

CoEN Review Panel assessment and scoring criteria

A) CoEN assessment criteria

Science

- High level of innovation and creativity of approach.
- Potential to address gaps in existing knowledge/barriers to progress, move the field forward significantly or make a step change in the research field.
- Overall scientific excellence of the research proposed.

Collaborative working

- The added value and unique opportunity of the partnership in addressing the issues identified in the proposal.
- The rationale for delivery of the proposal and the practicality of the partnership working proposed.
- Whether there is a clear demonstration that the collaboration is above and beyond that already taking place.

Ethics and governance

- Whether there are any ethical issues arising from the proposal, and where the use of animals is proposed, whether usage, numbers and species are appropriate.

Value for money

- The Expert Panel is not requested to assess proposal costs in detail but will be asked to verify general value for money and identify where obvious changes might be made.

Results Dissemination

- Whether the communication and knowledge exchange plans seem appropriate.

B) Scoring Criteria

Scores of 7 or above are considered fundable

Score/ Fundability	Indicators
	Excellent quality research
10 Fundable	<p>Exceptional - Top international programme or of exceptional national</p> <p>Strategic importance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality ▪ Highly original and innovative ▪ Novel methodology and design ▪ Excellent leadership (<i>team, environment, and collaborators are amongst the best in a broad field</i>) <p>Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Crucial scientific question, knowledge gap or barrier to progress ▪ Potential for very high health and/or socioeconomic impact (including medical practice, understanding of disease mechanisms, exploitation of discoveries and techniques) ▪ Outputs will be internationally unique and of value to many disciplines ▪ Provides exceptional added value (increase of critical mass, speed of progress, novel research resources) <p>Productivity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potential for high return on investment ▪ Very high likelihood of successful delivery (risks well managed)
9 Fundable	<p>Excellent - Internationally competitive and leading edge in most areas</p> <p>Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Original and innovative

- Novel methodology and design
- Excellent leadership (*team, environment, and collaborators e.g.*
- *among the best in a specialist area)*

Impact

- Crucial scientific question, knowledge gap or barrier to progress
- Potential for high health and/or socioeconomic impact (including medical practice, understanding of disease mechanisms, exploitation of discoveries and techniques)
- Outputs will be internationally significant and of value to many disciplines
- Provides excellent added value (increase of critical mass, speed of progress, novel research resources)

Productivity

- Potential for high return on investment
- Very high likelihood of successful delivery (risks well managed)

Good quality research

8 Fundable

Very High Quality - Internationally competitive and leading edge nationally

Quality

- Original and innovative
- Robust methodology and design (*innovative in parts)*
- Excellent leadership (*team, environment, and collaborators)*

Impact

- Crucial scientific question, knowledge gap or barrier to progress
- Potential for high health and/or socioeconomic impact (including medical practice, understanding of disease mechanisms, exploitation of discoveries and techniques)
- Outputs of value to many disciplines
- Provides high added value (increase of critical mass, speed

	<p>of progress, novel research resources)</p> <p>Productivity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potential for significant return on investment ▪ Very high likelihood of successful delivery (risks well managed)
<p>7</p> <p>Fundable</p>	<p>High Quality - Leading edge nationally and internationally competitive in parts</p> <p>Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Innovative ▪ Robust methodology and design (<i>innovative in parts</i>) ▪ Strong leadership (<i>team, environment, and collaborators</i>) <p>Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Key scientific question, knowledge gap or barrier to progress ▪ Potential for significant scientific, health and/or socioeconomic impact ▪ Outputs of value to the discipline ▪ Provides good added value (increase of critical mass, speed of progress, novel research resources) <p>Productivity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potential for significant return on investment ▪ High likelihood of successful delivery (risks well managed)
<p>6</p> <p>Not fundable</p>	<p>High Quality - Leading edge nationally, but not yet internationally competitive</p> <p>Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Methodologically robust study ▪ Appropriate leadership (<i>team; environment; collaborators</i>) <p>Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Worthwhile scientific question, knowledge gap or barrier to progress ▪ Value of outputs justified but considered only incremental knowledge

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides only moderate added value Potential for reasonable scientific, health and/or socioeconomic impact <p>Productivity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources appropriate to deliver the proposal High likelihood of successful delivery
<p>5</p> <p>Not fundable</p>	<p>Good Quality - Nationally competitive</p> <p>Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodologically sound study but areas require significant revision Leadership not optimal <i>collaborators</i>) <p>Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Worthwhile scientific question with potentially useful outcomes Provides minimal added value Moderate likelihood of contributing to new knowledge generation <p>Productivity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources broadly appropriate to deliver the proposal Good likelihood of successful delivery
	<p>Potentially useful study</p>
<p>4</p> <p>Not fundable</p>	<p>Potentially Useful - With significant weaknesses</p> <p>Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodologically weak study (<i>approach or study design requires significant revision</i>) Leadership/environment not optimal <p>Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contains potentially useful ideas but requires major revision Moderate likelihood of successful delivery

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No identifiable added value <p>Productivity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resources inappropriate to deliver the proposal Unlikely to significantly contribute to new knowledge generation
3 Not fundable	<p>Potentially Useful - With major weaknesses</p> <p>Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question poorly defined Methodologically weak study Poor leadership/environment No identifiable added value <p>Productivity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unlikely to contribute to new knowledge generation
	Unacceptable
2 Not fundable	Poor quality science, bordering on unacceptable
1 Not fundable	Unacceptable quality or has serious ethical concerns.