



GRANT AWARDS & PEER REVIEW PROCESSES

How we award fellowships

Restore's Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) includes independent scientists and clinicians from the research community with appropriate research expertise and experience to cover the fellowship applications that we receive. The Chair of the SAC will usually be a research scientist with expertise in the area of burns and wound research or in a related area. SAC Committee members have an initial term of office of 4 years; they do not receive any payment and must abide by both a Code of Conduct and Conflicts of Interest Policy.

The role of the SAC is to provide scientific guidance and support to Restore's Director(s) of Research and to advise and make recommendations to the Trustees with regard to the implementation of research projects and the award of research fellowships.

The Director(s) of Research aim to devise [two?] project[s] each year or as they see fit which will [develop the principal areas of research funded by the Charity]. They do not receive any payment and must abide by the Code of Conduct and Conflicts of Interest Policy.

All applications will undergo internal and external peer review. The internal peer review panel (IPR) is constituted from the SAC together with one lay member (usually a Trustee). Its members rotate every [three] years, subject to re-election for an additional [two] year term. The IPR will be responsible for reviewing applications and making recommendations to the Trustees on the suitability of candidates for fellowships as set out below. [If a Trustee is a member of the IPR, he/she will not either act as Chair or apply for funding].

At least [2] appropriate external reviewers are selected by the Director(s) of Research with guidance from the SAC. The external reviewers may provide written appraisals of applications for consideration by the IPR.

The review panels will include a significant number of non-beneficiaries. **Our peer review process**

The applications for Fellowships and reports of the external reviewers are discussed by the IPR who express their own views on the proposal and the external reviews and, by consensus, reach a decision for recommendation to the Trustees. The short-listed candidates for Fellowships will, in addition, be called for an interview.

Applications are not normally ranked, but those that have received uniformly low scores from all the external reviewers might not be discussed (or only briefly discussed) by the IPR.

Referee scoring system

Research Projects

External reviewers are asked to review research projects devised by the Directors of Research and Clinical Studies as excellent, good, moderate or poor on the basis of:

- [Hypothesis: its importance and originality]
- Approach: clarity of the objectives, the feasibility or appropriateness of the methodology and feasibility within the proposed timescale
- Potential Impact: scientific and/or clinical
- Relevance: to the cause, cure and/or treatment of burns and/or wounds

We also ask external reviewers to provide a written critique of the proposed research project, including comments on the importance and originality of the research question, the clarity of the research objectives, the suitability of the methodology and whether the planned experiments are likely to yield decisive results.

Applications for Fellowships

For Fellowship applications, the IPR is asked to review and score applications as excellent, good, moderate or poor on the basis of:

- the potential of the candidate,
- the quality of their application,
- their standing in the field of research and
- their ability to complete the research project on time and on budget.

The written reviews of referees are an important element in the decision making process, but are not the sole criterion for deciding the success or failure of an application.

In practice, however, only applications that score predominantly in the top two categories are likely to be successful.

Feedback

We may provide feedback to both successful and unsuccessful applicants in the form of the reviewers' comments plus any relevant points arising from the committee discussions. Any feedback provided is at our sole discretion.

November 2010