

**CCS/CIHR Survivorship Team Grant
Scientific Merit Rating Scale**

Characteristics	Alignment	Score Range	Priority for Funding
1. The background and scientific rationale for the proposed work assesses, integrates and builds on the best available evidence to propose highly suitable methods for achieving meaningful aims and objectives – in other words, the proposal thoroughly demonstrates its relevance to and potential to address cancer survivorship issues facing Canadians.	All (6) characteristics have been appropriately and thoroughly addressed in the research proposal. Very minor (if any) improvements are recommended.	4.9 – 5.0	Highest
	All (6) characteristics have been appropriately, but not thoroughly, addressed in the research proposal. Minor improvements of some characteristics are recommended.	4.6 – 4.8	Very High
2. The proposed research plan is highly feasible (i.e. expertise, environment and available resources will permit the proposed methodology to achieve the stated objectives within the proposed timeframe; risks are described and mitigated as much as possible).	Most (5) of the characteristics have been appropriately and/or thoroughly addressed in the research proposal. There is room for minor improvement of one or more characteristics, but no moderate or major weaknesses.	4.2 – 4.5	High
	Many (4) of the characteristics have been appropriately and/or thoroughly addressed in the research proposal. There are several minor or moderate areas for improvement, but no major weaknesses.	3.9 – 4.1	Medium - High
3. The team possesses the ideal combination and balance of experience and expertise to accomplish the stated objectives (including relevant clinical, practical, implementation and lived experience expertise). There is evidence (and/or confidence) that the team can successfully work together to achieve the anticipated outcomes.	Some (3) of the characteristics have been appropriately and/or thoroughly addressed in the research proposal. There are a number of areas for minor to moderate improvement and potentially one major, but addressable, weakness.	3.6 – 3.8	Medium - Low
	Few (2) of the characteristics have been appropriately and/or thoroughly addressed in the research proposal. There may be a number of well-addressed characteristics, but more than one major weakness.	3.3 – 3.5	Low
4. Survivors/caregivers have been and will continue to be appropriately and meaningfully engaged throughout the entire research process.	Very few (1) of the characteristics have been appropriately and/or thoroughly addressed in the research proposal. There are major weaknesses and the proposal needs further development before being competitive in this competition.	Below 3.3	Lowest
	The weaknesses of the proposed research far outweigh the strengths. The proposal is not recommended for further consideration by the panel.	0.1 (unscored)	None
5. Aspects of sex (biological), gender (socio-cultural), diversity, and other determinants of health such as income and access to health services are addressed in the research design, making it more ethically sound, rigorous and useful.			
6. The budget and timeline are clearly articulated, well-justified, and adequate to accomplish the proposed activities.			