SCORING GUIDE & ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE FOR GRANTS ALLOCATION COMMITTEE

For the Ruth Straus Foundation non-smoking lung cancer small grants programme

Part 1: Scoring Criteria:

We request that you base your review of the project proposal and project summary on the following criteria:

Importance and originality

1. How important is the research question(s) that will be addressed?
2. Is the study likely to contribute significant new understanding to the field of non-smoking or lung cancer in non-smokers?
3. Is there sufficient evidence that an exhaustive literature search has been carried out to confirm that the research project is of sufficient quality, and not overly duplicating any previous work?

Design and Methodology

4. How good is the scientific quality of the proposal?
5. Is the proposal original and innovative?
6. Is there a robust methodology and study design at the centre of the proposal?
7. How well have ethical issues and project risks been identified, and how will they be mitigated?

Potential Impact

8. What is the potential economic and societal impact of the proposed research?
9. Is the proposed research likely to result in health service benefits or those to people diagnosed and living with non-smoking lung cancers?
10. Is there identification of the potential impacts of research and plans to deliver these?

People and Workplace including PPI

11. How suitable are the research team and collaborators? Please comment on the track record(s) of the individual(s) in their fields and whether they are best placed to deliver the proposed research.
12. How suitable is the environment where the proposed research will take place?
13. Has appropriate patient and public involvement (PPI) been involved in the study, either in the design or as part of the project?

Value for Money

14. Are the funds requested essential for the work and fully justified?
15. Does the proposal represent good value for money?

Please provide a score of 1-10 and justify this score within your comments. You should refer to the scoring guide for an explanation of what we expect of applications to achieve each score.

Your scores will be considered along with those of any External Written Reviewers. The final decision for all grants to be awarded will be made at the RSF Grants Allocation Committee meeting.

Guide to Scoring

Excellent Quality	• Top international project of exceptional strategic importance • Crucial scientific question filling a knowledge gap of strategic importance • Original and innovative; novel methodology and design • Excellent potential for high health and/ or socioeconomic impact • Excellent team, track record, environment and collaborators • Excellent patient and public involvement in the study design • Strong potential for high return on investment • Appropriate staff time allocated to deliver projects on time	**9-10**
Very High Quality	• Internationally competitive and/or of national strategic importance • Important scientific question filling a knowledge gap of strategic importance • Original and innovative, with a robust methodology and design • Good potential for high health and/ or socioeconomic impact • Very strong team, track record, environment and collaborators • Very good patient and public involvement in the study design • Potential for high return on investment • Appropriate staff time allocated to deliver project	**7-8**
High Quality	• Worthwhile scientific question or knowledge gap or a valuable scientific resource • Robust methodology and design, with some innovation evident • May need some (relatively minor) revisions to improve quality and fundability • Potential for significant health and/ or socioeconomic impact • Strong team, track record, environment, and collaborators • Good patient and public involvement in the study design • Potential for significant return on investment • Appropriate staff time allocated to deliver project	**5-6**
Good Quality	• Worthwhile scientific question with potentially useful outcomes • Methodologically sound study but some areas require revision • Likelihood of successful delivery • Appropriate team, environment and collaborators (*scope to strengthen*) • Some patient and public involvement in the study design, but room for improvement • Potentially more limited return on investment • Resources broadly appropriate to deliver the proposal	**3-4**
Poor Quality	• Poorly defined scientific question • Methodologically weak study • Limited likelihood of new knowledge generation • Poor team • Poor or no patient and public involvement in the study design • Potentially poor return on investment	**1-2**

Part 2: Scoring

Please complete and submit this form to Deepa by Wednesday 11th March ahead of the Grants Allocation Meeting on Thursday 19th March 2026

Application being scored	
Lead Applicant name	
Host organisation	
Research/project title	

Conflict of declaration	
Are you related to the grant applicant? Have you recently (in the last 3 years) worked with or co-published with the grant applicant?	**Yes** ☐ **No** ☐
If you are related to or have worked with or co-published with the application in the last 3 years, please tell us how you know them, so we can consider the conflict of interest:	

SCORE
Please Score 1- 10 for each aspect of the criteria. (If you are unable to score any aspect of the criteria, please put N/A). For each score, please provide a *brief* written review, letting us know why you have selected that specific score. Your completed form will then be shared with the RSF Grants Allocation Committee, and anonymised versions of your comments will be shared with the applicant, as per AMRC guidelines.
Importance and originality
Score: **Notes on the score:**
Design and methodology
Score: **Notes on the score:**
Potential impact
Score: **Notes on the score:**
People, workshop, and patient/public involvement
Score: **Notes on the score:**
Value for money
Score: **Notes on the score:**
Do you recommend this project be funded by the Ruth Strauss Foundation? **Yes** ☐

	No ☐

Please tell us why you made this recommendation

Thank you for your time and expertise. We could not administer the Grants Programme without your support.