

## Relevance & Potential Impact Rating Scale

The Breakthrough Team Grants Relevance & Potential Impact rating scale is to be used by all reviewers to assess the relevance and potential impact of an application. 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
<b>Relevance &amp; Potential Impact</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application is clearly and compellingly relevant to one or more of the 6 low survival cancers (brain, esophagus, liver, lung, pancreas and/or stomach) (i.e. application is not relevant to cancer in general).</li> </ul>	✓	✓
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 one or more of these cancers.</li> </ul>	✓	✓
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where there is existing research capacity, proposed research has a clear line of sight to application in the short-to-medium term.</li> </ul>	✓	✓
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed work will lead to enhanced resources, platforms and/or capacity of the cancer research ecosystem to address challenges in one or more of the 6 cancers.</li> </ul>	✓	✓
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The knowledge translation and mobilization plan is well described, integrated into the proposed research, involves relevant stakeholders at the outset, and is poised to facilitate next steps towards implementation.</li> </ul>	✓	✓
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The potential impact of the proposed research on people at risk/patients is clearly described, compelling and transformative.</li> </ul>	✓	✓
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential for a paradigm shift/meaningful practice change is strong.</li> </ul>	✓	✓

### 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.	3.5 – 3.8	Medium-Low
Some (30-60%) scoring criteria have been met. Few items have been addressed. There are major 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