

### AGES Clinical Research Grants Scoring Rubric

SCORE	1 - 2	3 - 4	5 - 6	7 - 8	9 - 10
<b>What is the clinical and scientific significance?</b>	Research question is redundant, Information will not add to current knowledge, unlikely to impact on clinical practice.	Limited scientific value, minimal relevance to clinical practice.	Sound research question that may provide clinically relevant information.	Interesting research question on a topical subject that is clinically important.	Highly significant question on an important and novel research topic. Likely to change current clinical practice.
<b>Validity of the scientific approach?</b>	The approach is unsafe, not valid or does not address the research question.	The scientific approach addresses the hypothesis in a limited way, unlikely to meet research aims.	The hypothesis is mainly addressed by the scientific approach.	The approach is well established and will provide answers that will answer the research question.	The methods clearly address the research question and will provide publishable and clinically relevant outcomes.
<b>Feasibility of the study?</b>	Serious concerns about feasibility and quality of project.	Some concerns about feasibility of major aspects of the project.	Feasible although minor aspects may be questionable.	Solid, likely and feasible.	Highly feasible, likely to result in highly recognised publishable outcomes.
<b>Track Record of the Investigator?</b>	Failed projects/ projects not seen to completion.	Limited clinical or scientific research outputs in the context of several attempts.	Moderately good outputs and growing track record in research.	Clear interest in research, good outputs, strong potential for further growth in track record.	Strong CV and clear interest in clinical research, demonstrated ability to translate funding into research outputs.

<p><b>Availability of expertise and facilities?</b></p>	<p>Serious concerns about the ability to conduct research due to lack of expertise and/or facilities.</p>	<p>Concerns about the research environment and facilities.</p>	<p>Good facilities and some collaborators with past experience in project supervision and management.</p>	<p>Quality research environment and high commitment to project. Moderate track record of research supervision and project completion by collaborators.</p>	<p>High quality research environment with strong commitment and track record of collaborators.</p>
<p><b>Appropriateness of budget?</b></p>	<p>Minimal part of large project and budget unlikely to substantially contribute to project. Budget unrealistic or for staff or equipment that are minimally related to project.</p>	<p>Unclear if budget is appropriate for project completion.</p>	<p>Reasonable budget for the expectations of project.</p>	<p>Stand-alone budget directly applicable to project and likely to lead to completion.</p>	<p>Stand-alone budget that clearly supports project in the desired timeframe.</p>
<p><b>Overall suitability for an AGES grant?</b></p>	<p>Serious safety concerns. Ethical concerns. Project irrelevant to AGES.</p>	<p>Limited relevance to AGES.</p>	<p>Relevant to AGES but some aspects may be outside AGES activities.</p>	<p>Resides within the goals and ethos of AGES.</p>	<p>Highly relevant to the goals and ethos of AGES.</p>