

**Peer Review: 2021 Tim Glendinning Memorial Research Grant
7-Category Descriptor Scale**

One (1) Grant of up to \$75,000 in total over 1.5 years available to researchers of any career stage to address research in Australia that:

"Identifies enablers and barriers to engagement with young adult stroke survivors and tests novel strategies to engage with young adult stroke survivors to achieve optimal outcomes (e.g. peer support, continuity of care).

Proposals must demonstrate collaborative partnership with consumers, be transformative and solutions-based with national reach."

Category	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Category Descriptor	Highest International Quality and Research Performance	Excellent	Highly Competitive	Good	Satisfactory*	Marginal*	Poor*
Notes	<i>It is anticipated that only 1-5% of applications will fall into this category.</i>	<i>The panel regards these applications as in the "absolutely must fund" category. It is anticipated that 5-10% of applications will fall into this category with a maximum of 10% in categories 6 & 7.</i>	<i>The panel regards these applications as in the "strong desire to fund" category. It is anticipated that approximately 15% of applications will fall into this category.</i>	<i>The panel regards these applications as in the "fundable" category, budgetary restrictions aside. It is anticipated that approximately 25% of applications will fall into this category.</i>	<i>"It is anticipated that approximately 50% of applications will fall into categories 1, 2 or 3.</i>		
Criteria:							
Addressing the priority area	The planned research: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • will almost certainly lead to novel strategies or solutions to optimise engagement with young adult survivors in research • is highly transformative and solution-based • includes an iterative research design • has national reach and focus • results in strategies or solutions that are readily implementable and will highly likely result in outcomes that have impact among this targeted group of young adult stroke survivors. 	The planned research: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • will very likely lead to novel strategies or solutions to optimise engagement with young adult survivors in research • is transformative and solution-based • may include an iterative research design • has wide reach and focus, but not necessarily national • Results in strategies or solutions that are readily implementable and will likely result in outcomes that have impact among this targeted group of young adult stroke survivors. 	The planned research: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • could lead to novel strategies or solutions to optimise engagement with young adult survivors in research • is partially transformative OR solution-based • may include an iterative research design • has reach and focus, but may be limited to one or two states • may have some scope to result in strategies or solutions that are readily implementable and outcomes that have impact among this targeted group of young adult stroke survivors. 	The planned research: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is unlikely to lead to novel strategies or solutions to optimise engagement with young adult survivors in research • is unlikely to be transformative OR solution-based • lacks an iterative research design • is somewhat limited in reach and focus • is unlikely to result in strategies or solutions that are readily implementable and outcomes that have impact among this targeted group of young adult stroke survivors. 	Category 3 includes applications which, budgetary restrictions aside, are fundable, based on a satisfactory research approach and design. There is no question that the applicant(s) will be able to undertake the research. However, on balance the application is one that is not competitive in the Stroke Foundation round this year.	These applications display a number of good features but are not competitive.	Unfundable grants (reasons must be clearly articulated to applicants).
Relevance	The planned work will result in a highly significant advance in knowledge which addresses an issue of great importance to stroke and will translate into fundamental outcomes in the science and practice of clinical medicine, public health, or in health policy. The planned research: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • directly targets the research question listed above • will almost certainly result in highly influential publications • will almost certainly be the subject of invited plenary presentations at national and international meetings, often with relevance across several fields. • is highly innovative and introduces advances in concept(s) • will use very advanced approaches which will optimize outcomes • includes all priority groups • has very advanced procedures in place to ensure consumer participation 	The planned work will result in significant advance in knowledge which addresses an issue of importance to stroke and is likely to translate into fundamental outcomes in the science and practice of clinical medicine, public health, or in health policy. The planned research: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • directly addresses the research question listed above • will likely result in influential publications • will likely be the subject of invited plenary presentations at international and national meetings. • is highly innovative in concept • will use advanced approaches to enhance outcomes. • includes most priority groups, and where these cannot be included, there is good justification • has advanced procedures in place to ensure consumer participation 	The planned work will advance knowledge in this field which addresses an issue of importance to stroke and may translate into fundamental outcomes in the practice of clinical medicine, public health or in health policy. The planned research: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • addresses the research question listed above • is likely to result in some very strong publications • could be the subject of invited plenary presentations at international and national meetings • is innovative in concept • will use well established approaches to good effect • includes some priority groups, and adequate justification of non-inclusion of some groups • has adequate procedures in place to ensure some consumer participation 	The planned work may incrementally advance knowledge which addresses an issue of some importance to stroke, but is unlikely to translate into fundamental outcomes in the practice of clinical medicine, public health or in health policy. The planned research: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • although it addresses the research question listed above, this is only 40-60% of the focus of the application • may result in some good but not excellent publications • is unlikely to be the subject of invited plenary sessions at international meetings • less solid in concept • Will in the main use standard approaches • some priority groups are excluded, with adequate justification • has little or no established procedures to promote consumer participation 			
Research Program	The proposal has a research plan that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is well-defined, highly coherent and strongly developed. • has a near flawless study design. • is highly feasible with all of the required expertise, research tools and techniques established. • would be highly competitive with the best, similar research proposals internationally. 	The proposal has a research plan that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is clearly defined, coherent and well developed. • has a strong study design. • is feasible with all required tools, techniques and expertise established. • is likely to be competitive with strong, similar research proposals internationally. 	The proposal has a research plan that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is generally clear in its scientific plan and is logical. • raises only a few minor concerns with respect to the study design. • is feasible in all, or almost all areas - required techniques and tools either established or nearly established. • may not be highly competitive with similar research proposals internationally. 	The proposal has a research plan that <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is generally solid in its scientific plan, but may not always be clear in its intent and may lack some focus. • raises several concerns regarding the study design. • raises doubts about the feasibility in some areas. • is not likely to be competitive with similar research proposals internationally. 			
Team Track Record	Relative to opportunity the applicant(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has expertise that specifically targets the proposed research both in terms of its depth and/or breadth. • has over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement quality and productivity and/or translation into practice that is outstanding by international standards commensurate with their field of research. • if junior members are involved they are supported by outstanding senior members who will provide every strong mentoring environment. 	Relative to opportunity , the applicant(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has expertise that is highly relevant to the proposed research both in terms of its depth and/or breadth. • has over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement quality and productivity and/or translation into practice that is excellent by international standards commensurate with their field of research. • if junior members are involved they are supported by excellent senior members who will provide a strong mentoring environment. 	Relative to opportunity , the applicant(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has expertise that is relevant to the proposed research, and there are only minor concerns regarding the depth and/or breadth of expertise. • has over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement quality and productivity and/or translation into practice which places it well above average for their peers or cohort. • if junior members are involved they are supported by members with very good and growing reputations who may provide some mentoring 	Relative to opportunity , the applicant(s): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has expertise that is relevant to the proposed research, but there are some significant concerns regarding the depth and/or breadth of expertise. • has, over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement quality and productivity and/or translation into practice, that places them at an average level for their peers/cohort. • if junior members are involved they are supported by members with good and growing reputations, but there is little or no evidence of a mentoring framework to support them 			