

The Australian Epilepsy Research Fund Reviewer Form – 2019 Round

The AERF Peer Review process is designed to align with the [NHMRC Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research](#). In this way, we hope to ensure a fair and rigorous review process, for the purpose of funding high quality research, based on scientific merit.

Reviewers, please first document any perceived or actual CoIs. If this CoI is deemed high and felt to warrant further investigation, or if you believe it renders you ineligible to review the Proposal, please contact the Research Lead at the Epilepsy Foundation; research@epilepsyfoundation.org.au.

If the CoI is not high, please complete a review of the Scientific Quality, Expected Outcomes and Team Quality of the Proposal. The weightings of each of these aspects are detailed in [Table 3](#). These weightings reflect the focus of the AERF on outcomes for individuals living with epilepsy.

Please provide both the Category rating, as well as a comprehensive justification of why you have given this rating. Category descriptions ([Table 3](#)) have been based on the NHMRC Guidelines, to ensure a high standard of peer review that many reviewers will be familiar with.

Table 1 Proposal Details

Name of Proposal		
Lead CI		
Note any perceived or actual Conflicts of Interest (CoI)		

Table 2 Review of Proposal

	Category (See Table 3 for descriptors)	Justification
Scientific Quality (30%)		
Expected outcomes (40%)		
Team Quality (30%) To be weighted on the expertise of the <i>whole</i> team, and take into account ROPE and career disruptions.		
Total (100%)		

Table 3 Category descriptions

Based on the 2018 [NHMRC Project Grants Scheme-specific Peer Review Guidelines](#)

Category	Scientific Quality (30%) Expected outcomes (40%)	Team Quality (30%) To be weighted on the expertise of the <i>whole</i> team, and take into account ROPE and career disruptions
7 Outstanding	<p>The research proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is highly relevant to the mission and objectives of the AERF • is without question highly feasible and will successfully achieve the AERF objectives • has well-defined, highly coherent and strongly developed aims and expected outcomes • is extremely innovative and has a near flawless design that will produce very high quality data • is highly competitive with the best comparable international research proposals • is highly likely to transform the field of epilepsy research • will almost certainly result in highly influential publications 	<p>The applicant team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has a track record that specifically targets the proposed research both in terms of depth and breadth • has all the required skills and expertise to successfully achieve the expected outcomes
6 Excellent	<p>The research proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is very relevant to the mission and objectives of the AERF • is highly feasible and is highly likely to achieve the expected AERF objectives • has aims and expected outcomes that are clear, logical and well developed • is very innovative, with an excellent study design that will provide high quality data • is competitive with strong comparable research proposals internationally • is very likely to transform the field of epilepsy research • is very likely to result in highly influential publications 	<p>The applicant team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has a track record that is highly relevant to the proposed research in terms of depth and breadth • has all the required skills and expertise to successfully achieve the expected outcomes
5 Very Good	<p>The research proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is relevant to the mission and objectives of the AERF • is feasible and likely to achieve the expected AERF objectives • has objectives that are clear and logical • raises a few minor concerns with respect to the study design • will provide some high quality data • may not be highly competitive with comparable research proposals internationally • may be likely to transform the field of epilepsy research • may result in influential publications 	<p>The applicant team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has a track record that is very relevant to the proposed research in terms of depth and breadth • has most of the required skills and expertise to successfully achieve the expected outcomes
4 Good	<p>The research proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is somewhat relevant to the mission and objectives of the AERF • raises some concerns regarding feasibility and likelihood to achieve the expected AERF objectives • has aims and expected outcomes that are clear • raises some concerns regarding the study design • will provide some data that addresses the AERF objectives • is not likely to be competitive with similar research proposals internationally • may be likely to transform the field of epilepsy research • may result in modestly influential publications 	<p>The applicant team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has a track record that is somewhat relevant with the proposed research in terms of depth and breadth • has some of the required skills and expertise to successfully achieve the expected outcomes

3 Marginal	<p>The research proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is not particularly relevant to the mission and objectives of the AERF • raises several concerns regarding feasibility and likelihood to achieve the AERF objectives • is somewhat unclear with regards to the aims and expected outcomes • raises several concerns regarding the study design, and may therefore provide limited data • is not competitive nationally or internationally • unlikely to transform the field of epilepsy research • may result in publications of marginal influence 	<p>The applicant team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has limited track record in the field of the proposed research • has minimal skills and expertise required to successfully achieve the expected outcomes
2 Unsatisfactory	<p>The research proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is not adequately relevant to the AERF request for proposals • raises several major concerns regarding feasibility and likelihood to achieve the mission and objectives of the AERF • is unclear in its aims and expected outcomes • raises several major concerns regarding the study design and is therefore unlikely to provide data • is not competitive nationally or internationally • unlikely to provide data • very unlikely to transform the field of epilepsy research • unlikely to result in influential publications 	<p>The applicant team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has a track record which does not relate well to the proposed research • is deficient in many of the required skills and expertise to successfully achieve the expected outcomes
1 Poor	<p>The research proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is not relevant to the AERF request for proposals • contains a research plan that does not seem to be feasible and is unlikely to be successfully completed • is very unclear in its aims and expected outcomes • contains a study design that is not adequate, and is therefore very unlikely to provide quality data • is not competitive nationally or internationally • no potential to transform the field of epilepsy research • very unlikely to result in influential publications 	<p>The applicant team:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • does not have a relevant track record in the field of the proposed research • is deficient in most of the required skills and expertise to successfully achieve the expected outcomes

Note. The mission and objectives of the AERF can be found on Pp. 1-2 of the Guidelines for Assessors.