



The Challenge Grants **Scientific Merit** rating scale is to be used by scientific reviewers to assess the research project proposed. Reviewers are to assign a score for each category below and the weight indicated per category are to be considered when calculating the Overall score (rounded to two decimal places). Only the Overall score is collected.

Review criteria

Research strategy (~50%)

- scientific merit and convincing rationale that considers critical review and analysis of preliminary data and/or published literature
- feasibility of the project, including identification of potential problems and how they will be addressed, including alternative approaches
- appropriate positioning of the aims to generate meaningful data/information that will support a solution to the challenge identified
- sex, gender, and other identity factors (e.g. race, ethnicity) and their intersectionalities appropriately considered in the research design, methods, analysis, interpretation, and dissemination of findings/outcomes
- appropriateness of the term and amount of support requested

Relevance (~25%)

- clearly identified challenge to cancer and appropriate steps to address the challenge, both during and post-grant are well articulated
- potential of the project to generate outcomes that will (ultimately) be meaningful to people affected by or at risk of cancer
- knowledge translation/mobilization activities align well with grant focus and will support resolving the identified challenge

Team and Environment (~25%)

- the qualifications and appropriate expertise of the investigator(s) and other team members (including collaborators), particularly as it relates to the potential for (eventual) resolution of the identified challenge (note that career stage of investigator(s) will be taken into consideration, including any career interruptions)
- appropriate team members are in place to ensure that findings will be relevant to people affected by or at risk of cancer
- consideration of equity, diversity and inclusion principles in team composition and recruitment processes, and training and development opportunities
- quality of the research environment in which the work will take place (is there appropriate equipment, mentorship, etc. available to support success, taking into consideration contributions of collaborators as required)



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

Score calculation

Category	Relative weight	Assigned score
Research strategy	50%	
Relevance	25%	
Team and environment	25%	
Overall score	submit this score in EGrAMS	/ 5