



Triaging Statements of Interest

Process:

All applications:

- those not meeting all below essential criteria, as assessed by MQ research team, will be triaged out.
- MQ research team to notify applicants of reason for decision

Applications meeting all essential criteria:

- all to be scored against the below desirable criteria by MQ research team
- the 40 highest scoring applications to be sent to the PsyIMPACT Committee Chair with potential to be sent to full committee to review.
- Full committee to review applications using the same criteria, informed by MQ research team scores.
- The highest scoring 20 applications, as agreed by the committee, to be invited to Stage 2 full application

Essential criteria: if project scores 'no' on any item, they will not be eligible for stage 2	yes	no
Application form completed as specified		
PI:	-	-
• in post for duration of project		
• has PhD or equivalent		
• At least 5 publications, for one of which the PI is first author		
The host institution is eligible (i.e. an NHS trust or other healthcare provider, a university, or other research organisation with demonstrable track record in producing research).		
Team reflects expertise needed for the project		
Project is distinct from other projects currently submitted elsewhere for funding as reported by the applicants.		
Research question falls within funding call:	-	-
• Innovative (i.e. not a replication)		
• Focused on those at risk of developing a mental disorder or of relapsing		
• Theory-driven (i.e. supported by a rationale for how it will intervene with the mechanisms that cause or sustain the disorder)		
• Feasible (i.e. demonstration that the project can be completed in the timescale stated e.g. access to participants, evidence of successful recruitment to		

similar trials)		
Clear trajectory (with estimated time line) to patient benefit (e.g. specific plans for obtaining future funding and/or plans for future implementation of study findings into clinical practice.)		
Budget over £300k		

Desirable criteria: The 40 highest scoring applications will be reviewed by the committee chair with the potential to be sent out to committee member for expert opinion.	score
PI:	-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grant funding history: None or minor (less than moderate) = 0, moderate = 1 (PI or co-applicant on at least 2 previous grants of more than £50k each), excellent = 2 (PI or co-applicant on more than 2 previous grants of more than £50k each) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publications in peer reviewed journals: poor = 0 (0 or 1 publications in high quality, peer reviewed journals), moderate = 1 (2 or 3 publications in high quality peer reviewed journals), Excellent = 2 (4 or 5 publications in high quality peer reviewed journals) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total number of peer reviewed publications: Poor = 0 (fewer than 10), moderate = 1 (10-30), excellent = 2 (more than 30) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of peer reviewed first author (PI) applications: Poor = 0 (fewer than 5), moderate = 1 (5-15), excellent = 2 (more than 15) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of peer reviewed last author (PI) applications: Poor = 0 (fewer than 5), moderate = 1 (5-15), excellent = 2 (more than 15) 	
Team: Poor = 0 (overall relatively inexperienced eg minimal grant funding between them), moderate = 1 (some publication and grant attainment experience within the broader team), excellent = 2 (team contains recognised international experts in the field with significant publication and grant attainment experience)	
Project relates to larger programme of research No = 0, yes = 1 (either linked to an existing project or has clear potential to inform a programme of research, with a specific plan for the development of the future programme specified)	
Aims: unclear = 0, clear = 1	
Hypothesis/es: Not specified = 0, specified = 1	
Design and methods*: Not appropriate to research questions = 0, appropriate to research question = 1	

Plan for statistical analysis: Not approved by a statistician = 0, approved by a statistician = 1	
Outcome variables: Not specified = 0, specified = 1	
How well the project addresses the PsyIMPACT 2015 call: Not at all = 0, moderately = 1 (some variability between criteria in terms of how well they are met), excellently = 2 (all criteria well met)	
How well the project addresses MQ's interdisciplinary aim: Not at all = 0, moderately = 1 (1 or two disciplines involved in the project), excellently = 2 (more than two disciplines involved in the project)	
Other strengths (e.g. PPI involvement, systematic review informs proposal): None = 0, moderate = 1 (other strengths mentioned, but not fully specified), excellent = 2 (other strengths fully specified)	

* For applications that score zero on this point, the PsyIMPACT Committee chair will be consulted if the application is not one of the top 40 highest scoring applications

Total possible score = 29