

Score	Emerging Scholar Awards Scientific Merit Rating Scale	Priority for funding
4.7 – 5.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exceptional research design with clearly defined aims and well-described methodological approach, including alternative strategies</li> <li>• Extremely likely that all objectives will be met within the proposed timeframe and budget</li> <li>• Where applicable, sex, gender and diversity (and their intersectionalities (SGBA*)) considerations, in the context of research design, analysis and dissemination of findings, are clearly described and of the highest quality</li> <li>• Exceptional expertise of the research team to carry out the proposed research</li> <li>• Equity, diversity and inclusion considerations, in the context of the research team, are highly appropriate and clearly defined</li> <li>• The research team has (or has a plan to secure) the necessary resources to complete the work, including alternative strategies</li> <li>• No weaknesses</li> </ul>	<b>Highest</b>
4.3 – 4.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent research design with well defined aims and well-considered methodological approach, including alternative strategies</li> <li>• Likely that all objectives will be met within the proposed timeframe and budget</li> <li>• Where applicable, sex, gender and diversity (and their intersectionalities (SGBA*)) considerations, in the context of research design, analysis and dissemination of findings, are clearly described and of high quality</li> <li>• Excellent expertise of the research team to carry out the proposed research</li> <li>• Equity, diversity and inclusion considerations, in the context of the research team, are appropriate and clearly defined</li> <li>• The research team has (or has a plan to secure) the necessary resources to complete the work, including alternative strategies</li> <li>• At least one minor weakness identified that can be addressed during the term of the grant</li> </ul>	<b>High</b>
3.9 – 4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very good research design with moderately well-defined aims and methodological approach (with or without alternative strategies presented)</li> <li>• Likely that most objectives will be met within the proposed timeframe and budget</li> <li>• Where applicable, sex, gender and diversity (and their intersectionalities (SGBA*)) considerations, in the context of research design, analysis and dissemination of findings, are clearly described and of sufficient quality</li> <li>• Very good expertise of the research team to carry out the proposed research</li> <li>• Equity, diversity and inclusion considerations, in the context of the research team, are appropriate</li> <li>• Some minor weaknesses identified that can be addressed during the term of the grant</li> </ul>	<b>Medium-High</b>
3.5 – 3.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good research design with adequately defined aims and methodological approach (with or without alternative strategies presented)</li> <li>• Potential for most objectives to be met within the proposed timeframe and budget</li> <li>• Where applicable, sex, gender and diversity (and their intersectionalities (SGBA*)) considerations, in the context of research design, analysis and dissemination of findings, are described and of acceptable quality</li> <li>• Acceptable expertise of the research team to carry out the proposed research</li> <li>• Equity, diversity and inclusion considerations, in the context of the research team, are acceptable</li> </ul>	<b>Medium-Low</b>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least one moderate weakness, and/or several minor weaknesses identified</li> </ul>	
<b>3.0 – 3.4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate research design with aims and methodological approach lacking sufficient detail</li> <li>• Unlikely that objectives will be met within the proposed timeframe and budget</li> <li>• Where applicable, sex, gender and diversity (and their intersectionalities (SGBA<sup>+</sup>)) considerations, in the context of research design, analysis and dissemination of findings, are not clearly described or are insufficient</li> <li>• Insufficient expertise of the team to carry out the proposed research</li> <li>• Equity, diversity and inclusion considerations, in the context of the research team, are not clearly defined or are insufficient</li> <li>• Numerous moderate weaknesses, and/or one or more significant weaknesses</li> </ul>	<b>Low</b>
<b>Below 3.0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research in need of further development before being competitive</li> <li>• Numerous major weaknesses</li> </ul>	<b>None</b>