



**Multi-Centre, Collaborative Team Grant
Competition
Full Application Independent Review**

REVIEW CRITERIA – SCIENTIFIC REVIEWERS

When evaluating an application, the scientific reviewers are encouraged to consider the following questions:

1. Review of Scientific Research Proposal and Methodology

What are the strengths and weakness with the various aspects of the proposal? Some points to consider include:

- Are the aims logical?
- Is the approach valid and adequate to address the aims?
- Are the procedures feasible?
- Will this team effort lead to a major advance in MS research and/or treatment?
- Has a suitable working plan, including timelines and anticipated outcomes, been provided?
- Are the scientific milestones achievable during the duration of the grant?

2. Novelty and Innovation

- Is this a novel approach in MS research that will stimulate lateral thinking and innovation?
- Are the approaches or methodologies novel to the field of MS?
- Will the approaches or methodologies generate new and relevant data that will advance the field of MS?
- Are there any unique features of the facilities, equipment, and technology that would enhance or contribute to the progress of the project?

3. Significance and Translation

- Does the project address important questions about and/or unmet needs in MS?
- Does the proposal describe any short- and long-term objectives for the study, and does it describe how the team intends to achieve them beyond the duration of the grant term?
- Will the project involve high impact research with translational potential?
- Will the outcomes of the project advance the field of MS? Is there potential for the research to significantly improve clinical practice or quality of life among people with MS?
- Does the proposal include a sustainability plan that outlines how the research team intends to sustain key aspects of the research program and/or infrastructure beyond the term of the grant?

4. Collaborative Team Structure

- What are the competence and background of the lead investigators?
- Is this team the appropriate group to achieve the goals of the study and lead to significant advances in the field?
- Does the team have the appropriate expertise to conduct the project?
- Does the proposal describe the level of integration and interdisciplinary collaboration among the team and how team effort will bring added value to the project in terms of methodologies, data acquisition and analysis, knowledge exchange etc.
- Is the leadership approach and governance appropriate for the project?
- Does the proposal adequately explain how the study sites will be managed and how administrative responsibilities will be delegated?

5. Budget, Environment and Resources

- Are the items listed in the budget justified on the basis of the approach, procedures and analysis of data?
- Will the research environment contribute positively to the achievement of the defined objectives?
- Are the institutional supports, equipment and other resources adequately available to the investigators for the project proposed?
- Will the project benefit from unique features of the scientific environment, or collaborative arrangements?
- What is the availability of special animal species, tissue preparation, clinical case materials, etc.

6. Public Engagement and Communications

- Will the project engage people who are affected by MS in the research process; for example, in prioritization and decision-making of the research program through participation in advisory boards or steering committees, involvement in study design, implementation and data interpretation, etc.?
- Does the project discuss potential collaboration with partners in industry, government, non-profit etc.?
- Is there an explanation of how research progress and outcomes will be effectively communicated to the public and knowledge end-users through a detailed knowledge translation plan?

ENTHUSIAM CHART

Level of Enthusiasm	Description
High	Excellent proposal; strong scientific merit and high potential for impact; no concerns. Recommended for further consideration.
Medium	Good proposal; strong scientific merit and high potential for impact; some minor concerns or flaws related to approach and/or methodology. Recommended for further consideration.
Low	Poor proposal, major concerns related to scientific merit, potential for impact, and/or approach and/or methodology. Not recommended for further consideration.

REVIEW CRITERIA – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES

The community representatives are asked to answer the following questions:

1. Relevance & Impact

- Does the application have the potential to make a lasting influence on the health and quality of life and/or quality of clinical care for people affected by MS?
- Does the application address a critical gap in knowledge or barrier to progress in the field of MS?
- Is it clear that the application will provide immediate impacts to those affected by MS? If so, how, and if not, why not?
- Does the application bring hope and excitement to you as a person who is affected by MS, and do you anticipate that the outcomes of the research resound with the MS community in a positive way?

2. Language & Accessibility

- Does the applicant use clear, appropriate language to explain how the findings of their project will benefit people affected by MS?
- Does the applicant clearly explain background information and key concepts that form the foundation for the study? If not, what is missing or what can be improved?

3. Public Engagement and Knowledge Translation

- Will the project engage members of the public, specifically people who are affected by MS, within their project in a valuable and meaningful way?
- Has the applicant defined the role of people affected by MS within the project? Is this role adequate or can people affected by MS offer more or different input than what is being proposed?
- How will the research results be communicated to the public? Is the communications plan adequate and appropriate?
- Does the application explain how opportunities for training and mentorship will be provided that will ensure that trainees/young researchers are attracted to and retained in the field of MS?

ENTHUSIAM CHART

Level of Enthusiasm	Description
High	Highly relevant with high potential for impact for people affected by MS; very well written in clear and understandable lay language. No to minor revisions needed to lay documents.
Medium	Good with moderate relevance and moderate potential for impact for people affected by MS; written adequately with some use of technical language. Moderate revisions needed to lay documents.
Low	Low relevance and little potential for impact for people affected by MS; poorly written and excessive use of technical language. Requires major revisions to lay documents.