

## Scoring Matrix for Expert Review Panel

Score Indicators	Fundable
<b>10. Exceptional – Top international programme, or of exceptional national strategic importance</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Scientific quality and impact               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap</li> <li>– Highly original and innovative methodology and design</li> <li>– Exceptional plans, with well justified activities</li> <li>– Exceptional prospect for good scientific progress in this award AND future applications</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Careers               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– High achiever at the appropriate level for the project</li> <li>– Exceptional opportunity for career advancement for lead applicant; career development actively supported by appropriate activities</li> <li>– Clearly demonstrates necessary expertise and skill set across the project</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Use of prize funds               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Excellent use of funds essential for the research</li> <li>– Very high likelihood of successful delivery</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Other: Ethical and/or governance issues are fully considered</li> </ul>	<b>Fundable</b>
<b>9. Excellent – Internationally competitive and leading edge in most areas</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Scientific quality and impact               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap</li> <li>– Innovative methodology and design</li> <li>– Excellent plans, with well justified activities</li> <li>– Excellent prospect for good scientific progress in this award AND future applications</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Careers               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– High achiever at the appropriate level for the project</li> <li>– Excellent opportunity for career advancement for lead applicant; career development actively supported by appropriate activities</li> <li>– Clearly demonstrates necessary expertise and skill set across the project</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Use of prize funds               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Excellent use of funds essential for the research</li> <li>– Very high likelihood of successful delivery</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Other: Ethical and/or governance issues are fully considered</li> </ul>	<b>Fundable</b>
<b>8. Very High Quality – Internationally competitive and leading edge nationally</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Scientific quality and impact               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Key scientific question or knowledge gap</li> <li>– Robust methodology and design</li> <li>– Very good plans, with well justified activities</li> <li>– Very good prospect for good scientific progress in this award or future applications</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Careers               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– High achiever at the appropriate level for the project</li> <li>– Very good opportunity for career advancement for lead applicant; career development actively supported by appropriate activities</li> <li>– Demonstrates necessary expertise and skill set across the project</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Use of prize funds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Very good use of funds essential for the research</li> <li>– High likelihood of successful delivery</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Other: Ethical and/or governance issues are fully considered</li> </ul>	<b>Fundable</b>
<b>7. High Quality – Leading edge nationally and internationally competitive in parts</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Scientific quality and impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Key scientific question or knowledge gap</li> <li>– Sound methodology and design</li> <li>– Very good plans, with well justified activities</li> <li>– Good prospect for good scientific progress in this award or future applications</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Careers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Potentially high achiever at the appropriate level for the project</li> <li>– Very good opportunity for career advancement for lead applicant; career development actively supported by appropriate activities</li> <li>– Demonstrates majority of necessary expertise and skill set across the project</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Use of prize funds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Excellent use of funds essential for the research</li> <li>– Very high likelihood of successful delivery</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Other: Ethical and/or governance issues are well considered</li> </ul>	<b>Fundable</b>
<b>6. High Quality – Leading edge nationally, but not yet internationally competitive</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Scientific quality and impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Worthwhile scientific question or knowledge gap</li> <li>– Sound methodology and design</li> <li>– Good plans, with well justified activities</li> <li>– Good prospect for good scientific progress in this award or future applications</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Careers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Potentially high achiever at the appropriate level for the project</li> <li>– Some evidence of opportunity for career advancement for lead applicant; career development supported by appropriate activities</li> <li>– Demonstrates majority of necessary expertise and skill set across the project</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Use of prize funds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Good use of funds essential for the research</li> <li>– Good likelihood of successful delivery</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Other: Ethical and/or governance issues are well considered</li> </ul>	<b>Fundable</b>

<b>5. Good Quality – Nationally competitive</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Scientific quality and impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Worthwhile scientific question or knowledge gap</li> <li>– Some minor methodological or design flaws</li> <li>– Some good justification of activities</li> <li>– Some prospect for good scientific progress in this award or future applications</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Careers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Achievements at the appropriate level for the project</li> <li>– Limited opportunities for career advancement for lead applicant; career development may be supported by appropriate activities</li> <li>– Demonstrates some of necessary expertise and skill set across the project</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Use of prize funds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Most funds essential for the research</li> <li>– Likelihood of adequate delivery</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Other: Ethical and/or governance issues are adequately considered</li> </ul>	<b>Not fundable</b>
<b>4. Potentially Useful – With significant weaknesses</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Scientific quality and impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Scientific question or knowledge gap potentially useful but requires re-evaluation</li> <li>– Some methodological or design flaws</li> <li>– Some justification of activities</li> <li>– Some prospect for good scientific progress in this award or future applications</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Careers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Achievements not at the appropriate level for the project or not yet fully demonstrated</li> <li>– Limited opportunities for career advancement for lead applicant; career development not supported by appropriate activities</li> <li>– Gaps in necessary expertise and skills sets</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Use of prize funds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Proposed use of funds not necessarily essential for the research</li> <li>– Some potential for adequate delivery</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Other: Ethical and/or governance issues are not adequately considered</li> </ul>	<b>Not fundable</b>
<b>3. Potentially Useful – With major weaknesses</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Scientific quality and impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Question poorly defined</li> <li>– Methodologically weak study</li> <li>– Little prospect for scientific progress</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Careers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Limited opportunities for career advancement for lead applicant; career development not supported by appropriate activities</li> <li>– Gaps in necessary expertise and skills sets</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Use of prize funds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Proposed use of funds not essential for the research</li> <li>– Limited potential for adequate delivery</li> </ul> </li> <li>■ Other: Ethical and/or governance issues are poorly considered</li> </ul>	<b>Not fundable</b>

<b>2. Poor quality science, bordering on unacceptable</b>	<b>Not fundable</b>
<b>1. Unacceptable quality or has serious ethical concerns</b>	<b>Not fundable</b>
<b>0. Ineligible for funding</b>	<b>Not fundable</b>

---