

Strategic Award Assessment Panel scoring criteria

Development of an Adverse Outcome Pathway (AOP) for Cardiotoxicity

This document is intended as a guide for Panel members to score applications. It is essential that Panel members consider a range of factors when deciding on the overall score for a proposal. To assist Panel members in determining an appropriate score for applications, the NC3Rs has provided the scoring system below as guidance.

Panel members are asked to score the application from a range of 1 – 10, where one is the lowest score and ten is the highest. Scores should be whole numbers (0.5 integers are not accepted). Proposals with a median score of between seven and ten are considered fundable.

Scoring criteria

The following table should be used as guidance when determining an appropriate score for an application. It is not necessary to meet all of the individual criteria, as this is not intended to be prescriptive, but rather to provide a general framework. . The overall score should reflect your overall view of the application.

Score Indicators	Score
Exceptional <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Comprehensive explanation of planned methodology/approach towards execution of the project – thoroughly addresses all the call requirements▪ Demonstrates outstanding knowledge of the AOP process and terminology, having led previous AOP development projects▪ Applicant held in high esteem by the scientific community, considered an expert within the field, with an excellent publication record▪ Excellent understanding of, and well-articulated case for, the 3Rs impact of AOPs to cardiotoxicity▪ Very high likelihood of successful delivery of project, with comprehensive risk identification and mitigation▪ Excellent justification of resources required▪ Exceptional plans for dissemination	10

Score Indicators	Score
Excellent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comprehensive explanation of planned methodology/approach towards execution of the project – thoroughly addresses all the call requirements ▪ Demonstrates excellent knowledge of the AOP process and terminology, having played an instrumental role in previous AOP development projects ▪ Applicant held in high esteem by the scientific community, considered an expert within the field, with an excellent publication record ▪ Excellent understanding of, and well-articulated case for, the 3Rs impact of AOPs to cardiotoxicity ▪ Very high likelihood of successful delivery of project, with comprehensive risk identification and mitigation ▪ Excellent justification of resources required ▪ Exceptional plans for dissemination 	9
Very high quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comprehensive explanation of planned methodology/approach towards execution of the project – all call requirements addressed well ▪ Demonstrates very good understanding of the AOP process and terminology, having previously contributed to AOP development projects ▪ Applicant is highly regarded by the scientific community, considered an expert within the field, with an excellent publication record ▪ Excellent understanding of, and well-articulated case for, the 3Rs impact of AOPs to cardiotoxicity ▪ Very high likelihood of successful delivery of project, with comprehensive risk identification and mitigation ▪ Excellent justification of resources required ▪ Excellent plans for dissemination 	8
High quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Explanation of planned methodology/approach towards execution of the project is robust – all call requirements addressed well ▪ Demonstrates good understanding of the AOP process and terminology, having contributed to previous AOP development projects ▪ Applicant is highly regarded by the scientific community, considered an expert within the field, with a very good publication record ▪ Very good understanding of, and well-articulated case for, the 3Rs impact of AOPs to cardiotoxicity ▪ High likelihood of successful delivery of project, with risks identified and well mitigated ▪ Excellent justification of resources required ▪ Excellent plans for dissemination 	7

Score Indicators	Score
<p>Good quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Explanation of planned methodology/approach towards execution of the project is robust– addresses majority of call requirements ▪ Demonstrates good understanding of the AOP process and terminology, having contributed to previous AOP development projects ▪ Applicant is well-regarded by the scientific community and has a very good publication record in the relevant field ▪ Good understanding of, and well-articulated case for, the 3Rs impact of AOPs to cardiotoxicity ▪ Good likelihood of successful delivery of project, with risks identified and well mitigated ▪ Solid justification of resources required ▪ Good plans for dissemination 	6
<p>Good quality – with weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sound explanation of planned methodology/approach towards execution of the project – does not address all of the call requirements and some revisions required ▪ Demonstrates good understanding of the AOP process and terminology, has not previously contributed AOP development projects ▪ Applicant is respected by the scientific community and has a very good publication record in the relevant field ▪ Good understanding of, and adequately articulated case for, the 3Rs impact of AOPs to cardiotoxicity ▪ Good likelihood of successful delivery of project, with most risks adequately managed ▪ Solid justification of resources required ▪ Good plans for dissemination 	5
<p>Potentially useful – with significant weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Weak explanation of planned methodology/approach towards execution of the project – does not address all of the call requirements and significant revisions required ▪ Demonstrates an understanding of the AOP process and terminology, has not previously contributed AOP development projects ▪ Applicant is respected by the scientific community, publication record in the relevant field is not optimal ▪ Good understanding of the 3Rs impact of AOPs to cardiotoxicity ▪ Moderate likelihood of successful delivery of project ▪ Inappropriate resources requested to deliver project ▪ Adequate plans for dissemination 	4

Score Indicators	Score
Potentially useful – with major weaknesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="339 278 1208 368">▪ Planned methodology/approach towards execution of the project is weak – does not address all of the call requirements and substantial revisions required <li data-bbox="339 390 1176 458">▪ Poor understanding of the AOP process and terminology, has not previously been involved in AOP development projects <li data-bbox="339 480 1160 512">▪ Poor understanding of the 3Rs impact of AOPs to cardiotoxicity <li data-bbox="339 525 954 557">▪ Poor likelihood of successful delivery of project <li data-bbox="339 570 1017 601">▪ Inappropriate resources requested to deliver project <li data-bbox="339 615 727 646">▪ Lacking dissemination plans 	3
Poor Poor quality proposal, bordering on unacceptable	2
Unacceptable Unacceptable quality and serious concerns regarding the proposal	1