



The Multiple  
Sclerosis  
Scientific  
Research  
Foundation

**Multi-Centre, Collaborative Team Grant  
Competition  
Letter of Intent (LOI) Independent Review**

## REVIEW CRITERIA – SCIENTIFIC REVIEWERS

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

### 1. Novelty and Innovation

- Is this a novel project that constitutes a new effort not previously applied to MS?
- Are the hypothesis and study aims clear, relevant and can only be addressed through a group effort versus individual operating grants?
- Do the methods presented require out-of-the-box thinking and differ from conventional ways of studying MS?
- Will the study address important unmet gaps in the field of MS?

### 2. Team Structure and Study Feasibility

- Does the study involve multi-site collaboration, involving researchers that represent relevant and complementary backgrounds and expertise in MS?
- Is it clearly outlined that each team member will contribute valuable skills and resources to advance the study aims?
- Is an organized and integrated governance structure describing the coordination of research activities between sites well-articulated?
- Are the study PI and Co-PIs recognized and productive leaders in the MS field?
- Are the study PI and Co-PIs experienced in leading productive and organized research teams?
- Is the study methodology feasible and well described?

### 3. Impact and Translation in the Field

- Are anticipated outcomes of the study well described and achievable within the grant term?
- Is there a good indication of how people affected by MS will be meaningfully engaged and integrated in the research process?
- Is the potential for sharing research outcomes with knowledge end-users well described?
- Will the results of the study advance fundamental knowledge of MS, and have a valuable impact on improving health and quality of life among people living with MS?

## **SCORING CHART**

<b>Score</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
5	Outstanding proposal; demonstrates high degree of novelty, very strong team structure and a highly feasible approach, with a high potential for impact in the field.	Recommended to advance to the Full Application stage
4	Excellent proposal; demonstrates moderate to high degree of novelty, strong team structure and a feasible approach, with a moderate potential for impact in the field.	
3	Good proposal; demonstrates moderate degree of novelty, good team structure and a feasible approach, with a moderate potential for impact in the field.	Not recommended to advance to the Full Application stage
2	Acceptable proposal; demonstrates low to moderate degree of novelty, fair to good team structure and somewhat feasible approach, with a moderate potential for impact in the field.	
1	Below acceptable proposal; demonstrates low degree of novelty, poor to fair team structure and feasibility, with a low potential for impact in the field.	
0	Flawed proposal; serious scientific weakness or other major concerns.	

## REVIEW CRITERIA – COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES

The Community Representatives are asked to answer the following questions:

- 1) Does the study involve collaboration and does the applicant properly articulate how the aims identified will be achieved through a team effort rather than through distinct, individual research projects?
- 2) Is the topic under investigation by the research team relevant to people living with MS?
- 3) What feedback can you provide the applicant that would assist them in making the lay summary more understandable and relevant to the general public?

### 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.