



Score	Emerging Scholar Award Scientific Merit Rating Scale	Priority for funding
4.6 – 5.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is extremely likely to address an unmet need or answer an extremely important question in cancer research • Extremely novel, well defined, and rationalized hypothesis(es) and research aims • Exceptional research design • Leading edge nationally and internationally • Extremely likely that all objectives will be met • Exceptional expertise to carry out the proposed research • Very minor to no weaknesses identified 	Highest
4.1 – 4.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is very likely to address an unmet need or answer an important question in cancer research • Novel, well defined, and rationalized hypothesis(es) and research aims • Excellent research design • Nationally and internationally competitive • Very likely that all objectives will be met • Excellent expertise to carry out the proposed research • At least one minor weakness identified 	High
3.6 – 4.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is likely to address an unmet need or answer an important question in cancer research • Hypothesis(es) and research aims generally well defined and rationalized • Appropriate research design • Nationally competitive and potentially internationally relevant • Somewhat likely that all objectives will be met • Appropriate expertise to carry out the proposed research • Several minor weaknesses identified 	Medium
3.1 – 3.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uncertainty as to whether project will address an unmet need or answer an important question in cancer research • Hypothesis(es) and research aims lack detail and adequate rationale • Inadequate research design • Potentially nationally relevant • Unlikely that all objectives will be met • Insufficient expertise to carry out the proposed research • At least one major weakness identified 	Low
3.0 or less	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unlikely that project will address an unmet need or answer an important question in cancer research • Poorly defined/rationalized hypothesis(es) and research aims • Poor or vague research design • Unlikely to be nationally relevant • Unlikely that any objectives will be met • No or limited expertise to carry out the proposed research • Multiple major weaknesses identified 	Very Low
Unscored (mark as 0.01)	The application was triaged by the panel and not discussed. The weaknesses of the proposed research far outweigh the strengths and therefore there is a low expectation of success.	None