

MRC Score Indicators

Score Indicators	Score
<p>EXCEPTIONAL – Top international programme, or of exceptional national strategic importance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scientific quality and impact: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent leadership (<i>track record, team, environment, and collaborators</i>). Justification of resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for high return on investment (<i>resources requested, likelihood of project delivery, anticipated knowledge generation</i>). Appropriate staff time allocated to deliver project (<i>Principal investigators and co-investigators</i>). Other: Ethical and/ or governance issues are fully considered. 	6
<p>EXCELLENT - Internationally competitive and leading edge nationally, or of national strategic importance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scientific quality and impact: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent leadership (<i>track record, team, environment, and collaborators</i>). Justification of resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for high return on investment (<i>resources requested, likelihood of project delivery, anticipated knowledge generation</i>). Appropriate staff time allocated to deliver project (<i>Principal investigators and co-investigators</i>). Other: Ethical and / or governance issues are fully considered. 	5

<p>VERY HIGH QUALITY - Internationally competitive in parts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scientific quality and impact: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap or area of strategic importance. ○ Robust methodology and design (<i>innovative in parts</i>). ○ Potential for high health impact. • Scientific leadership: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Excellent leadership (<i>track record, team, environment, and collaborators</i>). • Justification of resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential for high return on investment (<i>resources requested, likelihood of project delivery, anticipated knowledge generation</i>). ○ Appropriate staff time allocated to deliver project (<i>Principal investigators and co-investigators</i>). • Other: Ethical and / or governance issues are fully considered. 	<p>4</p>
<p>HIGH QUALITY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scientific quality and impact: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Worthwhile scientific question or knowledge gap or a valuable scientific resource. ○ Methodologically sound study. ○ Potential for significant health and/or socioeconomic impact. • Scientific leadership: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Strong leadership (<i>track record, team, environment, and collaborators</i>). • Justification of resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential for significant return on investment (<i>resources requested, likelihood of project delivery, anticipated knowledge generation</i>). ○ Appropriate staff time allocated to deliver project (<i>may be scope strengthen management of the project</i>). • Other: Ethical and / or governance issues are fully considered. 	<p>3</p>

<p>GOOD QUALITY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scientific quality and impact: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Worthwhile scientific question with potentially useful outcomes. ○ Methodologically sound study but areas require revision. ○ Likelihood of successful delivery. • Scientific leadership: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Appropriate leadership (<i>scope to strengthen team; environment; collaborators</i>). • Justification of resources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potentially more limited return on investment (<i>resources requested, likelihood of project delivery, and anticipated knowledge generation</i>) ○ Resources broadly appropriate to deliver the proposal. • Other: Ethical and/or governance issues are adequately considered. 	<p>2</p>
<p>POOR QUALITY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scientific quality and impact: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Poorly defined question. ○ Methodologically weak study. ○ Limited likelihood of new knowledge generation. • Scientific leadership: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Poor leadership. • Justification of resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potentially poor return on investment. • Other: Ethical and / or governance issues are not adequately considered. 	<p>1</p>