

Research Grants

Each application will be assessed based on the following criteria:

The scientific quality and feasibility of the research proposal. (1-10)

- 10 – Very high quality proposal, well planned, with clear deliverable objectives and details of how the study is to be carried out.
- 8 – High quality proposal, well planned, with clear objectives and timelines but more detail required to understand feasibility.
- 6 – Good quality proposal, with more detail required on objectives, timelines and feasibility.
- 4 – Average quality proposal, with poor detail on objectives, and feasibility.
- 2 – Poor quality proposal, with very poor detail on planning and feasibility.

*The calibre of the applicant. (1-5)**

- 5 – Very high quality applicant with an excellent track record of physiology research including an excellent publication record.
- 4 – High quality applicant with a very good track record of physiology research at including very good publication record.
- 3 – Good quality applicant with a good track record of physiology research at including good publication record.
- 2 – Average quality applicant with an average track record of physiology research at including an average publication record.
- 1 – Poor quality applicant with a poor track record of physiology research at including a poor publication record.

**The quality of the applicant will be determined by their track record of original peer-reviewed research articles (in terms of the number and quality of articles) as related in their 'research history' and 'publications' within their application.*

The possibility of the proposal securing future funding. (1-3)

- 3 – Very likely to secure future funding. The proposal clearly demonstrates the potential for future research stemming from the project, which is very likely to attract funding from other bodies (e.g. funding councils).
- 2 – Likely to securing future funding. The proposal demonstrates the potential for future research stemming from the project, which may attract funding from other bodies (e.g. funding councils).
- 1 – Some likelihood of securing future funding. The proposal show little potential for future research or future research is unlikely to attract funding from other bodies (e.g. funding councils).

Commitment of the Host Institution and research environment. (1-3)

- 3 – Institution/department has offered strong support for the candidate's research in terms of start-up costs and/or research assistance and/or expertise. Excellent facilities for the project are available.
- 2 – Institution/department has offered some support for the candidate's research in terms of start-up costs and/or research assistance and/or expertise. Additional facilities may be required.
- 1 – Institution/department has offered a letter of support, but little evidence for further support. Facilities for undertaking the project may not be available.

Potential for collaborations. (1-2)

2 – High likelihood of a number of collaborations from both within the candidate's department/unit and from academics at other institutions.

1 – Likelihood of some collaborations from either within the candidates department/unit and/or from academics at other institutions.