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**2022 Non-responders Research Endorsement Fund**

**Reviewer Evaluation Form**

The mission of Growing Minds Australia (GMA) Clinical Trials Network (GMACTN) is to conduct clinical trials research to improve outcomes in child and youth mental health. GMACTN will be multidisciplinary and will aim to assess a broad range of treatment interventions and management strategies to improve outcomes in child and youth mental health.

In line with GMA’s strategic plan, the Endorsement Research Fund has been established to support members in the development of investigator-initiated studies, and for us to learn about how a clinical trials network may benefit our members. The studies may be trials, or research that may ultimately lead to trials. Grants of up to $100,000 (inclusive of GST) are available in 2022 to successful applicants. Eligible research projects may include:

* GMA pilot studies (including generating data to support a larger GMA clinical trial)
* Translational research that may lead to a larger GMA project;
* Seed funding to start a high priority GMA study that has a high likelihood of receiving ongoing funding from another source.

Not all funds may be awarded in the first round with any remaining funds available for ad-hoc grants or a second round of applications, at the discretion of the GMA Steering Committee following guidance from the GMA Scientific Advisory Committee.

**Eligible research projects will:**

* Be consistent with GMA’s mission and objectives and include a budget justification up to AUD$100,000 (inclusive of GST);
* Involve endpoints that are feasible within a 1-2 year time frame;
* Be expected to build capacity and/or collaborations for GMA and have the potential to lead to future GMA projects.

**The successful recipient will be required to:**

* Be a GMA member and an active contributor to GMA activities;
* Acknowledge GMA’s contributions towards ongoing development and any associated outputs of the funded research;
* Acknowledge GMA in any publications or presentations as a result of the Researcher Endorsement Fund award;
* Attend relevant meetings to provide updates on the project and present final report to the GMA Scientific Advisory Committee;
* Provide a formal written report at the completion of the project to GMA;
* Provide a summary report for use in GMA publications;
* As this research fund is supported by MRFF funds, successful recipients must ensure that any this grant is only used for direct research costs.

**Assessment and notification**

Please complete the Research Fund Grant Application Evaluation Form and email to: [**growing-minds-australia@sydney.edu.au**](mailto:growing-minds-australia@sydney.edu.au) by COB DAY DATE MONTH YEAR.

If you have any questions regarding the process, please contact Trisha Nowland, Executive Officer at [**growing-minds-australia@sydney.edu.au**](mailto:growing-minds-australia@sydney.edu.au).
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**Research Endorsement Application**

**Review and Evaluation Feedback Form 2022**

**1 Checklist:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **For the priority of non-responders are each of the following present:** | **Is it addressed? (Y/N)** |
| a) A plan detailing how collaboration and stakeholder consultation will overcome the barriers that have traditionally limited trial size and quality in the area |  |
| b) Quality of science in addressing non-responders including evidence this avoids duplication with other or earlier studies |  |
| c) Evidence that amount of funding applied for is used to seed advancement with further funding |  |
| d) Strength of research team including early-mid career researcher strategy |  |
| e) Demonstration that study accords with the mission, vision and values of GMA and its Terms of Reference |  |
| f) Consideration of health economics |  |
| g) Consumer/community engagement in research processes. |  |
| **TOTAL COMPLETED** |  |

**2. Review from core methods:**

1. **Research translation:**
2. **Quality of plan? (strengths/weaknesses comment)**
3. **Suggestions for improvement? (comment)**
4. **Resources/feasibility specified in detail to cover this aspect? (comment)**

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENTARY:** |

1. **Lived experience:**
2. **Inclusion of lived experience/community engagement plan?**
3. **Resources/feasibility specified in detail to cover this aspect?**

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENTARY:** |

1. **1. Health economics:**
2. **Quality of plan? (strengths/weaknesses comment)**
3. **Suggestions for improvement? (comment)**
4. **Resources/feasibility specified in detail to cover this aspect? (comment)**

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENTARY:** |

1. **2. Statistics**
2. **Quality of plan? (strengths/weaknesses comment)**
3. **Suggestions for improvement? (comment)**
4. **Resources/feasibility specified in detail to cover this aspect? (comment)**

|  |
| --- |
| **COMMENTARY:** |

**3 Evaluation Components**

1. **Scientific Merit/Knowledge Gain (33%)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Performance Indicator** | **Category Descriptors** |
| 7 | **Exceptional** | The proposed research:   * is supported by an extremely well justified and reasoned hypothesis/rationale * has a scientific framework, design, methods and analyses that are flawless, highly developed and highly appropriate * demonstrates to an extremely high level that it addresses an issue of critical importance to advance the research or health area (not prevalence or magnitude of the issue) * has or has access to exceptional technical resources, infrastructure, equipment and facilities, and if required, has access to additional expertise necessary to achieve proposed outcomes * will result in extremely significant and transformative changes/outcomes in the scientific knowledge, practice or policy underpinning human health issues * will lead to extremely significant research outputs (e.g. intellectual property, publications, policy advice, products, services, teaching aids, consulting, contract research, spin-offs, licensing) * would be extremely competitive with the best, similar research proposals internationally. |
| 6 | **Outstanding** | The proposed research:   * is supported by a very well justified and reasoned hypothesis/rationale * has a scientific framework, design, methods and analyses that are well developed and highly appropriate with only a few minor weaknesses * demonstrates to a very high level that it addresses an issue that is very important to advance the research or health area (not prevalence or magnitude of the issue) * has or has access to outstanding technical resources, infrastructure, equipment and facilities, and if required, has access to additional expertise necessary to achieve proposed outcomes * will result in very highly significant and substantial changes/outcomes in the scientific knowledge, practice or policy underpinning human health issues * will lead to very highly significant research outputs (e.g. intellectual property, publications, policy advice, products, services, teaching aids, consulting, contract research, spin-offs, licensing) * would be highly competitive with the best, similar research proposals internationally. |
| 5 | **Excellent** | The proposed research:   * is supported by a well justified and reasoned hypothesis/rationale * has a scientific framework, design, methods and analyses that are well developed and highly appropriate with several minor weaknesses * demonstrates to a high level that it addresses an issue that is of considerable importance to advance the research or health area (not prevalence or magnitude of the issue) * has or has access to excellent technical resources, infrastructure, equipment and facilities, and if required, has access to additional expertise necessary to achieve proposed outcomes * will result in highly significant and substantial changes/outcomes in the scientific knowledge, practice or policy underpinning   human health issues   * will lead to highly significant research outputs (e.g. intellectual property, publications, policy advice, products, services, teaching aids, consulting, contract research, spin-offs, licensing) * would be competitive with the best, similar research proposals internationally. |
| 4 | **Very Good** | The proposed research:   * is supported by a well justified and reasoned hypothesis/rationale * has a scientific framework, design, methods and analyses that are well developed and highly appropriate with a few minor concerns * demonstrates that it addresses an issue that is of importance to advance the research or health area (not prevalence or magnitude of the issue) * has or has access to very good technical resources, infrastructure, equipment and facilities, and if required, has access to additional expertise necessary to achieve proposed outcomes * is likely to result in significant and substantial changes/outcomes in the scientific knowledge, practice or policy underpinning human health issue * is likely to lead to significant research outputs (e.g. intellectual property, publications, policy advice, products, services, teaching aids, consulting, contract research, spin-offs, licensing)   would likely be competitive with high quality, similar research proposals internationally. |
| 3 | **Good** | The proposed research:   * is supported by a justified and sound hypothesis/rationale * has a scientific framework, design, methods and analyses that are developed and appropriate with several minor concerns * demonstrates that it is addressing an issue that is of some importance to advance the research or health area (not prevalence or magnitude of the issue) * has or has access to good technical resources, infrastructure, equipment and facilities, and if required, has access to additional expertise necessary to achieve proposed outcomes * could result in significant and substantial changes/outcomes in the scientific knowledge, practice or policy underpinning human health issues * could lead to significant research outputs (e.g. intellectual property, publications, policy advice, products, services, teaching aids, consulting, contract research, spin-offs, licensing) * would be somewhat competitive with high quality, similar research proposals internationally. |
| 2 | **Satisfactory** | The proposed research:   * is supported by a reasoned hypothesis/rationale * has a scientific framework, design, methods and analyses that are generally sound but may lack clarity in some aspects and/or may contain notable weaknesses/concerns * demonstrates that it is addressing an issue that is of marginal importance to advance the research or health area (not prevalence or magnitude of the issue) * has or has access to some/most but not all of the technical resources, infrastructure, equipment and facilities, and if required, has access to additional expertise necessary to achieve proposed outcomes * could result in appreciable improvements/outcomes in the scientific knowledge, practice or policy underpinning human health issues * could lead to moderately significant research outputs (e.g. intellectual property, publications, policy advice, products, services, teaching aids, consulting, contract research, spin-offs, licensing) * would be marginally competitive with high quality, similar research proposals internationally. |
| 1 | **Weak or limited** | The proposed research:   * has a weak hypothesis/rationale * has a scientific framework, design, methods and analyses that have significant flaws and may contain major weaknesses * demonstrates that it is addressing an issue of some concern to advance the research or health area (not prevalence or magnitude of the issue) * does not have access to the technical resources, infrastructure, equipment and facilities or access to additional expertise necessary to achieve proposed outcomes (if required) * is unlikely to result in improvements/outcomes in the scientific knowledge, practice or policy underpinning human health issues of significance * is unlikely to lead to research outputs (e.g. intellectual property, publications, policy advice, products, services, teaching aids, consulting, contract research, spin-offs, licensing) of significance * is unlikely to be competitive with similar research proposals internationally. |
| **SCORE AND COMMENTARY:** | | |

1. **Research Team – Track Record (33%)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Performance Indicator** | **Category Descriptor** |
| 7 | Exceptional | Relative to field, applicants demonstrate exceptional address of opportunity  Leadership is exceptional in respect of supervision and opportunities for early career researchers  Exceptional contribution in community engagement, stakeholder consultation  Contribution to non -research institutions is exceptional  Exceptional conceptualisation and implementation of research program  Building and maintaining collaborative diverse-representation stakeholder networks is exceptional |
| 6 | Outstanding | Relative to field, applicants demonstrate outstanding address of opportunity  Leadership is outstanding in respect of supervision and opportunities for early career researchers  Outstanding contribution in community engagement, stakeholder consultation  Contribution to non -research institutions is outstanding  Outstanding conceptualisation and implementation of research program  Building and maintaining collaborative diverse-representation stakeholder networks is outstanding |
| 5 | Excellent | Relative to field, applicants demonstrate excellent address of opportunity  Leadership is excellent in respect of supervision and opportunities for early career researchers  Excellent contribution in community engagement, stakeholder consultation  Contribution to non -research institutions is excellent  Excellent conceptualisation and implementation of research program  Building and maintaining collaborative diverse-representation stakeholder networks is excellent |
| 4 | Very Good | Relative to field, applicants demonstrate very good address of opportunity  Leadership is very good in respect of supervision and opportunities for early career researchers  Very good contribution in community engagement, stakeholder consultation  Contribution to non -research institutions is very good  Very good conceptualisation and implementation of research program  Building and maintaining collaborative diverse-representation stakeholder networks is very good |
| 3 | Good | Relative to field, applicants demonstrate good address of opportunity  Leadership is good in respect of supervision and opportunities for early career researchers  Good contribution in community engagement, stakeholder consultation  Contribution to non -research institutions is good  Good conceptualisation and implementation of research program  Building and maintaining collaborative diverse-representation stakeholder networks is good |
| 2 | Satisfactory | Relative to field, applicants demonstrate satisfactory address of opportunity  Leadership is satisfactory in respect of supervision and opportunities for early career researchers  Satisfactory contribution in community engagement, stakeholder consultation  Contribution to non -research institutions is satisfactory  Satisfactory conceptualisation and implementation of research program  Building and maintaining collaborative diverse-representation stakeholder networks is satisfactory |
| 1 | Weak or limited | Relative to field, applicants demonstrate weak or limited address of opportunity  Leadership is weak or limited in respect of supervision and opportunities for early career researchers  Weak or limited contribution in community engagement, stakeholder consultation  Contribution to non -research institutions is weak or limited  Weak or limited conceptualisation and implementation of research program  Building and maintaining collaborative diverse-representation stakeholder networks is weak or limited |

|  |
| --- |
| **SCORE AND COMMENTARY:** |

1. **Study Feasibility (33%)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Score** | **Performance Indicator** | **Category Descriptor** |
| 7 | Exceptional | Exceptional likelihood that the research and its outcomes can and will be completed and delivered in the time frame and budget proposed |
| 6 | Outstanding | Outstanding likelihood that the research and its outcomes can and will be completed and delivered in the time frame and budget proposed |
| 5 | Excellent | Excellent likelihood that the research and its outcomes can and will be completed and delivered in the time frame and budget proposed |
| 4 | Very Good | Very good likelihood that the research and its outcomes can and will be completed and delivered in the time frame and budget proposed |
| 3 | Good | Good likelihood that the research and its outcomes can and will be completed and delivered in the time frame and budget proposed |
| 2 | Satisfactory | Satisfactory likelihood that the research and its outcomes can and will be completed and delivered in the time frame and budget proposed |
| 1 | Weak or limited | Limited likelihood that the research and its outcomes can and will be completed and delivered in the time frame and budget proposed |

|  |
| --- |
| **SCORE AND COMMENTARY:** |