

Scoring Matrix for Expert Review Panel

Score Indicators	Fundable
10. Exceptional – Top international programme, or of exceptional national strategic importance	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Highly original and innovative – Novel methodology and design – Excellent potential for research leadership (excellent contribution to knowledge generation, engagement with wider research community, development of individuals) – Excellent research environment, collaborators amongst the best in a broad field – Excellent engagement and involvement plan with people with relevant lived/living experience ■ Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap – Potential for high health and/or socioeconomic impact – Internationally unique resource of value to many disciplines – Exceptionally meaningful and wide-reaching impact on people and communities affected by antimicrobial resistance ■ Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Potential for high return on investment – Very high likelihood of successful delivery (risks well managed) – Clearly resourced and feasible plan for involvement of people with lived/living experience ■ Other: Ethical and/or governance issues are fully considered <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Excellent consideration of safety, wellbeing, inclusion and accessibility of lived experience experts and participants 	Fundable
9. Excellent – Internationally competitive and leading edge in most areas	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Original and innovative – Novel methodology and design – Excellent potential for research leadership (excellent contribution to knowledge generation, engagement with wider research community, development of individuals) – Excellent research environment, collaborators amongst the best in a specialist field – Excellent engagement and involvement plan with people with relevant lived/living experience ■ Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap – Potential for high health and/or socioeconomic impact – Internationally significant resource of value to many disciplines – Meaningful and wide-reaching impact on people and communities affected by antimicrobial resistance ■ Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Potential for high return on investment – Very high likelihood of successful delivery (risks well managed) – Clearly resourced and feasible plan for involvement of people with 	Fundable

<p>lived/living experience</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Other: Ethical and/or governance issues are fully considered <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Excellent consideration of safety, wellbeing, inclusion and accessibility of lived experience experts and participants 	
8. Very High Quality – Internationally competitive and leading edge nationally	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Original and innovative – Robust methodology and design (innovative in parts) – Excellent potential for research leadership (excellent contribution to knowledge generation, engagement with wider research community, development of individuals) – Excellent research environment and collaborators – Very high quality engagement and involvement plan with people with relevant lived/living experience ■ Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap or area of strategic importance to the UK – Potential for high health and /or socioeconomic impact – Resource of value to many disciplines – Meaningful and significant impact on people and communities affected by antimicrobial resistance ■ Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Potential for significant return on investment – Very high likelihood of successful delivery (risks well-managed) – Clearly resourced and feasible plan for involvement of people with lived/living experience ■ Other: Ethical and/or governance issues are fully considered <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Very good consideration of safety, wellbeing, inclusion and accessibility of lived experience experts and participants 	Fundable
7. High Quality – Leading edge nationally and internationally competitive in parts	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Innovative – Robust methodology and design (innovative in parts) – Very good potential for research leadership (very good contribution to knowledge generation, engagement with wider research community, development of individuals) – Very good research environment and collaborators – High quality engagement and involvement plan with people with relevant lived/living experience ■ Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Key scientific question or knowledge gap or area of strategic importance to the UK – Potential for significant health and/or socioeconomic impact – Valuable scientific resource – Meaningful impact on people and communities affected by antimicrobial resistance ■ Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Potential for significant return on investment – High likelihood of successful delivery 	Fundable

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Mostly well resourced and feasible plan for involvement of people with lived/living experience ■ Other: Ethical and/or governance issues are well considered – Very good consideration of safety, wellbeing, inclusion and accessibility of lived experience experts and participants 	
6. High Quality – Leading edge nationally, but not yet internationally competitive	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Methodologically robust study – Good potential for research leadership (good contribution to knowledge generation, engagement with wider research community, development of individuals) – Good research environment and collaborators – Good engagement and involvement plan with people with relevant lived/living experience ■ Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Worthwhile scientific question or knowledge gap – Justifiable scientific resource – Potential for reasonable health and/or socioeconomic impact – Moderate impact on people and communities affected by antimicrobial resistance ■ Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resources appropriate to deliver the proposal – High likelihood of successful delivery – Adequately resourced and feasible plan for involvement of people with lived/living experience ■ Other: Ethical and/or governance issues are well considered <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Good consideration of safety, wellbeing, inclusion and accessibility of lived experience experts and participants 	Fundable
5. Good Quality – Nationally competitive	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Methodologically sound study but areas require significant revision – Research leadership potential not optimal (contribution to knowledge generation, engagement with wider research community, development of individuals) – Reasonable research environment, scope to strengthen team and/or collaborators – Poorly defined question – Largely good engagement and involvement plan with people with relevant lived/living experience ■ Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Worthwhile scientific question with potentially useful outcomes – Moderate likelihood of contributing to new knowledge generation – Some potential for impact on people and communities affected by antimicrobial resistance ■ Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resources broadly appropriate to deliver the proposal – Good likelihood of successful delivery – Some evidence of a resourced and feasible plan for involvement of people with lived/living experience ■ Other: Ethical and/or governance issues are adequately considered 	Not fundable

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Good consideration of safety, wellbeing, inclusion and accessibility of lived experience experts and participants 	
4. Potentially Useful – With significant weaknesses	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Methodologically weak study (approach or study design requires significant revision) – Research leadership potential not optimal (some contribution to knowledge generation, engagement with wider research community, development of individuals) – Research environment not optimal – Some indication of an engagement and involvement plan with people with relevant lived/living experience, but with significant limitations ■ Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Contains potentially useful ideas but requires major revision – Moderate likelihood of successful delivery – Limited potential for impact on people and communities affected by antimicrobial resistance ■ Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Resources inappropriate to deliver the proposal – Unlikely to significantly contribute to new knowledge generation – Some evidence of a resourced and feasible plan for involvement of people with lived/living experience, but with limitations ■ Other: Ethical and/or governance issues not adequately considered <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Some consideration of safety, wellbeing, inclusion and accessibility of lived experience experts and participants, but with significant omissions 	Not fundable
3. Potentially Useful – With major weaknesses	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Question poorly defined – Methodologically weak study – Poor leadership potential/environment – Poor evidence of an engagement and involvement plan with people with relevant lived/living experience. ■ Productivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Unlikely to contribute to new knowledge generation – Limited evidence of a resourced and feasible plan for involvement of people with lived/living experience ■ Other: Ethical and/or governance issues not adequately considered <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Limited consideration of safety, wellbeing, inclusion and accessibility of lived experience experts and participants, with major omissions 	Not fundable
2. Poor quality science, bordering on unacceptable	Not fundable
1. Unacceptable quality or has serious ethical concerns	Not fundable
0. Ineligible for funding	Not fundable
