

This assessment scale will be used by expert reviewers to assess applications and inform recommendations in Round 5 of the National Blood Sector Research and Development Program. Applications will need to achieve a score of 4 (Good) or more in each of the four criteria to be considered for shortlisting.

Criteria	Information Source	Evaluation Criteria	Poor = 1	Unsatisfactory = 2	Marginal = 3	Good = 4	Very Good = 5	Excellent = 6	Outstanding = 7
Criterion 1 Research focus and Potential Value	Section C Application	Addresses Priority area and Impact on patient outcomes or policy	Does not address any of the priority areas and will have no impact on patient outcomes, product use and/or policy.	Addresses a priority area however, the proposal raises several concerns about how the proposed research will impact on patient outcomes, product use and/or policy.	Addresses a priority area and is likely to have a minor impact on patient outcomes, product use and/or policy.	Addresses a priority area and is likely to have a moderate impact on patient outcomes, product use and/or policy.	Addresses a priority area and is likely to have a significant impact on patient outcomes, product use and/or policy.	Addresses a critical priority area and is likely to have a highly significant impact on patient outcomes, product use and/or policy.	Addresses a critical priority area and will result in an exceptional/outstanding impact on patient outcomes, product use and/or policy with international implications
Criterion 2 Quality	Section C Application and Team Member Biographies	Study Design	Poor quality and has many flaws. Is not clearly articulated and viability has substantial uncertainty. Unlikely to address the question or add to current knowledge.	Unsatisfactory quality and has multiple major flaws. Is articulated but uncertainty remains as to feasibility and objective, and whether the proposal will address the question and add to current knowledge.	Marginal quality and has multiple major weaknesses. Is uncertain in its scientific approach and there is uncertainty on how the research will add to current knowledge.	Good quality. Research plan is described and appears feasible with defined objectives. Likely to answer the question and add to current knowledge but some questions remain regarding study design.	Very good quality. Research plan is clearly articulated, feasible plan with well-defined objectives and outcomes that will most likely answer the question and add to current knowledge. Likely to be achieved within the timeframe. Only minor questions remain.	Excellent quality Is clearly articulated highly feasible plan with well-defined objectives and outcomes that will definitely answer the question and add significantly to current knowledge. Highly likely to be achieved within the timeframe. No outstanding questions remain.	Outstanding quality and is Flawless and if successful will change the direction of the field or will have very significant impact on clinical practice and policy within Australia and Internationally. Is clearly articulated highly feasible plan with well-defined and strongly developed objectives.
		Research Institution and Team	<p>Research Team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant deficiencies in the required areas of expertise. Insignificant relevant grants and publications history. <p>Project Management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager not identified Project management and risks not addressed No plan <p>For Scholarship grants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inexperienced supervisor Highly significant concerns with referee report 	<p>Research Team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is deficient in most areas of required expertise. Limited relevant grants and publications history. <p>Project Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager identified but has very limited experience Project management and risks addressed in part only with major concerns Plan is unclear and has significant concerns. <p>For Scholarship grants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supervisor has very limited experience Significant concerns with referee report 	<p>Research Team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proficiency in some required areas of expertise but concerning deficiencies remain Some relevant grants and publications history. <p>Project Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager identified and has some experience Project management and risks addressed but concerning deficiencies remain Plan is clear but has concerning deficiencies <p>For Scholarship grants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supervisor has some experience Some concerns with referee report 	<p>Research Team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proficiency in most required areas. Has had good success in grants and publication history. Emerging recognition in Australia. <p>Project Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager identified and has good experience Project management and risks addressed mostly. Plan is clear <p>For Scholarship grants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supervisor has good experience Good referee report 	<p>Research Team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proficiency in all areas of required expertise but minor concerns remain. Has had excellent and consistent success in grant and publication history. Recognised internationally. <p>Project Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager identified and has relevant experience. Project management and risks addressed but some minor concerns remain. Plan is clear but has some minor concerns. <p>For Scholarship grants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supervisor has relevant experience Some minor concerns with referee report 	<p>Research Team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly proficient in all areas of required expertise. Has had outstanding and consistent success in grant and publication history. Recognised internationally. <p>Project Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project manager has been identified and has significant experience. Project management and risks addressed with a clear reporting and management structure. Plan is clear but has some insignificant concerns. <p>For Scholarship grants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supervisor has significant experience Insignificant concerns with referee report 	<p>Research Team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly proficient in all areas of required expertise and specifically targets the proposed research. Has had exceptional success grant and publication history. Recognised as world leader/s in their field. <p>Project Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Project manager has been identified and has highly significant experience. Project management and risks have been addressed with a highly developed reporting and management structure. Plan is clear and has no concerns. <p>For Scholarship grants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supervisor has highly significant experience No concerns with referee report

Criteria	Information Source	Evaluation Criteria	Poor = 1	Unsatisfactory = 2	Marginal = 3	Good = 4	Very Good = 5	Excellent = 6	Outstanding = 7
Criterion 3 Governance and Ethics	Section C Application	Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research oversight and reporting not described or there are significant deficiencies. Data management not described/significant deficiencies Financial governance not described/significant deficiencies COIs not provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research oversight and reporting described but there are major concerns Data management described but there are major concerns Financial governance described but there are major concerns COIs provided, but there are major concerns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research oversight and reporting described but there are significant concerns Data management described but there are significant concerns Financial governance described but there are significant concerns COIs provided, but there are significant concerns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research oversight and reporting described and appears appropriate. Data management described and appears appropriate. Financial governance described and appears appropriate. COIs provided, and appears appropriate. Some questions remain 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research oversight and reporting is strong and appropriate. Data management described is strong and appropriate. Financial governance described and is strong and appropriate. COIs provided, and strong and appropriate. Some minor questions remain 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research oversight and reporting described in detail and provides a strong sense of confidence. Data management described in detail and engenders a strong sense of confidence. Financial governance described in detail engenders a strong sense of confidence COIs provided and demonstrates a strong management principles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research oversight and reporting described in detail and is outstanding Expert data management principle and processes described in detail Expert financial governance described in detail COIs provided detailed and demonstrates expert management of potential, perceived or real interests. Completely confident that all aspects of governance will be carefully managed.
		Ethics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited or no consideration of, or plan to, address ethical issues regarding potential risks to the participants, health providers and/or their information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some consideration of, or plan to, address ethical issues but major concerns remain regarding potential risks to the participants, health providers and/or their information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ethical issues considered, but significant concerns remain regarding potential risks to the participants, health providers and/or their information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ethical issues described but not in detail. Some confidence that risks to the participants, health providers and/or their information will be managed Some questions remain 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ethical issues and management approach described in detail. Confident that risks to the participants, health providers and/or their information will be well managed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ethical issues and management approach described in detail. Highly confident that risks to the participants, health providers and/or their information will be well managed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ethical issues and expert management approach described in detail. Certain that risks to the participants, health providers and/or their information will be expertly managed
Criterion 4 Effective and Efficient use of funds	Section C Application	Effective use of funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial and non-financial contributions not secured. Funding duplication possible. Agreed to funding agreement and reporting requirements with significant qualification. Budget not described/significant deficiencies in budget. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uncertain that financial and non-financial contributions are secured. Unlikely to be funding duplication. Agreed to funding agreement and reporting requirements with qualification. Major concerns over budget. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial and non-financial contributions probably secured. No funding duplication. Agreed to funding agreement and reporting requirements with only minor qualification. Significant concerns over budget 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial and non-financial contributions secured. No funding duplication. Agreed to funding agreement and reporting requirements with only minor qualification. Some significant concerns over budget. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial and non-financial contributions secured. No funding duplication. Agreed to funding agreement and reporting requirements with minor qualifications. Some minor concerns over budget. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial and non-financial contributions secured. No funding duplication. Agreed to funding agreement and reporting requirements without qualification. Confident that budget is accurate. Insignificant concerns over budget. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial and non-financial contributions secured. No funding duplication. Agreed to funding agreement and reporting requirements without qualification. The budget is accurate. No concerns over budget.