

RATING		1	2	3	4	5
A	SCIENTIFIC MERIT (Clear Research Questions & Appropriate Description of Methods)	Although the objectives may have merit, lacks clear research question. Methods significantly underdeveloped or characterized by major weaknesses that far outweigh strengths.	Includes research question(s). Description of research methods (may be missing key details). A few strengths but at least one major weakness. Some merit but significant concerns.	Clear scientific merit, including clear research questions. Appropriate description of methods. Strengths outweigh minor or moderate weaknesses.	Strong scientific merit, including clear, insightful research questions and hypotheses (when appropriate). Excellent description of methods. Strengths outweigh minor weaknesses.	Superb, leading edge, questions/hypotheses that address important issues that will advance the field. Major strengths far outweigh weaknesses.
B	RELEVANCE (to GRH Patient Populations, Strategic Directions)	Proposal focuses on a health issue unrelated to areas of clinical focus at GRH.	Potential relevance to GRH clinical population(s) but link not clearly stated.	Potential relevance to GRH clinical population(s) described, but addresses issue of low priority and/or questionable relevance to clinical care.	Clear relevance to GRH patient population(s), addresses issues of moderate importance to clinicians and families.	Clear relevance to GRH patient population(s). Addresses issues of great importance to clinicians and families.
C	Potential to Positively IMPACT Clinical Practice @ GRH	Unlikely to inform or positively impact clinical practice.	May generate information of interest to clinicians/families, but no specific practice implications (either explicit or implicit).	Likely to generate information which may eventually be relevant to clinical practice.	Likely to generate information that would inform service delivery systems/clinical practice at the GRH. The clinical team may or may not be heavily involved in the research.	Likely to generate information that would lead to positive and substantial improvements that impact on service delivery/clinical practice. Clinical team well-integrated into the research.
D	Potential to Build RESEARCH CAPACITY @ GRH	Unlikely to build research capacity beyond the specific proposed project.	Some involvement of new/junior researchers, trainees or GRH staff. Mentorship plan not well developed. Very unlikely to lead to additional grant funding.	New/junior researchers, trainees or GRH staff play important roles in the project. Potential for mentorship by other team members unlikely to lead to additional grant funding.	New/junior researchers, trainees or GRH staff play important roles in the project. Mentorship plan clearly stated and/or some potential to lead to additional grant funding.	New/junior researchers, trainees or GRH staff play important roles in the project. Mentorship plan clearly stated and/or potential to launch important new line of research with strong likelihood of attracting additional grant funding.
E	INNOVATION (Novel Concept or Approach)	Lacks novelty.	Some novelty in terms of methods or new patient population, but unclear how this adds to previous work.	Clear evidence of novelty in the field. Logical extension of previous work or replication using different methods/ patient population.	Utilizes novel, theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation or intervention -- a leap forward from previous work.	Extremely novel, giant leap forward, at the "cutting edge" with respect to advancing conceptual models, methodology and/or technology.

RATING		1	2	3	4	5
F	FEASIBILITY (Possibility of Completion in Timeframe and Within Budget)	Scope of project does not lend itself to completion within the granting time frame. Budget is unrealistic or poorly explained. Participant enrollment expectations are not realistic. Research team does not appear to have sufficient access to support and expertise.	Significant concerns about whether the project can be completed within award time frame; budget includes some detail but not adequately developed and/or justified. Considerable uncertainty about enrollment expectations. Research team has previously received funding but has <u>not</u> been able to complete original study	Uncertainty about whether project can be completed within time frame. Budget and justification reasonably well developed, but some key details missing. Enrollment expectations seem reasonable. Researchers have some expertise but may not have access to additional expertise that may be required. If team has received previous funding from GRHF, study was successfully completed.	Good probability of completion within time frames. Budget reasonably well developed and justified. Enrollment expectations are realistic. Adequate expertise and supports appear to be in place. If team has received previous funding from GRHF, study was successfully completed.	Excellent probability of effective and timely attainment of research objectives. Budget is realistic and provides enough detail for justification. Enrollment expectations are highly realistic. Researchers have supports and expertise to conduct the activities proposed. If team has received previous funding from GRHF, study was successfully completed.
G	KNOWLEDGE TRANSLATION (KT) and KNOWLEDGE MOBILIZATION (KM)	Proposal describes only basic dissemination activities, focusing primarily on presentations.	Proposal includes basic dissemination strategies (i.e. presentations and publications) with some reference to clinical audiences. How information will be targeted to different audiences is not well described.	Proposal includes KT activities that address communication and engagement with target audiences and potential impact on practice and policy.	Proposal includes KT activities that address communication and engagement with target audiences and potential impact on practice and policy. Consideration is given to how KT strategies will be tracked or measured.	Proposal includes description of how knowledge will be synthesized, disseminated and applied to practice and policy. Includes consideration for KM activities within the Knowledge-To-Action framework. Proposal includes indicators for both KT and KM activities.
H	OVERALL IMPRESSION	Application poorly put together with no clear enunciation of problem or outcomes.	Application somewhat disjointed and difficult to understand problem outcomes.	Application clearly written with reasonable problem and outcomes discussion.	Application well-written with reasonable statements of problem and outcomes expected.	Application extremely well written with clear statement of problem with explicit deliverables.