



# Research Grant Peer Review Form

## Background to the Brittle Bone Society Research Grants Programme

Applications are invited for Research Grants from investigators conducting research that will advance knowledge and application in the field of Osteogenesis Imperfecta. Proposals can complement existing research or can be made in their own right. Applications that focus on patient priorities are particularly welcomed. These can be found [here](#).

Please note:

- Detailed costing breakdowns are requested, and the successful application will be provided with the amount justified up to a maximum of £25,000.
- The scheme is open to clinicians, scientists, nurses, allied health professionals and anyone else involved in academic research and/or health care of the condition Osteogenesis Imperfecta.

This round of peer review seeks to assess and score all the applications received. A minimum of two referees will be allocated to each application.

## Assessment Criteria

Completed assessment forms should be returned to the Research Grant Co-ordinator ([admin@brittlebone.org](mailto:admin@brittlebone.org))

In your assessment of the application, please consider the following:

1. Distinctive contribution to, and likely impact on the health of those with Osteogenesis Imperfecta.
2. The quality of the science and the standing of the research group in the proposed area of research.
3. The quality of the research environment and the likelihood of using this funding as a springboard towards further funding applications.
4. Added value achieved through specific partnerships, e.g., across disciplines and departments, between academic institutions, with industry, the NHS, or other private and public sector organisations.
5. The quality of the applying investigators (refer below)

In addition, referees are asked to identify any ethical issues that need further attention.

## Scoring the application

Please ensure that you provide a score (1-10) for each aspect based on the criteria overleaf.

## Deadline for your assessments

Please complete and return the assessment form no later than the date specified in the email to you. If you are unable to help, please provide the name of an alternative referee(s). If you cannot provide your comments by the due date, please notify us as soon as possible.

## Feedback

Any feedback on the system will be gratefully appreciated. Your anonymised comments may be fed back to the applicant upon request.

## Confidentiality

Any applications sent to you are sent in confidence and you should destroy any files or printouts after use.

## Scoring Criteria

**Personal Qualities of the Applicant** (including motivation, evidence of the importance of research to career (1-poor quality, 10 highest quality))

Are the PIs, collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project? If Early-Stage Investigators or New Investigators, or in the early stages of independent careers, do they have appropriate experience and training? If established, have they demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s)? If the project is collaborative, do the investigators have complementary and integrated expertise; are their leadership approach, governance, and organisational structure appropriate for the project?

**Overall Impact.** (1-no impact, 10 highest impact)

Reviewers will provide an overall impact/priority score to reflect their assessment of the likelihood for the project to exert a sustained, powerful influence on the research field(s) involved, in consideration of the following review criteria and additional review criteria (as applicable for the project proposed).

**Importance and relevance to health care** (1-no importance/relevance, 10-most important/relevant).

Please comment on the originality, relevance to health care and implementability of the proposed research to benefit those with Osteogenesis Imperfecta.

**Methodology** (appropriateness, rigour, and feasibility of the methods (1-inappropriate, 10-highly appropriate))

Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented? If the project is in the early stages of development, will the strategy establish feasibility, and will particularly risky aspects be managed? Likelihood of achieving stated goals

**Environment** (1-unsuitable, 10-highly suitable)

Will the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success? Are the institutional support, equipment, and other physical resources available to the investigators adequate for the project proposed? Will the project benefit from unique features of the scientific environment, subject populations, or collaborative arrangements?

**Reviewer's Assessment Sheet**

Reviewer Name	
Lead Applicant Name	
Personal Qualities of the Applicant	Score 1- 10
Comments	
Overall Impact	Score 1-10
Comments	
Importance and relevance to health care	Score 1-10
Comments	
Methodology	Score 1-10
Comments	
Environment	Score 1-10
Comments	

Overall Comments	
------------------	--