

LUPUS UK Peer Review Panel Scoring system



Applications:

Hypothesis – Relevance to Lupus Patients		(✓)
Highly appropriate and novel	(A)	
Of some interest and value but not novel	(B)	
Valid but unlikely to contribute significant new knowledge	(C)	
Not appropriate or of no value	(D)	
Cost and Timescale		(✓)
Excellent value for money and realistic	(A)	
Good value for money and realistic	(B)	
Poor value for money and/or uncertain	(C)	
Inappropriate	(D)	
Potential Impact		(✓)
Excellent	(A)	
Good	(B)	
Fair	(C)	
Poor	(D)	
Applicants: Experience and standing within research community		(✓)
High (international reputation)	(A)	
Good (national reputation)	(B)	
Fair (local reputation having worked within nationally recognised research team)	(C)	
Little (no significant reputation in the field)	(D)	
Quality of each of the following: (score each: excellent (A), good (B), adequate (C) or poor (D))		(A-D)
Objectives		
Methodology		
Appropriate sample size		

Funding recommendation:

High priority to fund: <i>Appropriate and high scoring on above criteria (mostly A scores and some B scores or A, including A-)</i>	
Medium priority: <i>Moderate scoring on criteria – fund if sufficient money available (mostly B scores, some C scores, or B or B+)</i>	
Reject: <i>Not relevant, low scoring on most of above criteria (only C scores or any with D scores) (but allow resubmission if project of interest after considering reviewer comments)</i>	

Feedback:

Where members of the panel feel that the quality of research is scoring highly in most areas but can be improved with specific revision, feedback suggestions will be made and the grant approved pending a positive response.

Please provide feedback on any of the following areas:

- Hypothesis - relevance to Lupus patients
- Quality of objectives
- Quality of methodology
- Sample size considerations
- Cost and timescale
- Potential impact
- Applicants and facilities