



College of Medicine Research Awards (CoMRAD) Scoring Guide

Use this guide to assess each of the CoMRAD applications assigned and record scores in the Excel Reviewer Scoring Sheet provided. All applications will be ranked according to score. **Applications must have a score of 70 points or higher to be considered for funding.**

Please score based on the following sections:

Section 1: Strength of Research Team	20 point maximum
○ Principal Investigator's CV	
○ Co-Investigator(s) CV	
○ Strength of the Research Team	
Section 2: Research Proposal	60 point maximum
○ Part A: Research Question, Background and Objectives	20 point maximum
■ Research Question or Hypothesis	
■ Rationale for Research	
■ Objectives of the Research	
■ Quality and Clarity	
■ Novelty of Project	
○ Part B: Research Design, Methods and Planning	20 point maximum
■ Research Design and Methods	
■ Applicant's Detailed Timeline	
■ Availability of Resources	
■ Roles in Proposed Research	
■ Consideration of Sex and Gender	
■ Project Feasibility	
○ Part C: Expected Outcomes, Impact and Outputs	20 point maximum
■ Expected Outcomes and Impact	
■ Intended Outputs	
Section 3: Detailed Budget and Justification	20 point maximum
Total Maximum Points Available:	100 point maximum

CoMRAD Scoring Guide

Comments

Comments are an important method of improving unsuccessful applications for future rounds. This allows applicants to reflect on their applications and modify accordingly. All comments will be released to the Principal Investigator (PI). This is a blind peer review so all comments will be de-identified prior to being released.

Comments can be left on the Excel "Reviewer Scoring Sheet" in two formats:

- **Section comments:** Brief comment for each section explaining score. This is particularly important as it allows for perspective regarding which sections were stronger or weaker than others.
- **General Comments and/or Areas to Improve:** Summary of the most important points of the review, addressing the strengths and weaknesses of the application and include areas the applicant could improve. Score should reflect the overall impression of the application as well as the impact of the project on the field.

Disclosure of Association

Note if you have a connection to the application or applicant. This may include:

- You are a close, personal friend of the PI or Co-Investigator (Co-I).
- You have held or currently hold collaborative funding with the PI or Co-I.
- You have published together with the PI or Co-I in the last five years.

Please email the completed scoring sheet to com.rad@usask.ca. Once your scores are submitted, our office will contact you for your information to process honorarium payment.

CoMRAD Scoring Guide

Section 1: Strength of Research Team (Score of 0 to 20 points total)

Please assess the academic background of the PI and Co-I's tri-agency CV relative to their career stage, field of research, and with consideration to leaves of absence as noted within CV. Using the CV information and the "*Strength of the Research Team*" section of the application form, please assess the experience of applicants in the proposed area of research and with the proposed methodology and/or the appropriateness of the research team to carry out the proposed research. Please note that indicators may include awards, funding, work experience, publications, presentations, but also community-engaged work, outreach, and other "non-traditional" outputs and experiences.

More information for reviewing the tri-agency CV can be found [here](#).

Section 2: Research Proposal (Score of 0 to 60 points total)

Part A: Research Question, Background and Objectives (Score of 0 to 20 points)

1. **Research Question or Hypothesis:** Applicant must state an original and significant research question, hypothesis or any appropriate alternative that captures the central problem to be addressed by the research.
2. **Rationale for Research:** Applicant must explain the rationale for the research and outline how the new directions and ideas in the proposal will extend or advance current knowledge in this area.
3. **Objectives of the Research:** Applicant must explain the short, medium or long-term objectives they are expecting from the research.
4. **Quality and Clarity:** The purpose of the project must be clear and applicant must provide solid justification for the research project.
5. **Novelty of Project:** The proposed research must be novel rather than simply a continuation of ongoing or already funded research.

Part B: Research Design, Methods and Planning (Score of 0 to 20 points)

1. **Research Design and Methods:** Applicant must describe the research design and methods giving sufficient details of how he/she intends to carry out the proposal, including statistical analysis as appropriate, and explain why chosen research design and methodology is the most appropriate for the proposal.
2. **Applicant's Detailed Timeline:** Applicant must provide a realistic timeline of key activities and work to be completed during the length of the funding period, identifying who and what will be involved in each phase.
3. **Availability of Resources:** Applicant must provide evidence that the resources (e.g., time, specialized assistance, access to equipment) are available.
4. **Roles in Proposed Research:** Applicant must outline how the research team will undertake this project, describing what the roles of each team member will be and how the team will be able to drive the project to completion.
5. **Consideration of Sex and Gender:** Sex (biological attributes) and gender (socio-cultural factors) should be considered throughout the proposal where appropriate. If not considered, the applicant should provide a viable justification of why it is not applicable.
6. **Project Feasibility:** The proposed work must be feasible given the capacity of the investigators, proposed budget, proposed approach, with consideration for sex and gender-based approaches

(where appropriate) and displaying appropriate engagement and reciprocity with Indigenous peoples (where appropriate).

Part C: Expected Outcomes, Impact and Outputs (Score of 0 to 20 points)

1. Expected Outcomes and Impact:

- Applicant must describe the expected outcomes, impacts, and/or benefits that will result from the proposed work. This may include:
- Better meeting the needs of end-users/audiences (cultural, business, social, educational, policy, health etc.), whether as a direct 'user' of the research or as developers or intermediaries who might take the results/findings of the research farther.
- Changing the research trajectory to a strategically aligned new direction to take advantage of the opportunities in this new area.
- Working towards commercialization of the research by developing intellectual property and/or marketable products or processes.
- Seeking funding from external organizations by piloting new methodologies, gathering additional data, developing new or strengthening research relationships with government, business or community groups, validating a process or approach, and/or better meeting the expectations of an external funder.
- Developing or strengthening an inter/intra-disciplinary and/or trans-organizational research profile by undertaking a coherent set of aligned research investigations.

2. **Intended Outputs:** Applicant must describe the intended outputs of their research (e.g. community engagement outcomes, publication, report, process, performance, etc.) and include how they intend to disseminate the findings.

Section 3: Detailed Budget (Score of 0 to 20)

A detailed budget is required, and all expenses must be sufficiently justified. The level of financial support will be influenced by applicant's budget justification. All applicants must provide a detailed budget for the research and explain the items included. They must also justify personnel and salaries, general operating expenses, travel, and equipment directly related to the project (see guidelines for items that are/are not fundable.). All amounts listed should be inclusive of taxes (provincial and federal).