

# Research Funding Conditions

**Version: 12**

<b>Summary:</b>	The intention of this document is to express Big C's criteria for the charity's investment in scientific research.	
<b>Target audience:</b>	Trustees, Committee members, potential applicants for grant funding and other stakeholders.	
<b>Next review date:</b>	To be reviewed bi annually.	
<b>Reviewed by:</b>	Grants Committee Research Advisory Panel Grants Committee	<b>Date of meeting:</b> 1 April 2019 10 September 2021 15 November 2021
<b>Approved by:</b>	Board of Trustees  Grants Committee	First adopted by the Board: 26 July 2012 Revised by the Board: 24 April 2019 Revised by the Board: 30 June 2021 Amended by Exec Team: 20 July 2021 15 November 2021
<b>Date issued:</b>	24 November 2021	
<b>Author:</b>	Dr Melanie Pascale – Director of Charitable Operations Kate Morgan – Company Secretary (KM)	
<b>Director:</b>	Dr Melanie Pascale – Director of Charitable Operations	

## Version Control

### Change Record

Date	Author	Version	Page	Reason for Change
28 Nov 2013	Board	2		Autumn application deadline b/f to 31 August
10 Dec 2015	Board	3		GANTT chart required with applications
30 Nov 2017	Board	4		New policy for investment in research using animals
25 April 2018	Board	5		Project awards may be made to a maximum of £100k, with applicants wishing to apply for larger sums invited to discuss this with Big C before making an application. “Pump-priming/start up” awards may be made to a maximum of £25k
July 2018	KM	6		To reflect new application form
1 April 2019	Grants Cttee	7		To remove out of date references and meet the Association of Medical Research Charities’ membership requirements
16 April 2019	JW/KB	8		To reflect requirements for studies involving human participants.
30 June 2021	Board	9		Para 11.3 Unspent funds – two year limit
20 July 2021	ET	10		Paras 2-3.2 Application deadline and process – electronic applications only
26 July 2021	KM	11		To reflect 2021 basis of grant awards
15 Nov 2021	Grants Cttee	12		Overall update and strengthen requirements for interim reporting, engagement, add final report proforma and new peer review form as appendices

### Reviewers/contributors

Name	Position	Version Reviewed & Date
Simon Crocker Dylan Edwards Sharon Johnson David Moar MBE Jennie Wimperis Carolyn Sexton Kate Morgan Ian Johnson	Trustee Trustee Trustee Trustee Trustee Trustee Company Secretary Chair, Big C Research Advisory Panel	6.0 on 1 April 2019
Professor Kristian Bowles (KB)		7.0 on 12 April 2019
Research Advisory Panel		11 on 10 Sept 2021

## Contents

		<b>Page</b>
1	Introduction	4
2	Qualifying applicants	4
3	Qualifying projects	4
4	Qualifying project costs	5
5	Application procedures	6
6	Action to be taken on receipt of written confirmation of award	6
7	Start of project and late starts	6
8	Engagement, publicity and education	6
9	Financial management of grant	8
10	Changes to project after award of grant	8
11	General availability of funds	9
12	Scientific fraud	9
13	Progress and final reports	10
14	Intellectual property and the commercial development of Big C supported projects	11
15	Liability, indemnity and insurance	11
16	Governing law	11
<u>Appendix A</u>	Big C Open Access Policy	12
<u>Appendix B</u>	Application, review and award procedures	13
<u>Appendix C</u>	Final report pro-forma	15
<u>Appendix D</u>	Peer review report pro-forma	16

## **1. Introduction**

These Conditions of Funding (“**Conditions**”) contain detailed information to assist an applicant for a scientific/clinical research or equipment grant. They also contain conditions which shall be incorporated into the grants approved and made by Big C. Where there is any conflict between these Conditions and the notes in the application form these Conditions shall prevail. For the avoidance of doubt, both the relevant host institution and individuals responsible for the relevant grant are bound, by signing any standard application or other form of submission, by these Conditions. Variations can be made by Big C at any time but variations must be in writing and communicated to applicants/recipients in writing. Failure to comply with these Conditions, and any additional conditions applicable to any particular grant on the part of the applicant or his or her host institution shall allow Big C immediately or after due consideration to revoke or vary the grant as it thinks fit.

## **2. Qualifying applicants**

Only applications from researchers working within the boundaries of Norfolk & Waveney will qualify. Collaborations with researchers and institutions outside Norfolk & Waveney are welcome. The research or equipment should be carried out or used in Norfolk & Waveney.

Chief/Principal applicants must hold a post in an institution of higher education or comparable institution that will extend beyond the duration of Big C’s grant funding.

## **3. Qualifying projects**

### **3.1 Public benefit**

Big C supports research for public benefit and not for commercial or private gain.

### **3.2 Project types**

Big C will support:

- Seedcorn/pump priming grants to a maximum of £25k.
- Project grants for research projects of up to three years in length. These may be laboratory based research projects, projects which consider the impact of cancer, clinical trials, patient studies or projects which consider the societal causes of cancer.
- Studentships (BSc, MSc, MRes and PhD)
- Personal funding for Research Fellowships of up to two years in length
- Research equipment and infrastructure

Project awards will be made to a maximum of £100k, with applicants wishing to apply for larger sums invited to discuss this with Big C before making an application.

### **3.3 Standards of research practice**

Big C will only fund applications from institutions which have published standards of good research practice and which apply the principles of the Association of Medical Research Charities’ Guidelines on Good Research Practice as well as the Wellcome Trust’s “*Statement on the Handling of Allegations of Research Misconduct*”.

### **3.4 Ethical approval**

All studies involving human participants, human tissue samples (or other human biological samples) and data must obtain the appropriate approval from the Health Research Authority (HRA <https://www.hra.nhs.uk/approvals-amendments/what-approvals-do-i-need/>). HRA Approval is necessary for all project-based research involving NHS organisations in England. It combines an assessment of governance and legal compliance, which is undertaken by dedicated HRA staff, and the independent ethical opinion of a Research Ethics Committee (REC), so that only one application is submitted. Further details on the HRA Approval process can be found on the HRA website. Studies taking place in the NHS also require approval from the host NHS organisation. Applicants should contact their NIHR (Local Clinical Research Networks and 30 Specialties) for further information.

Approval must be obtained and confirmed by the grantholder prior to the recruitment of the first participant and/or the use of human biological samples. Evidence of such approval must be provided either within the application or in the case of PhDs at the point at which it is obtained.

Research using the use of Health information (also known as patient data or health records) must adhere to the AMRC position statement on the use of patient information for medical research and apply the 4Cs principles: (Choice: let me decide who has information about me; Care: treat my information with care; Competence: handle my information according to rules; Clarity: on who uses my information and for what purpose). <https://www.amrc.org.uk/Handlers/Download.ashx?IDMF=5f382b22-c3e1-4060-a0aa-fd032fb466e3>

### **3.5 R&D**

Research & Development Office approval is required where appropriate. Evidence of such approval must be provided either within the application or at the point at which it is obtained.

### **3.6 Animals**

Big C endorses the Association of Medical Research Charities' position on the use of animals in research (<https://www.amrc.org.uk/position-statement-on-the-use-of-animals-in-research>).

### **3.7 Cell lines**

The identity of cell lines used for research must be verified in an appropriate manner and as far as is reasonably possible. (Verification could be purchasing new cell stocks from a suitable supplier or laboratory analysis of the cells).

## **4. Qualifying project costs**

See paragraph 3.2 for maximum award values. The following costs will be considered for Big C funding:

- employment costs of research staff (gradings and salaries must be in accordance with the normal practices of the host institution)
- employment costs of technical/other staff (gradings and salaries must be in accordance with the normal practices of the host institution)

- consumables/materials (if a project is for consumables only then justification for this must be provided within the application)
- purchase and installation of equipment excluding VAT (where the equipment is required as part of a project application its value must be no more than 10% of the total cost of the grant award)
- cost of laptops and/or software subject to justification from the applicant that a particular laptop/software is necessary for the project. Such equipment should be treated as the property of the host institution which would also be responsible for installation.
- Open Access Article Processing Charges for any length of project to a maximum of £3,000 per project (see Appendix A for Big C's Open Access Policy)

The following costs do not qualify for Big C funding:

- personal support of applicants who are in University/NHS/research Institution full-time permanent employment
- provision of clerical assistance
- maintenance of equipment or service charges
- charges for indirect costs, overheads, estate charges
- salary enhancements or other locally agreed supplements

A separate fund is kept to support conference fees and the cost of travel to conferences relating to the research. Grantholders are invited to apply as and when opportunities arise.

## **5. Application procedures**

Applications must be made on the standard application form without modifications and completed in accordance with the instructions contained in Appendix B to these Conditions.

## **6. Action to be taken on receipt of written confirmation of award**

Written confirmation of the grant award will be issued as soon as possible after the Board of Trustees of Big C has made its decision. On receipt of this letter applicants must:

- provide written or electronic confirmation that the award and funding conditions will be accepted;
- provide verification of the identity of any cell lines used.

## **7. Start of project and late starts**

Projects must start within three months of the start date given in the application form. Big C may on exception grant an extension to the start date for a further three months and requires immediate written notification and justification of any such delay. Any delay greater than six months from the start date will be referred to Big C's Grants Committee for consideration.

## **8. Engagement, publicity and education**

In accepting funding from Big C the applicant agrees to co-operate with the following general conditions for promotion of the grant award. Specific conditions relating to the

promotion of the grant award may also be applied by Big C at any time prior to, during or after the grant award.

### **8.1 Participation in fundraising and publicity**

Big C may use data or other material from research it funds for the purposes of fundraising, publicity, public and community education and engagement, health practitioner education, policy advice and lobbying activities. The grantholder will promote Big C and its charitable aims by complying with all reasonable requests from Big C to attend or speak at events, and provide help with images and copy for Big C publications. The host institution will also co-operate in relation to publicity, research engagement and fundraising activity for Big C. Where Big C is the largest or most significant contributing funder of the research, it reserves the right to lead on publicity. If the study involves direct contact with patients with a cancer diagnosis Big C support and information documentation must be given to them so that Big C services can be accessed.

### **8.2 Press**

The grantholder and host institution must contact Big C before making any public announcements regarding the grant activities, results or other research outputs, especially in the case of clinical trials. On request, a copy of any upcoming paper with Big C funding must be shared with Big C at the time of journal submission or when an abstract has been accepted by a conference. When speaking publicly, the grantholder should identify themselves as 'Big C funded researchers' but be clear that they are not speaking on behalf of Big C.

### **8.3 Branding, Communications and Engagement**

Grantholders and host institutions must comply with any guidelines for branding, communications and engagement that Big C may issue from time to time including as a minimum:

- where laboratory or other research teams are funded by Big C, physical recognition (available from Big C) must be displayed in a prominent position.
- where any grant monies have been used for the purchase of major items of equipment, such items must bear physical recognition at all times identifying them as being paid for by Big C. Big C will provide the appropriate form of notice.
- Patient facing documents must include Big C's logo and recognition of Big C's contribution.
- PhD students to work with Big C on dissemination and engagement requirements, including opportunities provided by Big C for the development of their skills for engagement.

### **8.4 Acknowledgment of Big C support**

Grantholders must acknowledge Big C's support (and, where possible, include Big C's logo) in all research outputs, including publications, oral or written reports, posters, presentations and information posted on websites that relate to the grant activities or results.

## **8.5 Publishable abstracts**

At the time of application, grant applicants must provide publishable information about the proposed research and contact information which, if the application is successful, may be published on Big C's website.

## **8.6 Dissemination of findings**

The grantholder must publish or otherwise disseminate appropriately verified results to the broader scientific community as soon as possible, although Big C or the host institution may delay dissemination for a reasonable period in order to protect intellectual property.

## **8.7 Requirements for publications and other outputs**

Grantholders must:

- provide Big C with a copy of all publications and conference abstracts arising from the grant activities at the time of submission for publication. Any manuscripts and details will be held in the strictest confidence.
- acknowledge Big C's support in the format "This work was supported by Big C";
- comply with the requirements of Big C's Policy on Open Access including ensuring that a copy of each paper published in a peer reviewed journal funded wholly or partly by the Grant is deposited in Europe PubMed Central, where an article processing charge has been paid to the journal for deposit, with a CC-BY licence;
- ensure that appropriate validation of results have been carried out before dissemination;
- on request, provide a copy of the presentation, publication or other output to Big C in good time (and in any event at least thirty (30) days) before the presentation, publication or other dissemination.

## **9. Financial management of grant**

### **9.1 Invoicing requirements**

Invoices must be submitted to Big C on a quarterly basis (within two weeks of the end of the quarter) and include the grant reference number and a full breakdown of costs. Final invoices will only be paid once Big C has received a full report on the outcome and findings of the project. Conditions relating to this report are contained in paragraph 13.

### **9.2 Equipment orders**

If the grant award is for equipment then the applicant's host institution will be asked to order the equipment and Big C will pay the host institution against its relevant invoice.

## **10. Changes to project after award of grant**

Big C requires to be informed immediately of any proposed substantial amendments material changes to the project which require Ethical and/or R&D approval. Examples of other material changes which must be reported to Big C include but are not limited to: change of principal applicant or PhD supervisor; change of location of researcher or project; loss of PhD student). Approval to any such changes will always be required from Big C's Grants Committee and Big C reserves the right to suspend or withdraw funding

at its discretion. Failure to notify Big C will result in cessation of funding. Big C also reserves the right to suspend or withdraw funding for the following reasons:

- Misuse of funds
- Proven scientific fraud
- Failure to meet reporting requirements.

### **10.1 Employment costs**

The approval of Big C must be sought before an assistant for any grant is appointed either initially or as a replacement at a grade or salary scale different from that shown in the formal application and/or the formal offer of award made by Big C. Prior approval of Big C must also be obtained for any increase in remuneration other than normal increments. Details of such increased costs must be notified in writing by the host institution and clearly shown on invoices relating to the grant when these are submitted.

For the avoidance of doubt, it must be made clear to all persons engaged or employed in the research at all times, that such persons are not employees of Big C.

### **10.2 Virement of project costs**

With prior approval from Big C funds awarded to one cost area of the project may be transferred to another of the project's cost areas.

### **10.3 Unspent funds**

Funds awarded for equipment projects must be drawn within two years of the date of award. All funds for PhD projects should be fully drawn no more than one year after the end of Big C's funding period unless unforeseen circumstances arise which would be considered on a case by case basis. For all other projects the funds awarded must be fully drawn in a timely manner and in line with the progress reporting requirements.

Any funds left undrawn after the receipt of the final invoice will be returned to Big C's general funds.

## **11. General availability of funds**

Each grant is subject to Big C maintaining, in the opinion of the Board, sufficient income to meet its financial commitments. Big C may in its absolute discretion withdraw a grant at any time if in its opinion Big C is unable to continue to fund it.

## **12. Scientific fraud**

In the rare event of scientific fraud occurring Big C wishes to make it clear that it is the responsibility of the host institution (employing authority) to investigate this. Big C agrees to funding providing the employing authority can produce evidence of procedure for dealing with scientific fraud. Big C expects grant holders and their host institutions to abide by the Wellcome Trust "*Statement on the Handling of Allegations of Research Misconduct*". (available at <http://www.wellcome.ac.uk>).

If there is a case of scientific fraud in the course of the research, then Big C should be notified immediately and kept informed of further developments. At the initial stages of the enquiry Big C would not normally suspend the grant. However, if adequate steps are

not taken to proceed with the investigation Big C will suspend the grant. If fraud is proven Big C will terminate the grant immediately.

An acceptable mechanism for dealing with accusations of scientific fraud would probably contain the following elements: a guidance document or code of practice on standards of professional behaviour; provisions for induction and training of staff; monitoring; regulations and procedures for handling allegations; fair procedures and appropriate protection for both the accused and the 'whistleblower'.

### **13. Progress and final reports**

#### **13.1 Progress reporting**

Big C funded researchers are required to provide regular progress reports to Big C. This reporting allows us to review the progress of research projects against their plan and objectives, review any issues and their impact, and identify whether help or advice needed.

The interim report on the progress of the research shall be in the form of a written report set out by Big C. The report will include; research data, methods, an outline of any foreground Intellectual Property (IP), arising know-how results. background IP and provisional conclusions together with management information and any relevant information relating to the research up to the relevant date.

During the research period the researcher may also be asked to provide verbal or written reports as reasonably required by Big C on any aspect of the research. The nature and frequency of reporting will vary according to the research programme, project stage, and key milestones, but progress reports are generally due every six months.

When the project starts, Big C will advise of the dates or milestones when progress reports need to be submitted. Big C will also send a reminder when a report is due.

Big C will read your report and associated documents and provide feedback.

#### **13.2 Final reports**

A report must be submitted electronically at the completion of every grant no later than six months post completion date. This report must be in the format specified by Big C (attached as Appendix C) completed electronically using Microsoft Word and submitted as a Word document to:

[katherine.morgan@big-c.co.uk](mailto:katherine.morgan@big-c.co.uk)

Kate Morgan, Company Secretary

Big C  
Centrum  
Norwich Research Park  
Colney Lane  
Norwich NR4 7UG

The report must be short and suitable for publication in Big C's annual report, newsletters and website. Copies of publications cited in the report and acknowledging the support of Big C must also be supplied. Copyright in the report will belong to Big C.

Failure to provide any report will lead to the withholding of the next payment due to the host institution and will also make the applicant ineligible for any future funding.

#### **14. Intellectual property and commercial development of Big C supported projects**

Big C requires the applicant (and the host institution) to develop and implement strategies and procedures for the identification, protection, management and exploitation of charity-funded intellectual property. The responsibility for identification and protection of Big C funded intellectual property rests with the applicant (and the host institution). Big C has information and approval rights as well as rights to share in any value delivered by those inventions.

#### **15. Liability, indemnity and insurance**

##### **15.1 Liability**

Big C relies entirely on the host institution to ensure that grant activities are carried out in accordance with best practice and legal requirements to avoid damage, loss or injury to persons or property. The host institution must also ensure results are appropriately validated before publication. Big C accepts no responsibility for costs incurred other than those specifically set out in the grant application, nor any liability for any accident, injury or loss sustained by any person in connection with the grant activities or publication of results.

##### **15.2 Indemnity**

The host institution agrees to indemnify and hold harmless Big C and their respective employees, officers and agents against any costs, claims or liabilities (including legal costs) suffered or incurred by any of them as a result of any action, claim or complaint brought against any of them in connection with or arising from any grant activities or the negligence or wilful default of the research personnel or any failure to accurately report results or arising out of the use, publication or exploitation of the results by the host institution or research personnel in any manner.

##### **15.3 Insurance**

The host institution must ensure that it (and, so far as is relevant, the research personnel) hold appropriate insurances for professional indemnity, public liability and employer's liability during the grant period and for a period of six (6) years following the end date and during any commercialisation of the results.

#### **16. Governing law**

The Conditions of application and grant are governed by the laws of England and Wales. The host institution and grantholder irrevocably and unconditionally submit to the exclusive jurisdiction of the English courts in respect of disputes arising out of or in connection with the Conditions of application and grant.

**Big C Open Access Policy**

Big C's open access policies and requirements are designed to maximise the availability and reuse of publications.

**Big C support for open access costs may be used to cover:**

- original peer-reviewed research articles
- non-commissioned review articles
- non-invited review articles
- study protocols.

**We do not support:**

- any open access costs associated with commissioned or invited reviews, conference proceedings, editorials, letters or commentaries
- other charges associated with publication, such as page and colour charges

Where an APC is paid by Big C the journal must deposit the final version of the article, on behalf of the author, in [PubMed Central](#) (PMC), and it must be made freely available on PMC at the time of publication - a link to the article on the publisher site is not sufficient. The output must be licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution](#) (CC-BY) licence.

## **Application, review and award procedures**

### **1. Introduction**

These procedures set out detailed guidance on the application procedure for Big C's **Scientific/clinical research or equipment grants**.

### **2. Application form**

Applications must be made using the standard application form (without modifications) for **Scientific/clinical research or equipment grants** available from the Big C web site [www.big-c.co.uk](http://www.big-c.co.uk). The form must be completed electronically using Microsoft Word and submitted as a Word document including electronic signatures from appropriate personnel. No hard copy is required.

### **3. Application process**

#### **3.1 Time of application**

Applications may be submitted at any time however are only considered once yearly and must be submitted by **5pm on the deadline date of August 31st**. Applications missing the deadline will not be considered.

Applicants are advised to submit their applications well in advance of any notional starting date for the programme, to allow ample time for the assessment process.

#### **3.2 Address for applications**

Completed electronic application forms must be emailed to [bigcgrants@big-c.co.uk](mailto:bigcgrants@big-c.co.uk) and will be acknowledged by email.

Applications must not be sent to individual Trustees or Research Advisory Panel members.

#### **3.3 Review of applications by Big C**

Applications will be subject to an initial desk top review in order to establish that application criteria have been met and will then be submitted for peer review by up to three or more experts in the relevant field. Applicants are asked to suggest three independent reviewers to review their application and may also exclude up to three reviewers from this process. Big C's Research Advisory Panel reviews these suggestions for appropriateness and conflicts of interest and agrees a further minimum three individuals who will also be contacted.

Peer reviewers will use a standard form (attached as Appendix D) to assess each application and will be asked to give an overall rating.

Peer reviewers will also be asked to consider whether:

- Big C is the most appropriate funding body
- The duration of support and salaries/expenses are appropriate.
- The study has the appropriate statistical support.
- The application replicates other work being undertaken elsewhere.
- In relation to the application they have any conflicts of interest.

For PhD projects the peer reviewers will be asked to comment on the track record of applicants leading PhD projects by asking specific questions regarding their experience in this area.

The standard peer review form includes a section in which the peer reviewers are asked to give an assessment, suitable for anonymous transmission to the applicants as feedback. This section asks peer reviewers to give their opinion of the strengths and weaknesses of:

- (a) the importance of the research topic
- (b) its originality
- (c) the scientific quality (including the clarity of the research objectives, the suitability of the methods chosen and whether the planned experiments are likely to yield decisive results)
- (d) the track record of the principal applicant in this area of cancer research.

Big C's Research Advisory Panel will consider the results of the peer reviews and whether the project is one which donors which would wish to see supported. The Panel will rank the applications for funding and make recommendations to Big C's Grants Committee (to be considered alongside the recommendations of the Equipment Funding Panel). The Grants Committee then makes its final recommendations to the Board of Trustees at a meeting normally held in November/December. The decision of the Board is final.

### **3.4 Outcome of applications**

Applicants will be informed of the outcome of their applications in the first instance by email and then in writing. All applicants will be provided with feedback on their application however Big C will not enter into further communication (by telephone or email) or correspondence regarding the decisions of the Board.

### **3.5 Award offers**

Grants will normally be offered to the applicant's host institution as detailed in the application. When an application is approved by Big C, one letter is issued to the principal investigator containing details of the grant and any additional conditions. Responsibility for informing the relevant administrative authority of the host institution lies with the principal investigator. Until written acceptance is received from the host institution no monies can be or will be paid over.

**Final report pro-forma**

**Project title and Big C reference:**

**Principal investigator:**

**Co-investigator(s):  
Supervisor (if appropriate):**

**Host Institution:**

**Start date:**

**End date:**

Lay summary of the progress of the work, outcomes achieved etc.

Detailed report

What is the overall impact of this research in terms of patient benefits?

In your opinion what's the story for the Big C fundraising team?

**Publications arising from the work:**

**Research grants funded as a result of this Big C support:**

**Peer review report pro-forma**

Assessor name:

Grant ref. no.

First Author: *Insert Name*

Study Title: *Insert title*

Please use the table below to indicate your overall rating of the application by circling or ticking your overall rating score:

	Definition	Score
<p><b>Exceptional</b></p> <p><b>Top international programme, or of exceptional national strategic importance</b></p>	<p>Scientific quality and impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap or area of strategic importance</li> <li>- Original and innovative; novel methodology and design</li> <li>- Potential for high health and/or socioeconomic impact</li> </ul> <p>Scientific leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Excellent leadership (<i>track record, team, environment, and collaborators</i>)</li> </ul> <p>Justification of resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Potential for high return on investment (<i>resources requested, likelihood of project delivery, anticipated knowledge generation</i>)</li> <li>- Appropriate staff time allocated to deliver project (<i>Principal investigators and co-investigators</i>)</li> </ul> <p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ethical and/ or governance issues are fully considered</li> </ul>	<p><b>6</b></p>
<p><b>Excellent</b></p> <p><b>Internationally competitive and leading edge nationally, or of national strategic importance</b></p>	<p>Scientific quality and impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap or area of strategic importance</li> <li>- Original and innovative; novel methodology and design</li> <li>- Potential for high health and/or socioeconomic impact</li> </ul> <p>Scientific leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Excellent leadership (<i>track record, team, environment, and collaborators</i>)</li> </ul> <p>Justification of resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Potential for high return on investment (<i>resources requested, likelihood of project delivery, anticipated knowledge generation</i>)</li> <li>- Appropriate staff time allocated to deliver project (<i>Principal investigators and co-investigators</i>)</li> </ul> <p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ethical and/ or governance issues are fully considered</li> </ul>	<p><b>5</b></p>
<p><b>Very High Quality</b></p> <p><b>Internationally competitive in parts</b></p>	<p>Scientific quality and impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Crucial scientific question or knowledge gap or area of strategic importance</li> <li>- Robust methodology and design (<i>innovative in parts</i>)</li> <li>- Potential for high health and/or socioeconomic impact</li> </ul> <p>Scientific leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Excellent leadership (<i>track record, team, environment, and collaborators</i>)</li> </ul> <p>Justification of resources</p>	<p><b>4</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Potential for significant return on investment</li> <li>- Appropriate staff time allocated to deliver project (<i>Principal investigators and co-investigators</i>)</li> </ul> <p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ethical and/ or governance issues are fully considered</li> </ul>	
<b>High Quality</b>	<p>Scientific quality and impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Worthwhile scientific question or knowledge gap or a valuable scientific resource</li> <li>- Methodologically sound study</li> <li>- Potential for significant health and/or socioeconomic impact</li> </ul> <p>Scientific leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strong leadership (<i>track record, team, environment, and collaborators</i>)</li> </ul> <p>Justification of resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Potential for significant return on investment (<i>resources requested, likelihood of projected delivery, anticipated knowledge generation</i>)</li> <li>- Appropriate staff time allocated to deliver project (<i>may be scope strengthen management of the project</i>)</li> </ul> <p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ethical and/ or governance issues are well considered</li> </ul>	<b>3</b>
<b>Good Quality</b>	<p>Scientific quality and impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Worthwhile scientific question with potentially useful outcomes</li> <li>- Methodologically sound study but areas require revision</li> <li>- Likelihood of successful delivery</li> </ul> <p>Scientific leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Appropriate leadership (<i>scope to strengthen team; environment; collaborators</i>)</li> </ul> <p>Justification of resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Potentially more limited return on investment (<i>resources requested, likelihood of project delivery, and anticipated knowledge generation</i>)</li> <li>- Resources broadly appropriate to deliver the proposal</li> </ul> <p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ethical and/or governance issues are adequately considered</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>
<b>Poor Quality</b>	<p>Scientific quality and impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Poorly defined question</li> <li>- Methodologically weak study</li> <li>- Limited likelihood of new knowledge generation</li> </ul> <p>Scientific potential</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Poor leadership</li> </ul> <p>Justification of resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Potentially poor return on investment</li> </ul> <p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ethical and/ or governance issues are not adequately considered</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>

---

**For categories other than “poor quality”:**

Is **Big C** the most appropriate funding body? \_\_\_\_\_

Is the duration of support appropriate? \_\_\_\_\_

Are the salaries/expenses appropriate? \_\_\_\_\_

Are there any other aspects (eg, career or administrative implications, ethical approval, use of animals) that need to be considered? \_\_\_\_\_

Does the study have the appropriate statistical support? If yes, please state what this is:

---

Does this application replicate other work being undertaken elsewhere?

---

For PhD projects only - please comment on the track record of the applicant(s) in the supervision of PhDs:

---

Is any further information required? (please word questions so they can be transmitted verbatim to the applicants): \_\_\_\_\_

---

In relation to this application do you have any conflicts of interest? If yes, please state what these are:

---

***I understand that this entire review will be shared with members of Big C's Research Advisory Panel (and relevant Big C staff and Trustees) and that only the section entitled "Assessor's comments" will be shared with the applicant(s).***

**Assessor:** *Insert Name*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

---

**Assessor's comments:**

Please give an assessment, in typescript, suitable for anonymous transmission to the applicants as feedback. We are interested in your opinion of the strengths and weaknesses of:

- (a) the importance of the research topic
- (b) its originality
- (c) the scientific quality (including the clarity of the research objectives, the suitability of the methods chosen and whether the planned experiments are likely to yield decisive results)
- (d) the track record of the principal applicant in this area of cancer research.

Please also add (e) any further comments you feel appropriate.

Should you wish to make any confidential comments to the Chair of the Research Advisory Panel, these should be attached to the report form on a separate sheet.