Australian Government
National Health and Medical Research Council

CLINICAL TRIALS AND COHORT STUDY GRANTS 2019 GUIDE TO APPLICANTS ON PREPARING AN APPLICATION

Contents

1. Introduction *2*

2. Profile requirements *2*

2.1 Career Disruption (within the last 5 years) 2

2.2 Relative to Opportunity (within the last 5 years) 3

2.3 Publications 3

2.4 Minimum data requirements 4

2.5 Peer Review Area(s) 4

3. Addressing the assessment criteria *4*

3.1 Grant Proposal 4

4. Proposed Budget *6*

4.1 Personnel 6

4.2 Direct Research Costs 7

4.3 Research Facilities 7

4.4 Equipment 7

5. Funding partners and strategic priorities *7*

5.1 Electromagnetic Energy Research 7

5.2 Funding Partner Organisations 8

6. Attachments *8*

Attachment A – Clinical Trials and Cohort Studies Grants 2019 Category Descriptors *9*

1. INTRODUCTION

The objective of the Clinical Trials and Cohort Studies (CTCS) Grants 2019 opportunity is to support high-quality clinical trials and cohort studies that address important gaps in knowledge, leading to relevant and implementable findings for the benefit of human health.

The desired outcomes are improvements in health and well-being, health care practice or policy, as a result of:

- high-quality clinical trials that provide reliable evidence of the effects of health-related interventions on health outcomes (or appropriate surrogates), and/or
- high-quality cohort studies that provide reliable evidence on the relation of important risk factors and other exposures to health-related outcomes.

The CTCS Peer Review Guidelines will be available in 2019, when the scheme opens.

This grant opportunity is open to research proposals for clinical trials or cohort studies. Research proposals may be for a large or small clinical trial or cohort study, and may involve a new or established cohort. Applicants should consider the requirements in the *Clinical Trials and Cohort Studies Grants 2019 Guidelines*, including the objective and desired outcomes of the grant opportunity, the assessment criteria and the category descriptors, in deciding whether it best fits their proposed research. Only applications that will deliver against the objectives and outcomes will be competitive for funding.

Some resources that may assist you in considering applying for a clinical trial or cohort study grant include:

- 2011 WHO International Standards for Clinical Trial Registries. Available at http://www.who.int/topics/clinical_trials/en/. Accessed 25 Jul 2018.
- Chan A-W, Tetzlaff JM, Gøtzsche PC, Altman DG, Man H et al. SPIRIT 2013 explanation and elaboration: guidance for protocols of clinical trials. BMJ 2013; 346:e7586. Available at http://www.bmj.com/content/346/bmj.e7586. Accessed 25 Jul 2018.
- 2007 Strengthening the reporting of observational studies in epidemiology (STROBE) checklist for cohort, case-control, and cross-sectional studies (combined), Version 4, published in Oct/Nov 2007. Available at: http://www.strobe-statement.org/index.php?id=available-checklists. Accessed 25 Jul 2018.
- Porta M (ed). A Dictionary of Epidemiology. 6th Edition. Oxford University Press: Oxford: 2014.

2. PROFILE REQUIREMENTS

Instructions for entering CV information in NHMRC's granting system will be provided. Within an applicant's profile in NHMRC's granting system, there is mandatory information that will need to be completed and/or updated prior to submitting an application.

Applicants are also required to complete the sections outlined below. Should more information be entered than is required, only the required information will be imported into the application.

It is important that relevant profile information is up to date at the time of application submission as it is imported into the application and used by peer reviewers. Any changes made to the profile after Chief Investigator A (CIA) certification will not appear in the submitted application.

2.1 Career Disruption (within the last 5 years)

Guidance on what constitutes a career disruption and how it is considered is provided in Appendix B (NHMRC Relative to Opportunity Policy) of the *Clinical Trials and Cohort Studies Grants 2019 Guidelines*.

NHMRC is committed to ensuring that every applicant is treated fairly, and this means that it recognises some applicants will have had career disruptions that should be considered when evaluating their track record. A career disruption is defined as a prolonged interruption to an applicant's capacity to work due to pregnancy, major illness/injury and/or carer responsibilities.

The period of career disruption may be used to determine an applicant's eligibility for a grant opportunity or to allow additional track record information to be considered during assessment. See also relative to opportunity below. Relative to opportunity circumstances are not considered career disruptions.

If applicable, applicants should use this opportunity to declare any career disruptions that may be relevant to their career history. Declarations should include:

2.1.1 Impact (Maximum of 2000 characters including spaces and line breaks):

Applicants are required to provide a brief explanation of the impact the career disruption/s has/have had on their research and research achievements and associated productivity relative to stage of career. Applicants should not describe the nature of the career description in this explanation. Note that this information will be provided to peer reviewers.

2.1.2 Additional research outputs (Maximum of 2000 characters including spaces and line breaks):

Applicants are required to provide details of additional research outputs (those that occurred in the relevant preceding years) that they want the reviewers to consider when assessing the application. If applicable, indicate any national or international conferences where you were invited to give a major presentation, or other significant invitations (e.g., to join an editorial board of a major journal, or write a major review), and were not able to do so because of considerations associated with the career disruption.

2.1.3 Dates:

Applicants are required to nominate the periods (approximate dates) when they have had a disruption.

2.2 Relative to Opportunity (within the last 5 years)

Guidance on what constitutes 'Relative to Opportunity' is provided in Appendix B (NHMRC Relative to Opportunity Policy) of the *Clinical Trials and Cohort Studies Grants 2019 Guidelines*.

If applicable, the applicant should use this section to provide details of any relative to opportunity considerations and the effect they have had on their research and research achievements.

2.2.1 Circumstance (maximum of 200 characters including spaces and line breaks)

Provide a brief explanation of the type of relative to opportunity circumstance.

2.2.2 Impact (maximum of 1500 characters including spaces and line breaks)

Provide a brief explanation of the impact this has had on their research, research achievements and associated productivity relative to career stage.

2.2.3 Date

Nominate the periods where you have had a disruption (approximate dates).

2.3 Publications

Publication information must be uploaded to NHMRC's granting system. Further details on how to upload publications will be provided.

NHMRC accepts nine types of publication: Journal Articles (Original Research), Journal Articles (Review), Books/Chapters, Research Report – commissioned by Government, industry or other, Technical Report, Text Book, Accepted for Publication, Editorials and Letters to the Editor.

2.4 Minimum data requirements

Minimum data must be entered in NHMRC's granting system by the specified due date to allow NHMRC to start identifying suitable peer reviewers. Applications that fail to satisfy this requirement will not be accepted. Applicants must complete the required fields with correct information. Using placeholder text such as "text", "synopsis" or "xx" etc. is not acceptable as minimum data.

The required minimum data to be provided for the CTCS Grants 2019 opportunity will be communicated when the grant opportunity is published on Grant Connect. Minimum data is expected to include application information (such as Administering Institution, title, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander research, synopsis, research classification and peer review area(s)).

Failure to meet this deadline will result in the application not proceeding.

Research Administration Officers are not required to certify applications for the purpose of minimum data. Applications should only be certified once complete and ready for submission.

2.5 Peer Review Area(s)

The Clinical Trials and Cohort Studies scheme is open to research proposals for clinical trials and/or cohort studies that address important gaps in knowledge, leading to relevant and implementable findings for the benefit of human health. Applicants must identify in their application whether it is for a clinical trial and/or cohort study. Applicants will need to nominate the peer review area(s) most relevant to their application. This nomination will be used to determine a suitable Grant Review Panel (GRP) to review the application.

3. ADDRESSING THE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Applications for Clinical Trials and Cohort Studies Grants will be assessed by peer reviewers against the assessment criteria set out in Section 6 of the *Clinical Trials and Cohort Studies Grants 2019 Guidelines*. Peer reviewers will use information provided in the grant proposal to assess applications against the assessment criteria.

3.1 Grant Proposal

Your grant proposal is a key source of information for assessors and must comprise the following:

Section	**Page Limit**
A. Research proposal	9 pages
B. References	2 pages
C. Milestones and Performance Indicators	2 pages
D. Team Quality and Capability	1 page
E. Chief Investigator Capability and Achievement	2 pages per CI
F. Indigenous Research Excellence Criteria (if applicable)	2 pages

A pre-formatted Microsoft Word template for the grant proposal will be provided. Applicants must use this template to complete their grant proposal. Applicants will upload their grant proposal into NHMRC's granting system as a PDF file.

Naming, size and formatting requirements apply, including:

Component	**Component Requirements**
File format	The research proposal must be saved and uploaded as a Portable Document Format (PDF) file
File size	The PDF file MUST NOT exceed 2MB in size
Page size	A4
Header	Application ID and Applicant surname must be included in the header
Footer	Page number must be included in the footer
Font	NHMRC recommends a minimum of 12 point Times New Roman font. Applicants must ensure the font is readable

Line spacing	Single
Language	English

Applications that fail to comply with the formatting requirements or the specified page limits may be excluded from consideration. Applicants and RAOs are advised to retain a copy of the PDF file.

You should consider the assessment criteria used to evaluate applications (provided in Section 6 of the *Clinical Trials and Cohort Studies Grants 2019 Guidelines*) and the Category Descriptors in relation to each of the assessment criteria (provided at Attachment A of this guide to applicants).

A. Research Proposal – 9 pages

This section (A) and Section C (Milestones and Performance Indicators) should address the following assessment criteria:

- Significance (40% of overall score)
- Research Quality (40% of overall score).

The research proposal should include the following components:

- Aims: describe the specific aims of the project, including a clear statement of hypotheses to be tested
- Background: provide a rationale for the project
- Research plan: outline the research plan in detail
- Timeline: provide a detailed timeline for the expected outcomes of the research proposal along with justification for the duration requested
- Outcome and significance: describe the importance of the problem to be researched, the planned outcome of the research plan, and the potential significance of the research.

Your research proposal should be written in English and provide enough information so that the research approach can be assessed by the reviewers. All scientific information relating to your application must be contained in this section. This is assessed by experts in the field and you should include any pilot or feasibility study data supporting the planned research.

References cited in this document are to be listed in the separate references section (see below).

B. References – 2 pages

Provide a list of references cited in the application. References must:

- be listed in an appropriate standard journal format. NHMRC prefers the Author-date (also known as the Harvard) system, Documentary-note and the Vancouver Systems list authors in the order in which they appear in PubMed
- only include references to cited work
- be written in English.

C. Milestones and Performance Indicators – 2 pages

Provide a table of milestones and performance indicators with corresponding dates. The approach should be specific to the proposed research and provide for effective monitoring of progress at twelve month intervals. You are encouraged to include recruitment targets and receipt of ethics approval. Please justify your approach.

D. Team Quality and Capability – 1 page

This section (D) and the following section (E) should address the assessment criterion: Team Quality and Capability (20% of overall score). Provide a summary of the research team's quality and capability. Applicants should detail the following

- the expertise and productivity of team members relevant to the proposed project
- their influence in this specific field of research
- how the team will work together to achieve the project aims
- how junior members are contributing to the proposed research and the overall team quality and capability.

E. Chief Investigator Capability and Achievement – 2 pages per CI

Chief Investigators should use this section to highlight their research achievements. This section has two components:

Overall track record in the last 5 years

Applicants should use this section to identify aspects of their track record that are in addition to their publication record. The following areas may be relevant:

- career summary including qualifications, employment and appointment history
- collaborations
- community engagement and involvement
- contribution to the field of research, including the translation of research into health commercial outcomes, such as patents, including whether licensed (when, to whom and whether current) (see NHMRC's Guide to Evaluating Industry-Relevant Experience at https://nhmrc.gov.au/about-us/publications/guide-evaluating-industry-relevant-experience)
- international standing including invitations to speak and committee memberships
- peer review (e.g. for granting bodies, journals/editorial roles)
- research support including grants and fellowships
- professional activities (e.g. committees, conference organisation/participation)
- supervision and mentoring.

Top 5 publications in the last 5 years

Applicants are asked to list their top 5 publications in the last 5 years, taking into account career disruption. Please provide reasons why these publications have been selected.

Please not that, in accordance with the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment, NHMRC has eliminated the use of Journal Impact Factors and 'Excellence in Research Australia' metrics in the assessment of applications.

F. Indigenous Research Excellence Criteria (where applicable) – 2 pages

If at least 20% of the research effort relates to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health, the application will also be assessed against the *NHMRC Indigenous Research Excellence Criteria*:

- Community engagement
- Benefit
- Sustainability and transferability
- Building capability.

These criteria are set out in section 6.1 of the *Clinical Trials and Cohort Studies Grants 2019 Guidelines* and further details are provided in the Category Descriptors at attachment A of this *Guide to Applicants*. Applicants should ensure that they address each Indigenous Research Excellence Criterion and demonstrate what proportion of the research effort will be directed to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health.

4. PROPOSED BUDGET

Applicants must enter details of the proposed research budget into NHMRC's granting system. Applicants are required to justify the budget requested for each year of the proposed research in order to demonstrate value for money. Poorly justified items may be reduced or removed.

Grant funds can only be used to pay costs that arise directly from the research activities (refer to Section 5 and Appendix C of the *Clinical Trials and Cohort Studies Grants 2019 Guidelines* for what the grant money can be used for).

4.1 Personnel

Salary contributions for research staff (Chief Investigators, Professional Research Persons and Technical Support Staff) are provided as Personnel Support Packages (PSPs). The level of PSP requested in an application must match the roles and responsibilities of the position and the percentage of the PSP requested must reflect the required time commitment. Applicants must fully

justify all requests for PSPs.

Applicants can only draw one salary from one NHMRC grant/award. Further information about PSPs, including the levels, is available on the NHMRC website.

4.2 Direct Research Costs

Please refer to the NHMRC Direct Research Cost Guidelines at Appendix C of the *Clinical Trials and Cohort Studies Grants 2019 Guidelines*.

For each item requested you must provide:

- the item type
- the name/description of the item
- the total value of the item requested for each year
- a justification for the particular item requested.

This information must be aligned with the proposed aims of the study, be detailed on a yearly basis and be fully justified (including, in the case of equipment, why the equipment cannot be provided by the institution).

4.3 Research Facilities

Applicants may request funding for services from research facilities required to undertake the research proposal. These research facilities may include but are not limited to: biospecimens or data from biobanks, pathology services, the Australian Twin Registry, Cell Bank Australia, the Trans-Tasman Radio Oncology Group and other organisations that provide clinical trials services.

Applicants will need to consult with research facilities to ensure that the services they require can be provided and that the charges included in the budget are accurately reflected. Letters from research facilities confirming their collaboration must be provided.

4.4 Equipment

Applicants can request funding to pay for equipment costing over $10,000 that is essential to the research. The total equipment requested cannot exceed $80,000. Individual items of equipment costing less than $10,000 must be requested within DRCs (see above).

Applicants must clearly outline the total value of all items of equipment for each year, why the equipment is required for the proposed research and why the equipment cannot be provided by the institution.

For each item of equipment requested, a written quotation must be received and held with the RAO of the Administering Institution, to be available to NHMRC on request. The Administering Institution must be prepared to meet all service and repair costs for equipment funded.

Funds will not be provided for the purchase of computers except where these are an integral component of a piece of laboratory equipment or are of a nature essential for work in the research field, for example, a computer which is dedicated to data collection from a mass spectrometer, or used for the manipulation of extensively large datasets (i.e. requiring special hardware).

5. FUNDING PARTNERS AND STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

Appendix A of the *Clinical Trials and Cohort Studies Grants 2019 Guidelines* provides information about the NHMRC strategic priorities, the Clinical Trials and Cohort Studies Grants 2019 Opportunity priorities and funding partner organisations.

5.1 Electromagnetic Energy Research

Applicants may apply for Electromagnetic Energy (EME) funding and will be required to provide a statement justifying consideration of their application (see Appendix A to the *Clinical Trials and Cohort*

Studies Grants 2019 Guidelines).

Justification (maximum of **2000 characters** including spaces and line breaks).

Applicants will need to:

- justify how their project will investigate the effects of radio frequency (RF) EME on human health
- provide a description of both the RF exposure (such as frequency range and source of the exposure) and the health effect that is being investigated
- provide a detailed justification of how their application aligns with the research agenda for RF EME and health outlined in the 2017 Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency (ARPANSA) Technical Report, *Radiofrequency Electromagnetic Energy and Health: Research Needs.*

5.2 Funding Partner Organisations

Applicants may be able to seek funding from funding partners in addition to NHMRC funding. Details of the funding partners participating in the Clinical Trials and Cohort Studies Grants 2019 opportunity will be provided in NHMRC's granting system.

Applicants seeking funding from a funding partner should be aware of any additional application requirements.

6. ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Clinical Trials and Cohort Studies Grants 2019 Category Descriptors

Attachment A – Clinical Trials and Cohort Studies Grants 2019 Category Descriptors

The following category descriptors are used as a guide to scoring an application against each of the assessment criteria.

While the category descriptors provide peer reviewers with some benchmarks for appropriately scoring each application, it is not essential that all descriptors relating to a given score are met.

The category descriptors are a "best fit" outcome. Peer reviewers will consistently refer to these category descriptors to ensure thorough, equitable and transparent assessment of applications.

Assessing Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Contributions

To assist in assessing Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health research applications, the criteria for Indigenous health research have been integrated in the table below. This is to be used as a guide only.

Significance (40%)

SCORE						
7	**6**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
The proposed clinical trial and/or cohort study: • will comprehensively and convincingly address the objective of this grant opportunity and will deliver against the desired outcomes • is informed by an exemplary analysis or review of existing and ongoing studies in the field • was developed with broad and meaningful involvement of research end-users to ensure it meets their needs • if successful, will have very significant research impacts	The proposed clinical trial and/or cohort study: • will strongly address the objective of this grant opportunity and will deliver against desired outcomes • is informed by a thorough analysis or review of existing and ongoing studies in the field • was developed with meaningful involvement of research end-users to ensure it meets their needs • if successful, will have significant research impacts	The proposed clinical trial and/or cohort study: • will address the objective of this grant opportunity with only minor concerns and deliver relevant desired outcomes • is informed by a good analysis or review of relevant existing and ongoing studies in the field, with only minor concerns with respect to the analysis • had research end-user involvement in a number of key aspects of the design • if successful, will have appreciable research impacts	The proposed clinical trial and/or cohort study: • will partially address the objective of the grant opportunity and deliver desired outcomes of some relevance • there are several minor concerns about the analysis or review of existing and ongoing studies which informs the research • had research end-user involvement in a number of aspects of the design • if successful, may have moderate research impacts	The proposed clinical trial and/or cohort study: • will not convincingly address the objective of this grant opportunity or is unclear in its approach to doing so • there are significant or major concerns about the analysis or review of existing and ongoing studies which informs the research • had limited research end-user involvement in the design • if successful, it is unlikely to have anything other than minor research impact	The proposed clinical trial and/or cohort study: • will not address the objective of this grant opportunity or is unclear in its approach to doing so • is informed by a very limited analysis or review of existing and ongoing studies in the field • had minimal research end-user involvement in limited aspects of the design	The proposed clinical trial and/or cohort study: • will not address any of the objectives of this grant opportunity • is informed by a poor analysis or review of existing and ongoing studies in the field and therefore will not translate into outcomes that improve treatment of a medical condition or improve health outcomes

SCORE						
7	**6**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Significance of the grant outcomes: Indigenous criteria						
Sustainability and transferability ● The outcomes of the study will definitely lead to major and effective health gains for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, beyond the life of the project ● The outcomes of the study will have a very high impact on health services delivery or other community priorities. **Benefit** ● The outcomes of the study will have a very significant health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.	**Sustainability and transferability** ● The outcomes of the study will lead to considerable and effective health gains for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, beyond the life of the project ● The outcomes of the study will have a high impact on health services delivery or other community priorities. **Benefit** ● The outcomes of the study will have a significant health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.	**Sustainability and transferability** ● The outcomes of the study will lead to effective health gains for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, beyond the life of the project ● The outcomes of the study will have an impact on health services delivery or other community priorities. **Benefit** ● The outcomes of the study will have some health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.	**Sustainability and transferability** ● The outcomes of the study may lead to effective health gains for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, beyond the life of the project ● The outcomes of the study may have an impact on health services delivery or other community priorities. **Benefit** ● The outcomes of the study may have some health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.	**Sustainability and transferability** ● The outcomes of the study may lead to limited or short- term health gains for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples ● The outcomes of the study may have a moderate impact on health services delivery or other community priorities. **Benefit** ● The outcomes of the study are likely to have a minimal health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.	**Sustainability and transferability** ● The outcomes of the study are unlikely to lead to any health gains for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples ● The outcomes of the study are unlikely to have any impact on health services delivery or other community priorities. **Benefit** ● The outcomes of the study are likely to have little or no health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.	**Sustainability and transferability** ● The outcomes of the study will not lead to any health gains for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples ● The outcomes of the study will not have any impact on health services delivery or other community priorities. **Benefit** ● The outcomes of the study will have no health benefit for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

Research Quality (40%)

SCORE						
7	**6**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
The proposed clinical trial and/or cohort study: • has a near flawless design and research methodologies appropriate to the research question • is comparable with the best international research in the field • is highly feasible with all of the required techniques and resources established • includes highly appropriate research end-user involvement • includes highly effective milestones and performance indicators	The proposed clinical trial and/or cohort study: • has a strong, well defined and coherent design and research methodologies appropriate to the research question • is comparable with strong proposals in the field internationally • is feasible with required techniques and resources established • includes appropriate research end-user involvement • includes effective milestones and performance indicators	The proposed clinical trial and/or cohort study: • is generally clear in its research methodology, logical and appropriate to the research question • raises only very few minor concerns with respect to the study design • is feasible in almost all areas: required techniques and resources established or nearly established • may not be highly competitive with similar research proposals internationally • includes some appropriate research end-user involvement • raises a few very minor concerns about the appropriateness of milestones and performance indicators	The proposed clinical trial and/or cohort study: • is generally solid in design and is appropriate to the research question, but may not always be clear in its intent and focus • raises several minor concerns regarding the study design and research methodologies • raises doubts about feasibility in a number of areas • is not likely to be competitive with similar research proposals internationally • includes constructive research end-user involvement but with limited scope • raises minor concerns about the appropriateness of milestones and performance indicators	The proposed clinical trial and/or cohort study: • is somewhat unclear in its design • is not appropriate to the research question or contains some major design or methodological flaws • raises major concerns about the feasibility and thus the likelihood of successful completion • includes minimal, tokenistic research end-user involvement • raises significant concerns about the appropriateness of milestones and performance indicators	The proposed clinical trial and/or cohort study: • is unclear in its design • contains several major flaws in study design and research methodologies • raises several major concerns about the feasibility and thus the likelihood of successful completion	The proposed clinical trial and/or cohort study: • has a poorly developed research proposal which does not seem to be feasible and is unlikely to be successfully completed
Research quality: Indigenous criteria						
Community Engagement The proposal has a research plan that: • has outstanding levels of community engagement, ensuring that the proposal is highly feasible • demonstrates how the research and potential outcomes are a priority for the community to an outstanding degree.	**Community Engagement** The proposal has a research plan that: • has excellent levels of community engagement, ensuring that the proposal is feasible • demonstrates how the research and potential outcomes are a priority for the community to an excellent degree.	**Community Engagement** The proposal has a research plan that: • has very good levels of community engagement, ensuring that the proposal is likely to be feasible • clearly demonstrates how the research and potential outcomes are a priority for the community.	**Community Engagement** The proposal has a research plan that: • has good levels of community engagement • raises some concerns that the proposal is feasible • demonstrates how the research and potential outcomes are a priority for the community.	**Community Engagement** The proposal: • has limited community engagement • raises several concerns whether the proposal is feasible and achievable.	**Community Engagement** The proposal: • has little or no community engagement • is unlikely to be feasible and achievable.	**Community Engagement** The proposal: • has no community engagement • will not be feasible.

Team Quality and Capability (20%)

SCORE						
7	**6**	**5**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**
Relative to opportunity, the Chief Investigators (CIs): • have a high level of expertise and experience in all aspects of the proposed research • have over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement that is outstanding by international standards commensurate with their field of research (research achievement, quality and productivity) • have outstanding national and international reputations in clinical trial or cohort study methodology and relevant research fields • may include junior members who are strong contributors to overall team capability	Relative to opportunity, the CIs: • have expertise and experience that is highly relevant to the proposed research • have over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement that is excellent by international standards commensurate with their field of research (research achievement, quality and productivity) • have excellent national and/or international reputations in clinical trial or cohort study methodology and relevant research fields • may include junior members who contribute to overall team capability	Relative to opportunity: • there are only minor concerns about the CIs' level of expertise and experience required to undertake the proposed research • the CIs have over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement that is well above average by international standards commensurate with their field of research (research achievement, quality and productivity) • the CIs have very good national and/or international reputations in clinical trial or cohort study methodology and relevant research fields • the CIs may include junior members who have the potential to add to the team capability	Relative to opportunity: • there are significant concerns about the CIs' level of expertise and experience required to undertake the proposed research • the CIs have over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement that is average by international standards commensurate with their field of research (research achievement, quality and productivity) • the CIs have good national and/or international reputations in clinical trial or cohort study methodology and the relevant research fields • the CIs may include junior members who have the potential to add to the team capability, but there is little evidence of a mentoring framework	Relative to opportunity, the CIs: • have made contributions to the field of research but there are significant concerns regarding the depth and breadth of relevant expertise of the team • have over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement (research achievement, quality and productivity), that places them at an average level for their peers/cohort • have made limited progress towards research achievements warranting national or international recognition.	Relative to opportunity, the CIs: • are deficient in some areas of expertise required to successfully complete the proposed research • have published only a few works in relevant fields of research • are not well recognised nationally or internationally for their achievements in the relevant research fields.	Relative to opportunity, the CIs: • are deficient in the relevant expertise required to successfully complete the proposed research • are not productive to any significant extent in relevant fields of research • are not well recognised nationally or internationally for their achievements in the relevant research fields.

SCORE						
7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Team quality and capability: Indigenous criteria						
Building capability • The team has an outstanding track record in working with communities and building capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples • The proposal will build outstanding capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples	**Building capability** • The team has an excellent track record in working with communities and building capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples • The proposal will build excellent capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.	**Building capability** • The team has a very good track record in working with communities and building capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples • The proposal will build very good capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.	**Building capability** • The team has a good track record in working with communities and building capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples • The proposal may build good capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.	**Building capability** • The team has a marginal track record in working with communities and building capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples • The proposal may build minimal capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.	**Building capability** • The team has an unsatisfactory track record in working with communities and building capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples • The proposal is unlikely to build capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.	**Building capability** • The team has a poor track record in working with communities and building capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples • The proposal will not build capability among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples