

MRC SCORE INDICATORS

The guidance below is reproduced with the express permission of the MRC.

6 – EXCEPTIONAL

Top international programme, or of exceptional national strategic importance

- Scientific quality and impact:
 - Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap or area of strategic importance.
 - Original and innovative; novel methodology and design.
 - Potential for high health impact.
- Scientific leadership:
 - Excellent leadership (*track record, team, environment, and collaborators*).
- Justification of resources:
 - Potential for high return on investment (*resources requested, likelihood of project delivery, anticipated knowledge generation*).
 - Appropriate staff time allocated to deliver project (*Principal investigators and co-investigators*).
- Other: Ethical and/ or governance issues are fully considered.

5 – EXCELLENT

Internationally competitive and leading edge nationally, or of national strategic importance

- Scientific quality and impact:
 - Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap or area of strategic importance.
 - Original and innovative; novel methodology and design.
 - Potential for high health impact.
- Scientific leadership:
 - Excellent leadership (*track record, team, environment, and collaborators*).
- Justification of resources
 - Potential for high return on investment (*resources requested, likelihood of project delivery, anticipated knowledge generation*)
 - Appropriate staff time allocated to deliver project (*Principal investigators and co-investigators*).

- Other: Ethical and / or governance issues are fully considered.

4 - VERY HIGH QUALITY

Internationally competitive in parts

- Scientific quality and impact:
 - Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap or area of strategic importance.
 - Robust methodology and design (*innovative in parts*).
 - Potential for high health impact.
- Scientific leadership:
 - Excellent leadership (*track record, team, environment, and collaborators*).
- Justification of resources:
 - Potential for high return on investment (*resources requested, likelihood of project delivery, anticipated knowledge generation*).
 - Appropriate staff time allocated to deliver project (*Principal investigators and co-investigators*).
- Other: Ethical and / or governance issues are fully considered.

3 - HIGH QUALITY

- Scientific quality and impact:
 - Worthwhile scientific question or knowledge gap or a valuable scientific resource.
 - Methodologically sound study.
 - Potential for significant health and/or socioeconomic impact.
- Scientific leadership:
 - Strong leadership (*track record, team, environment, and collaborators*).
- Justification of resources:
 - Potential for significant return on investment (*resources requested, likelihood of project delivery, anticipated knowledge generation*).
 - Appropriate staff time allocated to deliver project (*may be scope strengthen management of the project*).
- Other: Ethical and / or governance issues are fully considered.

2 – GOOD QUALITY

- Scientific quality and impact:
 - Worthwhile scientific question with potentially useful outcomes.
 - Methodologically sound study but areas require revision.
 - Likelihood of successful delivery.
- Scientific leadership:
 - Appropriate leadership (*scope to strengthen team; environment; collaborators*).
- Justification of resources:
 - Potentially more limited return on investment (*resources requested, likelihood of project delivery, and anticipated knowledge generation*)
 - Resources broadly appropriate to deliver the proposal.
- Other: Ethical and/or governance issues are adequately considered.

1 – POOR QUALITY

- Scientific quality and impact:
 - Poorly defined question.
 - Methodologically weak study.
 - Limited likelihood of new knowledge generation.
- Scientific leadership:
 - Poor leadership.
- Justification of resources
 - Potentially poor return on investment.
- Other: Ethical and / or governance issues are not adequately considered.