

FMD Research Grant Peer Review Process_V4

To support staff in submitting research grant proposals, with the aim of improving the likelihood of award success and providing constructive mentoring support, all Institutes across the Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry must establish an internal Institute grant review process as per the requirements detailed below.

Key overarching principles:

- FMD Research Grant Peer Review Process aims to scrutinise and then provide constructive comment and advice, available to all those submitting grants for assessment, related to scientific novelty, experimental design and to identify additional collaborative opportunities to enhance a proposal.
- FMD Grant Peer Review Process particularly seeks to support those in the early stages of their research careers by providing guidance and mentoring on research grant applications.
- The Institute Director together with the Institute Research Manager has the overall responsibility to ensure the timely progression of the FMD Research Grant Peer Review process prior to going through approvals on Worktribe.

Peer Review Pathways

Clinical and non-clinical Early Career Researchers (ECRs), Lecturers and Senior Lecturers, when they are the PI with QMUL leading the application, and where grant value is greater than £100k (ex-partner costs).

1. Peer review can be conducted either by review through presentation and discussion at an Institute Whiteboard session or through provision of two separate independent senior academic researchers (Appendix 1).
 - a. **For Whiteboard sessions:** PIs should present their research proposal at their respective Institute Whiteboard meeting, chaired by a senior academic. Notes of the review with recommendations for improvements should be detailed within the peer review form and the form signed and dated by The Chair.
 - b. **For Independent Academic Review:** The PI should seek independent review from two relevant academic colleagues (of whom one should be the PI Centre Lead or delegate). Each senior academic should complete one peer review form each. It is recommended that peer review comments are sought on proposals well ahead of the submission deadline, to provide good time for comments to be collected and, where needed, for grants to be amended based on this feedback.
2. The above FMD Institute Peer Review Process is **mandated** for **all** grant proposals, irrespective of grant giving body, to be submitted by **(clinical and non-clinical) Early Career Researchers (ECRs), Lecturers and Senior Lecturers when they are the PI and the grant value is greater than or equal to £100k (ex-partner costs)**. Grant approval in Worktribe will not be provided without evidence of internal peer review uploaded into the system.
3. Irrespective of which approach is conducted for Peer Review the PI should provide a

brief response document detailing how the recommendations have been responded to (Appendix 1). All peer review documents, and a summary of changes document must be uploaded on Worktribe for approval prior to submission. Failure to do so might result in a delay in approvals which could affect timely submission.

4. If Institutes wish to broaden the mandated scope beyond the academic levels detailed in point 2 above it is entirely at their discretion.

Large FMD strategic grants

5. For large FMD **strategic** cross faculty grant initiatives (see list of exemplars in Appendix 2) the lead PI should present the EoI or the submission proposal to the RSB at least **two months** prior to the submission deadline. If you are unsure if this applies to a scheme you are interested in applying to then please contact the Dean For Research directly.
6. The above Institute Peer Review Process is also mandated for **all** grant proposals over £2m (excluding partner costs) that are not clinical trials irrespective of academic level. All grants above £1.5m (excluding partner costs) automatically require approval from the Dean for Research within Worktribe who will check for the peer review for all grants over £2m (excluding partner costs).

Demand Management proposals

7. Any grant proposals where the funder has mandated only a single submission per HEI will undergo an RSB selection process. There will be specific calls with details of EoI and review stages where this process is required. Please contact your Institute Research Manager who will assist you on how to proceed.
8. All proposals for any single scheme will be reviewed by a panel constituted by RSB and scored to identify the nominated proposals to go forward (see appendix 3 for examples of schemes with demand management)

General additional considerations

9. Approval on Worktribe for submission by Institute Directors should be given only if the requisite reviews have been provided.

APPENDIX 1 FMD Peer Review form

FMD Individual Reviewer/Whiteboard Peer Review Form Please upload the completed form onto Worktribe. Please use this form to review the attached study.			
Reviewer or Whiteboard Chair Name:			
Date of review:		Deadline date for submission:	
Study Title:			
Lead Investigator:	<i>Please include name and email address.</i>		

Originality	
Is the study original? Is this study important and relevant to this field of research? Please rate originality from 1 (least) to 6.	
Ethics	
If the research presents ethical concerns, does the plan of investigation/scientific background address these concerns?	Human:
	Animal:
Methodology	
Are the methods used valid? Please add comments as relevant.	
Statistics (where applicable)	
Has a statistician been involved and are the methods described appropriate?	
Are the number of subjects / observations sufficient? Is there a power calculation?	

Costings	
Do the costings and use of resources seem appropriate? Please see costing details about Salary costs; Equipment costs; Consumables; Equipment; Tuition fees (where relevant). Add comments as relevant.	
Do you have any advice on potential additional sources of funding?	
Feasibility	
Are project aims appropriate for the resources requested in required timeframe?	
Overall rating	
What is your overall evaluation of the importance of study within the field from 1 (poor) to 6 (high)?	
Additional comments for PI	
Do you support the submission of this project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> With amendments

Signature of Reviewer	
-----------------------	--

--

APPENDIX 1 FMD PI Peer Review Response form

FMD PI Peer Review Response Form

Please upload the completed form onto Worktribe.

Please use this form to review the attached study.

Name of Reviewers:

Date of review:

Deadline date for
submission:

Study Title:

Lead Investigator:

Please include name and email address.

Response to Reviewer/Whiteboard comments

Please list how you have modified your proposal to take into account the peer review comments.

APPENDIX 2: EXAMPLES OF LARGE STRATEGIC GRANT APPLICATIONS

- Barts Charity Programmes: Please see internal FMD guidance (contact your Institute Research Manager)
- MRC Centres of Research Excellence: <https://www.ukri.org/who-we-are/mrc/centres-of-research-excellence/>
- Expanding Excellence in England: <https://www.ukri.org/what-we-do/browse-our-areas-of-investment-and-support/expanding-excellence-in-england-e3-fund/>
- British Heart Foundation Centres of Excellence: <https://www.bhf.org.uk/what-we-do/our-research/research-excellence-and-accelerator-awards>
- CRUK Grand Challenge: <https://cancergrandchallenges.org>

APPENDIX 3: EXAMPLES OF DEMAND MANAGEMENT SCHEMES

- Future Leaders Fellowship: <https://www.ukri.org/what-we-do/developing-people-and-skills/future-leaders-fellowships/>
- MRC Equipment Grant: <https://www.ukri.org/opportunity/purchase-mid-range-equipment-for-biomedical-research-mrc-equip/>