

FMD Research Grant Peer Review Process Guidelines

Reviewed and approved by FMD Research Strategy Board

Date: 25/07/2023

Reviewed and approved by Dean For Research

Signature:



Date: 26/07/2023

FMD Research Grant Peer Review Process

To support staff in submitting research grant proposals, with the aim of improving the likelihood of award success and providing constructive mentoring support for all Institutes across the Faculty of Medicine & Dentistry have been conducting ad hoc bespoke internal grant review processes. Whilst this has been helpful there is recognition that the processes across the Institutes would benefit from harmonisation. Below is guidance that has been created following discussions at both the FMD Research Strategy Board and the FMD Executive Board.

Key overarching principles:

- FMD Research Grant Peer Review Process aims to scrutinise and then provide constructive comment and advice, 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.
- We will introduce the new approach to peer review for 1 year and then assess effectiveness and impact.
- 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.

Review Process

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.
2. **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.
3. **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.
4. Irrespective of which approach conducted for Peer Review the PI should provide a brief response to recommendations made during the review process.
5. For large FMD strategic grants the lead PI should present the EoI or the submission to the RSB at least one month prior to the submission deadline.
6. 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 the submission.

7. Approval by Institute Directors should be given only if the requisite reviews have been provided.

Peer review mandates

1. This 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**. Grant approval in Worktribe will not be provided without evidence of internal peer review.
2. Any strategic large grant proposals, including where the funder has mandated only a single submission per HEI should be reviewed via this process and also presented to the FMD Research Strategy Board. **Strategic proposals will need approval by the FMD Dean for Research on Worktribe before final submission.** If you have any queries, please contact your Research/Institute Manager who can assist you on how to proceed.
3. Any large grant EoI/proposals (+£1M) should ideally undergo the above review process. For this pilot period, ***due to potential workload***, this is not at the present time mandated from those at Reader and Professor level. However, any grant over £1m will still require Worktribe approval from the Dean for Research.
4. This pilot will begin from September 1st 2023, and run to August 31st 2024 in the first instance.

FMD 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	
-----------------------	--

ADMIN ONLY - Worktribe Reference Number:

FMD PI Peer Review Response 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>		

Response to Reviewer/Whiteboard comments

--