

Challenging genetic disorders



Chronic Granulomatous Disorder Research Trust

Referee Report Form

The CGD Research Trust aims to promote research into the cause, inheritance, management, symptoms and cure of CGD and to disseminate the useful results of such research.

Please would you complete the following form and return it, with the application, in the addressed envelope provided.

In appropriate sections please would you both comment and give score rating.

In Confidence

Application Reference:
Applicant(s):
Referee:

A. The importance of the problem that the application seeks to overcome.

B. The importance of the contribution it will make to furthering the Charity's strategic aims

CONTRIBUTION SCORE =

(1-3 = little or no contribution; 4-7 = average contribution; 8-10 = excellent contribution).

C. Scientific merit, feasibility of the work proposed and the likelihood of a successful conclusion within the time specified.

SCIENTIFIC MERIT SCORE =

(1-3 = little or no contribution; 4-7 = average contribution; 8-10 = excellent contribution).

D. Originality of ideas i.e. are others attempting to answer the same question and if so does the work need repeating or do the proposals offer anything new.

ORIGINALITY SCORE =

(1-3 = little or no contribution; 4-7 = average contribution; 8-10 = excellent contribution).

E. The qualification and track record of the applicant(s) and his/her/their department(s)

F. Cost effectiveness. How much of the support requested is justified? What modifications to the support would you recommend to the advisory panel?

Please give an overall score for the application according to the criteria below.

Mark Awarded:

Scoring system

8-10. Scientifically excellent and of major importance, internationally competitive; worthy of award.

6-7. Very good; likely to make a significant contribution to knowledge; nationally competitive; worthy of award.

5. Good. Likely to produce novel and worthwhile data. Consider for award but not in its present format.

3-4. Fair. May contribute to knowledge but unlikely to make an impact.

0-2. Unfundable. Flawed, marginal or unnecessarily repetitious of other work. Not worthy of support

Normally only those applications that score over five will be considered for funding.

H. Areas of concern that need to be addressed before the application can be considered for funding.

I. It is our policy to provide feedback to our applicants once the outcome of their submission is known. Please complete the section below.

J. Details of the Referee

Name of Referee:

Department:

Address:

Phone:

Fax:

e-mail:

Field of expertise:

Signature of Referee:

Date: