GENETIC EPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH ALLIANCE:

**LARGER PROJECT FUNDING ASSESSMENT FORM**

**ROUND 1, 2025**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title of Project:**  |  |
| **Name of applicant** |  |
| **Name of assessor** |  |

This assessment form is modelled from NHMRC ideas grant score descriptors.

**Assessment Process**

1. All funding applications will be independently assessed and scored by at least two reviewers.
	* Reviewers will include Chief Investigators. Associate Investigators and External Reviewers will be invited as necessary. Investigators who are named on an application will not be invited to review applications in that category. Reviewers are also required to declare if they believe they are in a conflict of interest. The Executive Committee will decide if to exclude them from review.
2. Scores will be calculated and provided to the Executive Committee.
3. Applications will be discussed by the Executive Committee. CIA will make the final decision if no consensus.

|  |
| --- |
| **Alignment with CRE (15%)**How closely does the proposed project align with the vision and aims of GERA? Boast score for collaborations between GERA investigators. For example: if a project “Highly aligns” and includes multiple investigators you may choose to score 5 or 6 out of 7, instead of 4 out of 7. **Vision:** To embed the field of genetic epidemiology into population health research, leading to more tailored approaches to improve health for all Australians**Aims:**1. *To develop, teach and apply advanced analytic methods to big and complex datasets to generate new knowledge on disease causes and risk predictions.*
2. *To transfer research insights and outcomes into practice and decision-making via working with stakeholders such as researchers, clinicians, governments, and policymakers.*
3. *To build a new generation of up-skilled early- and mid-career research leaders with opportunities for training, mentorship, career development, leadership, and international collaborations.*
 |
| [ ]  **7 Exceptional**  | [ ]  **6 Outstanding** | [ ]  **5 Excellent**  | [ ]  **4 Very Good**  | [ ]  **3 Good**  | [ ]  **2 Satisfactory**  | [ ]  **1 Poor**  |
| The project extremely aligns with CRE focusShows strong collaboration between GERA investigators  | Strongly alignsBoost score if shows collaborations between GERA investigators\* | Highly aligns Boost score if shows collaborations between GERA investigators\* | Aligns wellBoost score if shows collaborations between GERA investigators\* | AlignsBoost score if shows collaborations between GERA investigators\* | Marginally alignsBoost score if shows collaborations between GERA investigators\* | Weakly aligns (application to be rejected) |
| **Project Quality (35%)** This includes clarity of aims and objectives, strengths and weaknesses of the study design or project. *(Refer to question 3)* |
| [ ]  **7 Exceptional** | [ ]  **6 Outstanding** | [ ]  **5 Excellent** | [ ]  **4 Very Good** | [ ]  **3 Good** | [ ]  **2 Satisfactory**  | [ ]  **1 Poor** |
| The project aims and proposed research/project plan: |
| are supported by an extremely well-justified hypothesis/rationaleare focused, well-defined, extremely coherent and have a flawless study design and approach | are supported by a very well-justified hypothesis/rationaleare focused, well-defined, very highly coherent and have an outstanding study design and approach with a minor weakness | are supported by a well-justified hypothesis/rationaleare focused, well-defined, highlycoherent and have an excellent study design and approach with a few minor weaknesses | are supported by a well-justified hypothesis/rationaleare focused, well-developed, coherent and have a very good study design and approach with several minor concerns | are supported by a sound hypothesis/rationaleare logical, generally clear in the study design and approach with more than a few minor concerns | are supported by a satisfactory hypothesis/rationaleare satisfactory in the study design and approach, but may lack clarity in some aspects and may contain some major weaknesses | are underpinned by a weak hypothesis/rationalehave significant flaws in the study design and approach and may contain several major weaknesses |
| **Significance and clear impact that will benefit the CRE (25%)** The project’s potential to increase knowledge about health and disease, through the application of new ideas and methods. Does this project have clear outcomes, outputs and impact that will benefit the CRE?*(Refer to questions 4, 6, 7 & 13)* |
| [ ]  **7 Exceptional**  | [ ]  **6 Outstanding** | [ ]  **5 Excellent** | [ ]  **4 Very Good** | [ ]  **3 Good** | [ ]  **2 Satisfactory**  | [ ]  **1 Poor** |
| The planned research, relative to the research field: |
| will result in extremely significant outcomes in the science, knowledge, practice or policy will lead to extremely significant research outputs\* has excellent potential to lead to future funding, with a specific grant application plan  | will result in very highly significant outcomes in the science, knowledge, practice or policy will lead to very highly significant research outputs\*has excellent potential to lead to future funding, with a rough grant application plan proposed by the applicant | will result in highly significantoutcomes in the science, knowledge, practice or policy will lead to highly significant research outputs\*has great potential to lead to future funding, with a grant application plan proposed by the applicant | will result in significant outcomes in the science, knowledge, practice or policy will lead to significant research outputs \*has good potential to lead to future funding, with a grant application plan proposed by the applicant | will result in moderately significant outcomes in the science, knowledge, practice or policy will lead to moderately significant research outputs\* has good potential to lead to future funding | may result in outcomes in thescience, knowledge, practice or policy may lead to research outputs has some potential to lead to future funding  | unlikely to result in outcomes in the science, knowledge, practice or policy unlikely to lead to research outputsunlikely to lead to future funding |
| \*research outputs = intellectual property, publications, products, services, conferences, teaching aids, consulting, contract research, spin-offs, licensing etc. |
| **Project feasibility and Capability (20%)** Feasibility and the likelihood that the project will produce the outcomes stated. Are the time frames feasible? Are the capabilities of the research team suitable for this project (i.e. are the right people involved)? *(Refer to questions 5 & 8-11)* |
| [ ]  **7 Exceptional**  | [ ]  **6 Outstanding** | [ ]  **5 Excellent** | [ ]  **4 Very Good** | [ ]  **3 Good** | [ ]  **2 Satisfactory**  | [ ]  **1 Poor** |
| The project team overall: |
| has exceptional capability toexecute the project and deliver outcomes in the required timelinehas access to exceptionaltechnical resources,infrastructure, equipmentand facilities necessary forthe project.  | has outstanding capability to execute the project and deliver outcomes in the required timelinehas access to outstanding technical resources, infrastructure, equipmentand facilities necessary forthe project  | has excellent capability to execute the project and deliver outcomes in the required timelinehas access to excellent technical resources, infrastructure, equipment and facilities necessary for the project  | has very good capability to execute the project and deliver outcomes in the required timelinehas access to very good technical resources, infrastructure, equipment and facilities necessary for the project  | has good capability to execute the project and deliver outcomes in the required timelinehas access to good technicalresources, infrastructure,equipment and facilitiesnecessary for the project  | has some capability to execute the project and deliver outcomes in the required timelinehas access to some of the necessary technical resources, infrastructure,equipment and facilities relevant to the project, with some notableconcerns  | does not demonstrate capability to execute the project and deliver outcomesdoes not have access to thenecessary technicalresources, infrastructure,equipment and facilities relevant to the project, withseveral major concerns  |
| **Budget (no score)** Is the proposed budget justifiable for this project? [ ] Yes [ ] No*(Refer to question 12)***Comment** |
|  |
| **Additional comments** |
| **To be shared with the applicant:**  | **For the GERA team ONLY:** |
|  |  |