

## Diabetes Australia Research Program Information for Reviewers General Grant and Millennium Award Applications

### Background

We hope you can participate in the review process for the 2024 Diabetes Australia Research Program Grant Round.

You have been sent the following documents:

- Application forms for the grants we are asking you to review
- Scoresheets to complete as you review the applications
- Information for reviewers (this document)
- Diabetes Australia Research Program Guidelines

### How to review Diabetes Australia Research Program Applications

- Please read the applications and review them against the two selection criteria.
- Provide a score (out of 10 for each criterion, based on the selection criteria guidance provided below).
- Provide a brief overall comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the application with reference to the selection criteria. **Note:** upon request, and after the selection process has concluded, these comments will be provided as feedback to applicants but will not be attributed to any individual and will not include scores.
- Please return the completed Scoresheets to [research@diabetesaustralia.com.au](mailto:research@diabetesaustralia.com.au)

### Note:

1. If you believe at any stage that you have an actual or perceived conflict of interest, then please discontinue your review and email details of the conflict to [research@diabetesaustralia.com.au](mailto:research@diabetesaustralia.com.au). The conflict will be reviewed and the application may need to be reallocated.
2. You should be familiar with and act in accordance with, the *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research, 2018 (the 2018 Code)*, including Guides, available from the NHMRC website.

## **Selection Criteria Guidance**

General Grant and Millennium Award applications should be assessed in accordance with the selection criteria outlined below:

### **40% – Research Methods / Quality**

This criterion is based on the details of the research plan and assesses the appropriateness of the suggested methods and the scientific quality of the study design. Applications will need to show strong design using robust methods. The reviewer will also need to consider whether the research team has the necessary skills and experience to complete the project; in doing so they should consider the timeframes, sufficiency of the budget and whether the principal researcher has the necessary resources.

### **60% – Potential Research Outcomes / Merit**

This criterion is drawn from the literature review and research plan. This refers to the significance and impact of the study on a particular area of diabetes research or clinical care. Applications will need to show that the results are likely to influence future diabetes research, treatment or clinical care. Originality looks at what is new or likely to be added to the literature by the project. It is advantageous that applicants demonstrate their potential future diabetes leadership through the innovation and originality of the research.

The final score will be weighted so that Research Methods / Quality scores and Potential Research Outcomes / Merit scores will contribute 40% and 60% to the final score, respectively. Scoring guidelines specifically aligned to these assessment criteria are provided below.

## SCORING SYSTEM

Scoring guidelines which aim to simplify the review process and make the rankings more consistent are outlined in the following table:

<b>Score</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>	<b>Research Methods / Scientific Quality</b>	<b>Potential Research Outcomes</b>
10	Exceptional	Clear objectives, with flawless design. Highly feasible study with all resources required and relevant expertise available.	Will result in a major advance in knowledge and translate into significant outcomes for the diabetes community. Is highly innovative and likely to result in highly influential publications and plenary presentations.
9	Outstanding	Clear objectives with near flawless design. Very likely to be achieved with resources available.	Will advance knowledge in an important area of diabetes and translate into significant outcomes for the diabetes community. Is innovative and likely to result in highly influential publications.
8	Excellent	Clear objectives however with some minor design concerns. Good feasibility although some barriers evident which may require minor developmental work.	Will advance knowledge in diabetes and translate into tangible outcomes for the diabetes community. Is innovative and likely to result in influential publications.
7	Very Good	Clear objective however with some design concerns. Good feasibility but minor concerns regarding the breadth of relevant expertise available.	Most likely will advance knowledge in diabetes and translate into tangible outcomes for the diabetes community. Is innovative and likely to result in publications. Outcomes can form the basis for a further competitive grant proposal.
6	Good	Clear objective although several design concerns. Likely to be successfully achieved, although some concerns about the need for more significant developmental work.	Addresses an issue of some importance in diabetes. May have some novel aspects and may result in publications. Outcomes can form the basis for a further competitive grant proposal.

<b>Score</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>	<b>Research Methods / Scientific Quality</b>	<b>Potential Research Outcomes</b>
5	Satisfactory	Clear objectives although several potentially significant design concerns. Can be achieved but needs some potentially significant developmental work.	Will address an issue of minor importance in diabetes and may have some novel aspects. May result in publications.
4	Fair	Some objectives questionable or unclear, several significant design concerns. Some concerns regarding feasibility.	Will address an issue of minor importance in diabetes. Results will only underpin existing knowledge in the field. May result in low impact publications.
3	Marginal	Objectives questionable or unclear. Several significant design concerns and unlikely to be successful.	Does not address an issue of more than marginal concern in the field and follows previously established approaches.
2	Unsatisfactory	Contains several major design flaws and unlikely to be completed successfully.	Does not address an issue of any importance in the field and has little novelty.
1	Poor	Unfeasible and poorly designed research plan unlikely to be successful.	Does not address an area of any importance in the field and will not advance current knowledge.

**If you have any questions or require any assistance, please email [research@diabetesaustralia.com.au](mailto:research@diabetesaustralia.com.au)**