

Score Matrix A

Reviewers should score each application based on their overall impression of the application and the response to review.

Review Criteria	Definition	Score
Importance to Emergency Care	Leads to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better care for patients in Emergency Medicine and/or support and outcomes for staff providing services in Emergency Medicine Improved access to treatment, time to recovery, degree of full recovery Capacity to improve upon current best practice Cost savings for patient (travel, return to work, etc) and/or health service delivery 	
Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriateness of expenditure Impact of expenditure 	
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health economic impact including cost efficiency/potential savings for healthcare systems e.g. bed occupancy rates, clinical hours and/or Broader economic impact e.g. productivity, jobs, economic sustainability Importance of the problem and outcomes for society (reduction in visits to health service, avoid family separation etc.) 	
Innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New knowledge/novelty and/or Degree of innovation in methodology, equipment, techniques, cross-disciplinary approaches and/or Generation of new research output 	
Translation into practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of the practical ability & plan to communicate and disseminate findings into the research and emergency care community and Evidence and plan to translate outcomes into practice 	
TOTAL Score		
Average Score		

Scale

5	Strong Fully addresses the criterion and sets forth a compelling argument as to the application's merit in this area
4	Acceptable Enough of the key points in the criterion are covered to make a legitimate case for consideration. Additional information gives significant enough argument to be seen as a highlight in the application
3	Average Either enough of the key points in the criterion are addressed or sufficient evidence is provided, to make a case for meeting the criterion. However, the narrative is such that it is unremarkable and does not rise beyond cursory interest
2	Weak Addresses only some of the elements within the criterion with sufficient detail in the application
1	Very weak Does not sufficiently address the elements within the criterion to be considered

Score Matrix B

Reviewers should score based on their overall impression of the application and the response to review.

Review Criteria	Weighting	Definition	Score
Scientific Quality	40%	Includes approach and robustness of methodology/experimental design	
Importance and Impact	40%	Includes new knowledge/novelty, degree of innovation in methodology, equipment, techniques, cross-disciplinary approaches, generation of new research output, impact and significance such as for the patient, community, societal, clinical, economic and translation	(Total average score from Score Matrix A)
Investigator & Team Track Record	20%	Team quality & capability relevant to the application and relative to opportunity	
TOTAL Score	100%		
Average Score			

Scale

5	Strong Fully addresses the criterion and sets forth a compelling argument as to the application's merit in this area
4	Acceptable Enough of the key points in the criterion are covered to make a legitimate case for consideration. Additional information gives significant enough argument to be seen as a highlight in the application
3	Average Either enough of the key points in the criterion are addressed or sufficient evidence is provided, to make a case for meeting the criterion. However, the narrative is such that it is unremarkable and does not rise beyond cursory interest
2	Weak Addresses only some of the elements within the criterion with sufficient detail in the application
1	Very weak Does not sufficiently address the elements within the criterion to be considered

*Applications will be ranked from highest to lowest scores with the highest scoring applications recommended for funding.

Closing Comments and Advice for Applicants (Optional Comments)

Professional reviewer feedback and advice that may assist the applicant to improve their proposal for current and future rounds. Applications will not be scored on the optional comments, but these can be further utilised by the Strategic Grants Committee and/or the EMF staff in providing guidance to applicants.