

**Peer Review 2019: Early Career Researcher Seed Grants  
7-Category Descriptor Scale**

Four (4) Seed Grants of up to \$50,000 available to early career researchers, addressing (at least) one of the following Stroke Foundation 2020 Research Priority Areas:  
One Seed grant is allocated to a carer support project, subject to the external independent review panel's assessment of proposal quality for funding eligibility.

**2020 Research Priority Areas: To improve access to and delivery of:**

- i) long term community support (e.g. continuity of care, health services, and rehabilitation) with outcome measures beyond 6 months;
- ii) interventions for long term psychosocial recovery (i.e. recovery of cognition, communication, and emotional and social wellbeing) with outcome measures beyond 6 months;
- iii) health services and pathways of stroke management, including proposals addressing implementation and change in practice (i.e. translation into practice for acute stroke care studies);
- iv) support for the diverse needs of Carers.

| 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 &amp; 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:                |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |
| <b>Relevance</b>         | The planned work will result in a <b>highly significant</b> advance in knowledge which addresses an issue of <b>great importance</b> to stroke and <b>will</b> translate into fundamental outcomes in the science and practice of clinical medicine, public health, or in health policy. The planned research:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>directly targets</b> one of the five <b>priority areas</b> of research listed above</li> <li>• will <b>almost certainly</b> result in <b>highly influential</b> publications</li> <li>• will <b>almost certainly</b> be the subject of invited plenary presentations at national and international meetings, often with relevance across several fields.</li> <li>• is highly innovative and introduces advances in concept(s)</li> <li>• will use very advanced approaches which will optimize outcomes</li> <li>• includes all priority groups</li> <li>• has very advanced procedures in place to ensure consumer participation</li> </ul> | The planned work will result in a <b>significant</b> advance in knowledge which addresses an issue of importance to stroke and <b>is likely</b> to translate into fundamental outcomes in the science and practice of clinical medicine, public health, or in health policy. The planned research:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>directly addresses</b> one of the five <b>priority areas</b> of research listed above</li> <li>• will <b>likely</b> result in <b>influential</b> publications</li> <li>• will <b>likely</b> be the subject of invited plenary presentations at international and national meetings.</li> <li>• is <b>highly</b> innovative in concept</li> <li>• will use <b>advanced</b> approaches to enhance outcomes.</li> <li>• includes most priority groups, and where these cannot be included, there is good justification</li> <li>• has advanced procedures in place to ensure consumer participation</li> </ul> | The planned work will <b>advance</b> knowledge in this field which addresses an issue of importance to stroke and <b>may translate</b> into fundamental outcomes in the practice of clinical medicine, public health or in health policy. The planned research<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>addresses</b> one of the five <b>priority areas</b> of research listed above</li> <li>• is likely to result in some <b>very strong</b> publications</li> <li>• <b>could</b> be the subject of invited plenary presentations at international and national meetings</li> <li>• <b>is</b> innovative in concept</li> <li>• Will use <b>well established</b> approaches to good effect</li> <li>• includes some priority groups, and adequate justification of non-inclusion of some groups</li> <li>• has adequate procedures in place to ensure some consumer participation</li> </ul> | The planned work may <b>incrementally</b> advance knowledge which addresses an issue of some importance to stroke, but is <b>unlikely to translate</b> into fundamental outcomes in the practice of clinical medicine, public health or in health policy. The planned research<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• although it <b>addresses</b> one of the five <b>priority areas</b> of research listed above, this is only 40-60% of the focus of the application</li> <li>• may result in some <b>good but not excellent</b> publications</li> <li>• <b>is unlikely to</b> be the subject of invited plenary sessions at international meetings</li> <li>• less solid in concept</li> <li>• Will in the main use <b>standard</b> approaches</li> <li>• some priority groups are excluded, with adequate justification</li> <li>• has little or no established procedures to promote consumer participation</li> </ul> | 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). |
| <b>Research Program</b>  | The <b>proposal has a research plan that:</b><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is <b>well-defined</b>, highly coherent and strongly developed.</li> <li>• has a <b>near flawless</b> study design.</li> <li>• is <b>highly feasible</b> with all of the required expertise, research tools and techniques established.</li> <li>• would be highly competitive with the best, similar research proposals internationally.</li> </ul>  | The <b>proposal has a research plan that:</b><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is clearly <b>defined</b>, coherent and well developed.</li> <li>• has a strong study design.</li> <li>• is <b>feasible</b> with all required tools, techniques and expertise established.</li> <li>• is likely to be competitive with strong, similar research proposals internationally.</li> </ul>   | The <b>proposal has a research plan that:</b><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is <b>generally clear</b> in its scientific plan and is logical.</li> <li>• raises only a few <b>minor concerns</b> with respect to the study design.</li> <li>• is <b>feasible in all, or almost all areas</b> - required techniques and tools either established or nearly established.</li> <li>• may not be highly competitive with similar research proposals internationally.</li> </ul>  | The <b>proposal has a research plan that:</b><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is <b>generally solid</b> in its scientific plan, but may not always be clear in its intent and may lack some focus.</li> <li>• raises <b>several concerns</b> regarding the study design.</li> <li>• raises <b>doubts</b> about the feasibility in some areas.</li> <li>• is not likely to be competitive with similar research proposals internationally.</li> </ul>   |   |   |  |
| <b>Team Track Record</b> | <b>Relative to opportunity</b> , the applicant(s):<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• has expertise that <b>specifically targets the proposed research</b> both in terms of its depth and/or breadth.</li> <li>• has over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement quality and productivity and/or translation into practice that is <b>outstanding by international standards</b> commensurate with their field of research.</li> <li>• if junior members are involved they are supported by <b>outstanding</b> senior members who will provide a <b>very strong</b> mentoring environment.</li> </ul>   | <b>Relative to opportunity</b> , the applicant(s):<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• has expertise that is <b>highly relevant</b> to the proposed research both in terms of its depth and/or breadth.</li> <li>• has over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement quality and productivity and/or translation into practice that is <b>excellent by international standards</b> commensurate with their field of research.</li> <li>• if junior members are involved they are supported by <b>excellent</b> senior members who will provide a <b>strong</b> mentoring environment.</li> </ul>   | <b>Relative to opportunity</b> , the applicant(s):<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• has expertise that is relevant to the proposed research, and there are only <b>minor concerns</b> regarding the depth and/or breadth of expertise.</li> <li>• has over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement quality and productivity and/or translation into practice which places it <b>well above average</b> for their peers or cohort.</li> <li>• if junior members are involved they are supported by members with <b>very good and growing</b> reputations who may provide some mentoring</li> </ul>  | <b>Relative to opportunity</b> , the applicant(s):<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• has expertise that is relevant to the proposed research, but there are <b>some significant concerns</b> regarding the depth and/or breadth of expertise.</li> <li>• 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 <b>average</b> level for their peers/cohort.</li> <li>• if junior members are involved they are supported by members with <b>good and growing</b> reputations, but there is little or no evidence of a mentoring framework to support them</li> </ul>   |   |   |  |