



CCS Emerging Scholar Research Grants

Scientific Merit Rating Scale

The Emerging Scholar Research Grants Scientific Merit rating scale is to be used by all reviewers to assess the proposal's scientific merit. Assigned reviewers are asked to assign a preliminary **Scientific Merit** score (between 0 and 5, to 1 decimal place) based on the criteria below, and to record this score in EGrAMS prior to the panel meeting. *Note that guidance has been provided to indicate which criteria may be deemed most relevant by reviewer type, however reviewers are free to assess based on their own personal (and intersectional) expertise/experience.*

Review Criteria	Sci	PSC/End-Users
Research Approach (~60%)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scientific rationale and evidence for the proposed research is thorough, balanced, and compelling • Aims are clearly articulated and well-conceived • Approach/methods is/are well-described and feasible, with potential challenges and alternative approaches discussed • High likelihood that anticipated outcomes will be realized – i.e. key milestones & timelines and budget are realistic 	✓	*
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Public Summary is written in non-technical language and clearly describes the goal/purpose, methods, relevance and potential impact of the proposed research, and the process for engaging patient, caregivers and other stakeholders in research design, implementation and results dissemination • Where relevant, the proposed research acknowledges the burden of cancer on patients and their caregivers, and considers the quality of life of study participants in tangible, measurable ways • Sex, gender, and other dimensions of diversity/social determinants of health (e.g. race, ethnicity, education, economic status) and their intersectionalities are appropriately addressed in the research design, methods, analysis, interpretation, and dissemination/implementation of findings/outcomes • The proposed research is creative, innovative and/or original 	✓	✓
The team and environment (~40%)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant has the expertise to carry out the proposed research • Applicant has (or has a plan to secure) the necessary resources and expertise to complete the work, including alternative strategies • The environment(s) where the research will take place is/are appropriate (e.g. contain the required equipment, expertise, and support, including any collaborations, when relevant) • Meaningful involvement has been demonstrated with <u>all</u> members of the research team in the development of the research proposal (described in the Terms of Reference). • Accessibility, equity, diversity and inclusion principles are evident in team composition 	✓	✓



***Note:**

Please be aware that the initial/preliminary scores given by reviewers during the review process may not be reflective of final scores, as some reviewers may need more information to evaluate the scientific merit, for example (i.e., whether the proposed study has a sound design and can answer the research questions). Additionally, **not all reviewers will rate every aspect of an application.**

Score descriptions

When interpreting score descriptions, the proportion of criteria addressed (all, majority, most, etc.) should pertain only to those that are relevant to a given reviewer. For example, if PSCs and/or End-Users are scoring based on 8 (of the possible 13 points above), then 8 is the denominator for the descriptions below.

Description	Score range	Funding priority
All scoring criteria have been met and some exceeded. Each item has been appropriately and thoroughly addressed. Very minor improvements are recommended.	4.7 – 5.0	Highest
The majority (>85%) scoring criteria have been met and some exceeded. The majority of items have been appropriately addressed. Some minor improvements are recommended.	4.3 – 4.6	High
Most (70-85%) scoring criteria have been met. Most items have been appropriately addressed. There are several minor or moderate areas for improvement, but no major weaknesses	3.9 – 4.2	Medium-High
Many (60-70%) scoring criteria have been met. Many items have been addressed. There is at least one moderate weakness or many minor weaknesses, no major weaknesses.	3.5 – 3.8	Medium-Low
Some (30-60%) scoring criteria have been met. Few items have been addressed. There are major weaknesses, or many minor to moderate weaknesses, and the proposal needs further development before being competitive in this program.	3.0 – 3.4	Low
Not enough (<30%) scoring criteria have been met. The weaknesses of the proposal outweigh the strengths.	Below 3.0	None



Relevance & Potential Impact Rating Scale

The Emerging Scholar Research Grants Relevance & Potential Impact rating scale is to be used by all reviewers to assess the relevance and potential impact of an application and applicant. Assigned reviewers are asked to assign a preliminary **Relevance & Potential Impact** score (between 0 and 5, to 1 decimal place) based on the criteria below, and to record this score in EGrAMS prior to the panel meeting.

Criteria	Sci	PSC/End-Users
Relevance & Potential Impact of the project		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed research is clearly and compellingly relevant to cancer (specific or in general). The potential impact (short or long-term) of the proposed research on people at risk/patients is clearly described and compelling There is evidence that patients/caregivers and clinicians/end-users have been and will be engaged throughout the life of the research project. There is appropriate representation of patients/caregivers on the research team – or a description of how deficits will be addressed The application describes and has a high potential to lead to improvements in the prevention, detection, treatment, and/or duration and quality of life for people affected by cancer, and/or equitable and timely access to cancer care. Where relevant, the proposed research has a clear line of sight to application in the short-to-long term. 	✓	✓
Relevance & Potential Impact for the applicant		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant shows evidence of commitment to cancer research. The impact of receiving this grant on the applicant's cancer research program and their research team is <u>evident and would be transformational</u>. The applicant shows leadership capabilities through research experience, community engagement, volunteering with patients, work experience, or/and other meaningful experience. A mentorship plan is available to the applicant and the mentorship benefits (specific skills and opportunities gained) are likely to lead to greater impact in cancer research. The applicant has a demonstrated commitment to/track record of mentorship activities/experiences. 	✓	✓
Relevance & Potential Impact through knowledge translation, training & mentorship		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The knowledge translation and mobilization plan is well described, integrated into the proposed research, involves relevant stakeholders at the outset (including patient representatives), and is poised to facilitate next steps towards implementation. Patients/Survivors/Caregivers have been/will be included/engaged in appropriate, defined aspects of knowledge translation, training and mentorship Training and mentorship are valued and articulated as an integral part of the research plan and will result in PI mentorship and leadership skills 	✓	✓



<p>improvement as well as a sustained increase in research capacity and momentum in the future (from a human resources perspective)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Specific and appropriate approaches, activities, and skills to be developed are described for different career stages/types of team members as relevant, with consideration for accessibility, equity, diversity, and inclusion principles		
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

Score descriptions

Description	Score range	Funding priority
All scoring criteria have been met and some exceeded. Each item has been appropriately and thoroughly addressed. Very minor improvements are recommended.	4.7 – 5.0	Highest
The majority (>85%) scoring criteria have been met and some exceeded. The majority of items have been appropriately addressed. Some minor improvements are recommended.	4.3 – 4.6	High
Most (70-85%) scoring criteria have been met. Most items have been appropriately addressed. There are several minor or moderate areas for improvement, but no major weaknesses	3.9 – 4.2	Medium-High
Many (60-70%) scoring criteria have been met. Many items have been addressed. There is at least one moderate weakness or many minor weaknesses, no major weaknesses.	3.5 – 3.8	Medium-Low
Some (30-60%) scoring criteria have been met. Few items have been addressed. There are major weaknesses, or many minor to moderate weaknesses, and the proposal needs further development before being competitive in this program.	3.0 – 3.4	Low
Not enough (<30%) scoring criteria have been met. The weaknesses of the proposal outweigh the strengths.	Below 3.0	None