent experts against three core criteria, the significance of the research finding, the merit of the dissemination plan and the implementation of the findings. Applicants are encouraged to consult or include a science communications professional (i.e. from their university) on the application, although this is not a requirement.

Please see Annex A for details of the scoring range the Panel will use to assess applications.

Significance of Research Finding

- Prevalence of condition (if disease-related)
- Potential impact of findings for public health or on healthcare policy/practice.
- Contribution of results to current practice or knowledge
- Consideration of other relevant research
- Publication of findings in peer-reviewed journal(s)

Dissemination

- Need for wider dissemination beyond the scientific community
- Appropriateness of the target audience and method of delivery
- The value-for-money of the individual elements of the dissemination activities
- Effectiveness of the proposed activities and likelihood of reaching the target audience

Implementation

- Impact of the dissemination plan on the target audience
- Potential of the dissemination activities to change behaviour, policy and practice
- Plans to evaluate your dissemination activities and change in behaviour, practice and policy

What makes a successful application?

- A clear understanding of the significance of the research findings and the need for dissemination beyond the normal scientific press to the target audience
- A strong consideration of how disseminating the finding will influence behaviour, healthcare policy or practice
- Appropriateness and suitability of the target audience
- Justified and appropriate methods for disseminating the research findings that are effective and likely to reach the target audience.
- Clearly defined objectives that help to guide project activity and facilitate effective evaluation.
- Detail of the longevity of developed dissemination resources (if applicable).
- Considered or defined expected outcomes, influence or impact from disseminating the key finding to the target audience.
- A clear plan to evaluate the proposed dissemination activities including detail of the planned methods of assessing, recording and evaluating the impact of the results on the target audience.

What is not within remit for this scheme?

- Applications requesting funding to continue existing research or conduct new research.
- Dissemination plans that are too broad, incorporate multiple messages or are not targeted to a specific audience.
- Dissemination activities not related to the original research findings
- Applications focussing on disseminating research findings to other researchers (for example requests for academic conference travel).
- Applications that request funding for Public Engagement with Science activities without a target outcome.
- Applications that are principally educational in nature.
- Applications focussing on increasing participation in research.

Examples

Below are examples of previously successful applications

Example 1: Fluid management of severely ill children in Africa

The dissemination work supported meetings with key international policymakers, development of training resources, production and distribution of a film and development of information packs. Policy changes were made as a result with amendments to Médecins Sans Frontières and WHO guidelines.

Example 2: The molecular causes of five novel disorders affecting developmental processes within North American Amish communities

The team worked with the local community and developed a strategy to share clinically relevant findings with affected families, education providers, clinicians and other healthcare professionals. This involved generating culturally appropriate disorder specific literature, holding family information days and educational meetings for local healthcare providers and special educational needs (SEN) teachers, and online educational tools for specific audiences. The dissemination activities have been linked to a rise in diagnosis rate of these disorders from 5% to 70-80%, with a large effect on the developmental, clinical and social outcomes of the affected individuals.

How to Apply

Applications must be submitted and approved by all signatories and the application received in its entirety by the deadline. All applications must be submitted via our online grants management system (https://medicalresearchfoundation.flexigrant.com/). Paper application forms will not be accepted.

Queries

Any queries on the competition, the application process, or eligibility should be addressed to Rebecca Milton at research@medicalresearchfoundation.org.uk.

Please refer to the sections below to complete your application form.

Terms and Conditions of Award

Awards made through this competition will follow standard Medical Research Foundation Terms and Conditions. The Medical Research Foundation Terms and Conditions spell out the responsibilities of the joint Principal Investigator and the Lead Research Organisation. The Principal Investigator and the Lead Research Organisation are required to indicate their formal acceptance of the application, their acceptance of the terms and conditions of a Medical Research Foundation award, and the approval of the salaries and resources sought in the application. The Medical Research Foundation may add additional conditions to an award to reflect the particular circumstances and requirements of the funding, or the nature of a particular award. Acceptance of an award constitutes acceptance of both the core conditions and any additional conditions. The Medical Research Foundation reserves the right to vary these Terms and Conditions.

Guidance for Applicants

The information provided in this section provides guidance on completing the application form though the online

grants management system (https://medicalresearchfoundation.flexigrant.com/). Guidance is also provided within the system itself.

Please clearly label all uploaded files and ensure that all relevant documents are suitable and present.

If you have any questions about any aspects of the application process, please contact a member of the Medical Research Foundation's team.

Email: research@medicalresearchfoundation.org.uk Tel: +44 20 4581 2403 or +44 20 4581 2415

Completing the narrative CV

Lead applicants are required to submit a CV using the Medical Research Foundation Résumé for Researchers CV template. A word version of the template is available on our website and within the online application form.

The Résumé for Researchers is an open-source template which has been developed by The Royal Society as a tool to more broadly evaluate researchers, particularly at the early career stages. The template has been adopted and adapted by the Medical Research Foundation as it supports the Foundation's approach of considering a wider view of contribution to the research landscape, at all career stages, not based solely on publication record.

Applicants are encouraged to provide examples of their impact outside of publications lists, although these should still be provided. Examples such as collaborative working, effective leadership, coaching and mentoring as well as inspiring others are welcomed.

Career progression disruptions and Impact of COVID-19

The COVID-19 pandemic has had a significant and variable impact on researchers' careers across the world. The Foundation is committed to helping mitigate this is much as possible through our grant making policies and practices, we are pleased to support the UK Academy of Medical Sciences Cross-funder COVID-19 memory statement as co-signatories, please see our website for further details.

There is a dedicated space within the application form, to detail how your career progression has been impacted by COVID-19. Additionally, guidance will be given to our Expert Reviewers and Panel Members so that they are able to take these impacts on an applicant's career into account when they are making funding recommendations.

Applicants are also provided with space to detail any other career disruptions (e.g. parental leave, ill health) that may have impacted their progression. Please only share details that you are comfortable with being shared with the Panel and do not include identifying information about third parties.

Contribution to knowledge generation

This section can be used to explain how you have contributed to the generation of new ideas and hypotheses and which key skills you have used to develop ideas and test hypotheses. It can be used to highlight how you have communicated your ideas and research results, both written and verbally. It can include a small selection of outputs, with a description of why they are of particular relevance and why they are considered in the context of knowledge generation. Outputs can include (but is not limited to) open data sets, software, commercial, entrepreneurial or industrial products, clinical practice developments, educational products, policy publications, evidence synthesis pieces and conference publications that you have generated. Where outputs have a digital object identifier (DOI) please only include this.

Contribution to the development of individuals

This section can be used to highlight expertise you provided which was critical to the success of a team

or team members including project management, collaborative contributions, and team support. It can include your teaching activities, workshops or summer schools in which you were involved (for undergraduates and post-graduates as well as junior colleagues), and the supervision of students and colleagues. It can be used to mention mentoring of members in your field and support you provided to the advancement of colleagues, be it junior or senior. It can be used to highlight the establishment of collaborations, from institutional (maybe interdisciplinary) to international. It can be used to describe where you exerted strategic leadership, how you shaped the direction of a team, organisation, company or institution.

Contribution to the wider research community

This section can include various activities you have engaged in to progress the research community. It can be used to mention commitments including editing, reviewing, refereeing, committee work and your contributions to the evaluation of researchers and research projects. It can be used to mention the organisation of events that have benefited your research community. It can highlight contributions to increasing research integrity, and improving research culture (gender equality, diversity, mobility of researchers, reward and recognition of researchers' various activities). It can be used to mention appointments to positions of responsibility such as committee membership and corporate roles within your department, institution or organisation, and recognition by invitation within your sector.

Contribution to broader society

This section can include examples of societal engagement and knowledge exchange. It can include engagement with industry and the private sector. It can be used to mention engagement with the public sector, clients and the broader public. It can be used to highlight positive stakeholder feedback, inclusion of patients in processes and clinical trials, and other impacts across research, policy, practice and business. It can be used to mention efforts to collaborate with particular societal or patient groups. It can be used to highlight efforts to advise policy-makers at local, national or international level and provide information through the press and on social media.

Application form question guidance

Section 1: Lead Applicant details

There can only be one lead applicant. Additional project Co-Investigators can be included in the sections 2-5. A maximum of four Co-Investigators can be included.

Any other individuals involved in the application can be listed as collaborators in section 7, unless they will be employed on the grant, in which case they should be named as staff members. Collaborators will need to provide a signed declaration on letter-headed paper confirming that they have consented to co-operate in the research project and explaining the role they will play.

Additional Co-Investigators and Collaborators can be added at the Full application stage, in addition to those included in the Expression of Interest application, by invite from the Lead Applicant.

Section 2-5: Co-Investigator details and career summary

Please provide career history details of up to four Co-Investigators. A Co-Investigator is a person who assists the Principal Investigators in the management and leadership of the research and is named as such in the application.

Please note that Co-Investigators must also upload their CVs using the Résumé for Researchers template which can be found on our website.

Section 6: Medical Research Foundation/MRC funding

Published research findings

Applications should be based on research findings from a Medical Research Foundation or MRC grant. This includes awards funded solely by the Foundation or the MRC, as well as co-funded awards.

Please provide details of the grant that supported the research to be disseminated in this proposal.

The research finding to be disseminated must have been published in a peer reviewed journal prior to submission of an application. Please detail the journal reference of the published article include a DOI where possible. Publications must be full, peer-reviewed articles. Pre-prints are not eligible.

Please only reference the publications that have contributed the research basis for the specific dissemination activities proposed. Only publications acknowledging the original award should be included in the application. Other related publications are not eligible and will not be considered. A larger number of publications will not benefit your application.

Lay description of published research

The lay description should be written in a form understandable by members of the public (e.g. current or potential supporters) who are not specialists in the research field.

Please provide a summary of the research findings to be disseminated, highlighting key findings to be disseminated and indicating the research significance.

We may use this section for external communications associated with the Changing Policy and Practice Award and we aim to publish the lay summary of successful applicants on our website. The text style should be suitable to a lay audience and not contain specific details of any sensitive information.

The MRC or Medical Research Foundation funding supporting the research should be acknowledged in the publication.

Section 7: Dissemination Activities

The detailed Dissemination Plan should not exceed 5 A4 pages (size 12 Arial font). References, diagrams, tables or charts can be included within the text or as an appendix and are included in the 5-page limit.

If this application is not a renewal of a previous or current Medical Research Foundation Changing Policy and Practice award, please do not fill in any questions related to the renewal scheme. If this application is a renewal of an award, please contact the research team for the Changing Policy and Practice Renewal scheme guidance.

The detailed Dissemination Plan should include the following information:

1. **Key message** – The key message or implication from the research finding that is to be disseminated.
2. **Target audience** – The specific target group that can act upon the research finding.
3. **Background** – Provide relevant background information that is needed to understand the wider context of your application.
    - Detail the original aims of the MRC/Foundation-funded research and the subsequent published research result.
    - Explain the need for dissemination of the research finding and the rationale of the dissemination methods and approach planned.
    - Place the published research finding in the context of existing evidence.

- Detail any previous dissemination methods and approach and the impact of prior dissemination if applicable.
- Justify the significance of the research finding to be disseminated, in terms of its potential to improve health in the target group, effect a behaviour change or impact on healthcare practice and/or policy.

4. **Aims and Objectives** – Outline the changes in practice, policy or behaviour that the dissemination plan is aiming to achieve.
5. **Dissemination Programme** – Indicate the proposed methods of dissemination. Include information about:
    - Who will deliver the programme,
    - How the activities will be undertaken,
    - Where the activities will take place and the timeframe in which the programme will be completed,
    - The numbers of the target audience that the dissemination method or approach is expected to reach,
    - What the expected outcomes would be from these activities,
    - If applicable, outline any expert advice sought in preparation of, or involved in, the dissemination programme.
6. **Evaluation Plan** – Identify how the impact of the dissemination programme will be assessed.
    - Provide details of how the behavior/practice/policy change will be measured and evaluated. A strong evaluation plan will clearly define what success will look like for this programme of work.
7. **Justification for support** – Justify the resources requested. This can be expanded in the Justification of Costs in Section 8.

The Medical Research Foundation expects that before work commences, the Principal Investigator will have ensured, in collaboration with the lead research organisation, that all appropriate regulatory approvals are in place. These could include those relating to human participation, personal safety and health and safety.

Collaborators

Please provide details of any additional collaborators on the project. Collaborators will need to provide a signed declaration on letter-headed paper confirming that they have consented to co-operate in the programme of work and explaining the role they will play. Please note, if there are multiple collaborators from the same institution, they will all still need to provide individual letters.

Data Management Plan

The Medical Research Foundation is committed to ensuring that the knowledge and discoveries which result from our funded projects are available freely and immediately to everyone. A Data Management Plan (DMP) is required to detail how you will collect, store, curate, and manage data, including how it will be shared and any open access requirements.

Where substantial data is being used, the DMP will be more in depth and therefore likely to be up to 1000 words long, for studies using smaller amounts of data, DMPs will be short i.e. 200-500 word in total.

The MRC Policy and Guidance on Sharing of Research Data from Population and Patient Studies is a useful reference for data relating to studies involving human participation.

Section 8: Funding requested

The Medical Research Foundation will meet the full direct costs of the dissemination activities.

Direct costs are those that will arise from the conduct of the research project and can be charged as the cash value spent and can be supported by an auditable record. In line with other UK medical research charities, the Medical Research Foundation will not meet directly allocated or indirect costs as standard.

If the planned dissemination activities are to be carried out outside of the UK, and cannot be facilitated without the inclusion of indirect costs, up to 15% of the total budget can be attributed to reasonable directly allocated and/or indirect costs. Please contact the Research Team prior to submission research@medicalresearchfoundation.org.uk if you require further advice. Indirect/directly allocated costs should be clearly detailed in the justification of costs.

Applications should be costed at today's prices and inflation should not be included.

Dissemination activities will be dependent on the nature of the research finding and the target audience.

Applications could include requests for the costs of:

- Writing, publicising and disseminating non-specialist reports for a target public audience or wider network of healthcare practitioners
- Developing online resources or posters for target audiences
- Organising events, policy working groups or seminars
- Professionals key to dissemination i.e. science communicators, educators or health professionals, as long as this is in relation to a specific research finding and appropriate for the target audience.
- Travel and subsistence
- Research staff (who will directly support the dissemination project, but not the salary of the PI)
- Access charges for specialist equipment or services
- Any other direct costs of dissemination
- Direct costs for sustainability measures. This includes:
    - Environmentally sustainable consumables and materials, including those with a higher upfront cost where they offer demonstrable environmental benefits.
    - Refurbished, second-hand, or shared equipment, or costs associated with the maintenance and repair of existing equipment to extend its usable life for the purpose of the project.
    - Training and capacity-building activities that support the adoption of sustainable dissemination practices within the team for the purpose of the dissemination project.
    - Travel costs that reduce the carbon footprint of the dissemination, including the use of lower-emission transport options (e.g. rail travel in place of flights), even where these incur higher costs.
    - Costs related to sustainable data management and dissemination, including infrastructure that supports low-impact data storage and sharing.

Medical Research Foundation Changing Policy and Practice Awards will **not** fund:

- Any directly allocated costs i.e. estate costs and costs of shared resources such as staff and equipment
- The salary of the PI
- Any indirect costs which cannot be allocated to individual projects (including but not limited to computing and information support, general maintenance and other infrastructure costs, HR and recruitment costs etc.)
- Cost of general public engagement in science work

Applicants should justify the budget requested and provide details of any costs to be met through other funding sources.

Direct environmental sustainability costs are specific, project-related expenses that directly support the reduction of your research's environmental impact. Examples include:

- Purchasing sustainable or recycled consumables and materials.
- Upgrading to energy-efficient equipment which will be necessary for your project.
- Costs for sustainable travel (e.g. train instead of air travel).
- Costs for recycling or waste reduction initiatives directly linked to your project.

Applicants should clearly explain how each cost contributes to environmental sustainability and why it is necessary for the proposed research.

Applicants are encouraged to minimise the environmental impact of equipment purchases by:

- Using existing equipment or shared facilities where possible.
- Leasing equipment for short-term needs.
- Collaborating with other research groups to share resources.

If new equipment is essential, applicants should justify why alternatives were not feasible and describe any steps taken to ensure the purchase is as sustainable as possible (e.g. choosing energy-efficient models, considering lifecycle impacts).

Section 9: Human participation and ethical approval

If the project involves the use of human participants and/or organs, tissues or cells relevant to The Human Tissue Act 2004 (England, Wales and N. Ireland) and The Human Tissue (Scotland) Act 2006 in the UK, please detail the relevant ethical approvals. SSA Human use ethics, Ethical approval justification.

If ethical approval is required for the research proposal, please provide details of the relevant approvals.

If your research involves the use of human participants and/or organs, tissues or cells outside the UK, please provide details in the relevant questions. Describe how your research complies with relevant UK regulations. Applications involving human participants in counties outside of the UK may be subject to additional ethical implications.

Please see the MRC guidance related to Using human samples in research and Human Participants in Research for further direction on research involving human participants in countries outside of the UK.

Section 10: Intellectual property

Please detail any intellectual property that this project will generate, either during or beyond the lifetime of the award. Please include details of any existing background intellectual property that will need to be used and/or modified and plans for ownership of this intellectual property.

Section 11: Environmental sustainability

We ask you to confirm whether reducing the environmental impact of your research has been considered in your application and if so to describe how it has been considered. You may include measures that you will take in practicing your research to reduce environmental impact. Please see our tips and resources about environmental sustainability in research.

We understand that sustainability practices vary between organisations. Please indicate that you have designed your research using the most sustainable approach available at your organisation that you can access and describe the support, resources and/or initiatives at your organisation to support you with environmental sustainability in your research. When planning, please use the expanded guidance in the appendices at the end of this document.

Section 12-14: Declaration

Authorisations and/or declarations are needed from the following application participants:

- Principal Investigator
- Research Administrator
- Head of Department

Participants should be invited to complete their sections of the application by following the instructions under the participants tab on the Application Summary page. Please check which email address they would like to use, as they may already be registered on Flexi-Grant and mistakes may lead to a delay in processing the application.

Applicants can keep track of the progress of submission completion status on the Application Summary page. Applicants can issue a reminder email to the invited participants through the participants tab on the Application Summary page. If the instruction email from the Medical Research Foundation has not been received please: a) double check the accuracy of the email address supplied on the application form; b) advise the intended recipient to check their spam filters/junk folders; c) contact the Medical Research Foundation with an alternative email address for the recipient. The Medical Research Foundation is happy to help where possible but cannot be held responsible for automated emails that are not received due to address errors or spam filters.

All declarations must be signed by the appropriate persons prior to the submission of the application. It is the applicants' responsibility to ensure that approval of the application by the Lead Research Organisations is completed before the closing date.

Annex A: Scoring Matrix for Expert Review Panel Members

Score Indicators	Fundable
10. Exceptional – Considerable potential to impact upon policy and practice	
■ Significance of Research Finding – Crucial contribution of scientific results to current practice or knowledge – Crucial medical or health condition to address – Excellent consideration of other relevant research (where appropriate) – Exceptional understanding of the impact of findings for public health or on healthcare policy/practice ■ Dissemination – Crucial need for wider dissemination beyond the scientific community – Exceptional plans, with well justified dissemination activities – Highly appropriate target audience and method of delivery – Very high likelihood of successful delivery (change in behaviour, policy and practice) – Excellent use of funds essential for the activities ■ Implementation – Very high impact of the dissemination plan on the target audience – Clear plans for evaluation of change (where appropriate)	**Fundable**
9. Excellent - Significant potential to impact upon policy and practice	
■ Significance of Research Finding – Crucial contribution of scientific results to current practice or knowledge – Crucial medical or health condition to address – Excellent consideration of other relevant research (where appropriate) – Excellent understanding of the impact of findings for public health or on healthcare policy/practice ■ Dissemination – Very high need for wider dissemination beyond the scientific community – Excellent plans, with well justified dissemination activities – Highly appropriate target audience and method of delivery – Very high likelihood of successful delivery (change in behaviour, policy and practice) – Excellent use of funds essential for the activities ■ Implementation – Very high impact of the dissemination plan on the target audience – Clear plans for evaluation of change (where appropriate)	**Fundable**
8. Very High Quality – Significant potential to impact upon policy and practice	
■ Significance of Research Finding – Key contribution of scientific results to current practice or knowledge – Key medical or health condition to address – Very good consideration of other relevant research (where appropriate) – Very good understanding of the impact of findings for public health or on healthcare policy/practice	**Fundable**

■ Dissemination – Very high need for wider dissemination beyond the scientific community – Very good plans, with well justified dissemination activities – Highly appropriate target audience and method of delivery – Very high likelihood of successful delivery (change in behaviour, policy and practice) – Very good use of funds essential for the activities ■ Implementation – Very high impact of the dissemination plan on the target audience – Clear plans for evaluation of change (where appropriate)	
7. High Quality – Potential to impact upon policy and practice	
■ Significance of Research Finding – Key contribution of scientific results to current practice or knowledge – Key medical or health condition to address – Good consideration of other relevant research (where appropriate) – Very good understanding of the impact of findings for public health or on healthcare policy/practice ■ Dissemination – Very high need for wider dissemination beyond the scientific community – Very good plans, with well justified dissemination activities – Appropriate target audience and method of delivery – High likelihood of successful delivery (change in behaviour, policy and practice) – Very good use of funds essential for the activities ■ Implementation – High impact of the dissemination plan on the target audience – Clear plans for evaluation of change (where appropriate)	**Fundable**
6. Very Good Quality – Potential to impact upon policy and practice	
■ Significance of Research Finding – Worthwhile contribution of scientific results to current practice or knowledge – Worthwhile medical or health condition to address – Good consideration of other relevant research (where appropriate) – Good understanding of the impact of findings for public health or on healthcare policy/practice ■ Dissemination – High need for wider dissemination beyond the scientific community – Good plans, with adequately justified dissemination activities – Appropriate target audience and method of delivery – Likelihood of successful delivery (change in behaviour, policy and practice) – Good use of funds essential for the activities ■ Implementation – Good potential for impact of the dissemination plan on the target audience – Some plans for evaluation of change (where appropriate)	**Fundable**
5. Good Quality – Some Potential to impact upon policy and practice but not fully demonstrated	
■ Significance of Research Finding – Worthwhile contribution of scientific results to current practice or knowledge	**Not**

– Worthwhile medical or health condition to address – Some consideration of other relevant research (where appropriate) – Some understanding of the impact of findings for public health or on healthcare policy/practice ■ Dissemination – Moderate need for wider dissemination beyond the scientific community – Mostly good plans, with adequately justified dissemination activities – Adequate target audience and method of delivery – Likelihood of adequate delivery (change in behaviour, policy and practice) – Some proposed use of funds essential for the activities ■ Implementation – Some potential for impact of the dissemination plan on the target audience – Limited plans for evaluation of change (where appropriate)	**fundable**
4. Good quality with some weaknesses	
■ Significance of Research Finding – Contribution of scientific results to current practice or knowledge is potentially useful – Potentially useful medical or health condition to address – Limited consideration of other relevant research (where appropriate) – Some understanding of the impact of findings for public health or on healthcare policy/practice ■ Dissemination – Some need for wider dissemination beyond the scientific community – Mostly good plans, with some justification for dissemination activities – Some gaps in the target audience and method of delivery – Some potential for adequate delivery (change in behaviour, policy and practice) – Some proposed use of funds essential for the activities – Some gaps in the understanding or plans for delivery ■ Implementation – Some potential for impact of the dissemination plan on the target audience – Limited plans for evaluation of change (where appropriate)	**Not fundable**
3. Acceptable quality with major weaknesses	
■ Significance of Research Finding – Contribution of scientific results to current practice or knowledge is potentially useful – Potentially useful medical or health condition to address – Limited consideration of other relevant research (where appropriate) – Some understanding of the impact of findings for public health or on healthcare policy/practice ■ Dissemination – Some need for wider dissemination beyond the scientific community – Limited plans, with limited justification for dissemination activities – Considerable gaps in the target audience and method of delivery – Some potential for adequate delivery (change in behaviour, policy and practice) – Proposed use of funds not necessarily essential for the activities – Gaps in the understanding or plans for delivery ■ Implementation	**Not fundable**

– Some potential for impact of the dissemination plan on the target audience – Limited plans for evaluation of change (where appropriate)	
2. Poor quality – bordering on unacceptable	
■ Significance of Research Finding – Contribution of scientific results to current practice or knowledge is limited – Limited importance of medical or health condition being addressed – No consideration of other relevant research (where would have been appropriate) – Some understanding of the impact of findings for public health or on healthcare policy/practice ■ Dissemination – Limited need for wider dissemination beyond the scientific community – Inadequate plans, with little justification for dissemination activities – Extensive gaps in the target audience and method of delivery – Little potential for adequate delivery (change in behaviour, policy and practice) – Proposed use of funds not essential for the activities – Major gaps in the understanding or plans for delivery ■ Implementation – Little potential for impact of the dissemination plan on the target audience – Limited plans for evaluation of change (where appropriate)	**Not fundable**
1. Unacceptable quality	
■ Significance of Research Finding – Contribution of scientific results to current practice or knowledge is inappropriate – Inappropriate medical or health condition to address – No consideration of other relevant research (where would have been appropriate) – Limited understanding of the impact of findings for public health or on healthcare policy/practice ■ Dissemination – No need for wider dissemination beyond the scientific community – Inadequate plans, with no justification for dissemination activities – Extensive gaps in the target audience and method of delivery – No potential for adequate delivery (change in behaviour, policy and practice) – Proposed use of funds not essential for the activities – Major gaps in the understanding or plans for delivery ■ Implementation – Little potential for impact of the dissemination plan on the target audience – Plans for evaluation of change have major flaws	**Not fundable**
0. Ineligible for funding	
Unacceptable quality or has serious ethical concerns	**Not fundable**

Annex B: Climate-Conscious Travel Guidelines for Researchers

As part of the Foundation's commitment to reducing the carbon footprint of funded research, researchers are expected to consider the environmental impact of travel when preparing their budgets. The following guidelines are designed to help Principal Investigators and their teams cost their applications responsibly and in line with the Foundation's grant Terms and Conditions.

General Principles

- Remote collaboration should be the default for meetings, workshops, and stakeholder engagement, unless in-person attendance is essential for project delivery or impact.
- Researchers must ensure that travel decisions are justifiable, proportional, and documented, representing a reasonable use of charitable funds and following environmental sustainability principles.

Travel Planning and Costing

When travel is necessary, researchers should:

- Prioritise low-carbon travel options, such as train travel over flights, especially for domestic and short-haul journeys, and public transport over private vehicles.
- Consider group travel to reduce the number of individual trips.
- Include carbon offsetting costs in the budget, where applicable.

Example:

If a researcher chooses to travel from London to Edinburgh for to attend a conference, they should opt for a train rather than a flight, even if the train is more expensive.

Carbon Offsetting Requirements

Investigators must follow their Lead Research Organisation's (LRO) carbon offsetting policy, where one exists.

If the LRO does not have a policy, researchers must:

- Calculate the carbon footprint of their travel (e.g. using the ICAO Carbon Emissions Calculator).
- Select a recognised carbon offset provider.

Example:

A flight to attend an international conference may be unavoidable. In this case, the researcher should calculate the emissions and include offsetting costs in the budget or plan to vire funds from another heading.

Budgeting and Approval of Carbon Offsetting costs:

Carbon offsetting costs may be included in the budget at the point of application or covered by virement between grant headings.

Example:

If, during the course of an awarded grant, offsetting costs exceed the original budget due to a change in travel plans, the Principal Investigator (PI) should meet the additional charges by using underspend available in other budget headings on the award. The PI should then inform the Research Team of the amount to be vired between budget headings to cover these additional offsetting costs.

Environmentally Sustainable Consumables

Applicants may request funding for research consumables and materials that are environmentally sustainable, including those with a higher upfront cost, where there is a clear and demonstrable environmental benefit. This may include items that:

- Reduce plastic or hazardous waste
- Are biodegradable or recyclable
- Have lower carbon footprints in their production or transport
- Support circular economy principles (e.g. reusable labware)

Researchers should justify the environmental advantages of the proposed consumables in their application and how they align with the project's sustainability goals. The Foundation recognises that investing in greener alternatives may incur additional costs and encourages applicants to consider long-term value and impact. We also acknowledge that the use of sustainable consumables may not always be feasible where institutional procurement processes require ordering standard items in bulk or mandate preferred suppliers.

Example:

A researcher requests reusable glass vials instead of single-use plastic tubes at a higher cost as this change is expected to reduce plastic waste over the course of the project. Additionally, they outline how they will work with suppliers which offer bulk packaging to reduce transport emissions and packaging waste.