

CPQC – Programme Grant Review Form

Programme Grants provide larger, longer term (up to 5 years) and renewable funding to leading research groups to address significant research challenges with the potential to make real impact on the field.

In response to the BHF strategy refresh, we want to support the most ambitious and innovative ideas, capable of significantly advancing the relevant field and/or benefitting patients. To help unlock the full potential of cardiovascular research, we will consider larger proposals. Costs will be considered in relation to the scale, scope, ambition and potential for impact.

Declaration of Research Assessment

The BHF is a signatory to the [Declaration of Research Assessment](#) (DORA). Before completing your review, please ensure you are familiar with [BHF independent expert review guidelines](#). You may also find the individual funding scheme guidelines helpful when completing your review.

Use of Generative AI Tools

Committee members and external reviewers must not use generative AI when assessing grant applications. Maintaining security and confidentiality in our peer review process is essential for safeguarding the exchange of scientific opinions and evaluations and the release of material into generative AI tools breaches this confidentiality. Furthermore, the use of AI tools may compromise the integrity of our peer review process by, for example, producing text that contains inappropriate content, such as generic comments and restatements of the application.

Scoring the application

Criteria	Score
Originality of Science	High Medium Low
Ambition and potential added value and impact	High Medium Low
Appropriateness of design & methods <i>Please also consider the information provided in the Diversity and Inclusion Details section of the application form when making this assessment.</i>	High Medium Low
Feasibility in the time proposed	High Medium Low
Expertise of the primary applicant and team relevant to the project	High Medium Low

Value for money in terms of potential impact	High Medium Low
Appropriateness of the costs requested to deliver the proposal	High Medium Low
Staff costings	Appropriate Excessive Inadequate Not Applicable
Consumables costings	Appropriate Excessive Inadequate Not Applicable
Equipment costings	Appropriate Excessive Inadequate Not Applicable

How would you rate the application overall?

☐ 6 ☐ 5 ☐ 4 ☐ 3 ☐ 2 ☐ 1

6 is the highest score, 1 is the lowest.

Your score should reflect your written comments.

6	<i>The application is exceptional. It very strongly meets all the assessment criteria to the highest standard. Priority recommendation for an award.</i>
5	<i>The application is excellent. It meets all the assessment criteria, but with some minor weaknesses or limitations. Recommendation for an award.</i>
4	<i>The application is good. It meets the assessment criteria well, but with some clear weaknesses or limitations. Potentially a recommendation for an award.</i>
3	<i>The application is weak. It meets the assessment criteria, but with significant weaknesses or limitations. Unlikely to recommend an award.</i>
2	<i>The application is unsatisfactory. It does not meet one or more of the assessment criteria. Recommend reject.</i>
1	<i>The application is unsatisfactory. It does not meet any of the assessment criteria. Recommend reject.</i>

Please provide an assessment of the application, under the following headings

These comments may be fed back anonymously to the applicant(s) - any confidential comments should be entered in the next section. Your comments should reflect and justify your score. If you give a high score, please still justify your reasoning.

If the application proposes the use of animals, please ensure your review includes an assessment of whether:

- the research question can be addressed without the use of animals
- the species is justified
- the experimental design is appropriate
- the number of animals requested and the power calculations are appropriate
- appropriate consideration has been given to sex balance

If the application proposes a clinical study, please ensure your review includes an assessment of whether:

- the study design, the total number of participants and the power calculations are appropriate
- appropriate consideration has been given to factors such as age, sex, gender or ethnicity of the participants
- the study timelines are feasible, including the proposed recruitment rate
- study costings, including CTU costs and support requested for research activities at local sites are appropriate
- the application demonstrates good PPI engagement where applicable
- appropriate governance is in place for the study

Originality of science relative to current state of the field

Strength of any pilot data

Ambition and potential added value and impact

Appropriateness of design and methods

For clinical studies and research involving animals, please see additional points to consider.

Information provided in the Diversity and Inclusion Details section of the application should be referenced where applicable.

Expertise of the primary applicant and team relevant to the project

Feasibility of the proposed work

Please refer to the Gantt chart provided.

Value for money in terms of potential impact**Appropriateness of the costs requested to deliver on the ambition of the proposal - highlight any specific concerns****Concluding statement/summary**

In a few sentences, please summarise your assessment of the application.

Please do not include any funding recommendations.

Type of Confidential Comments (if applicable)

BHF committee members and external expert reviewers should be explicit in their written reviews about the criteria that they have applied and the concerns that have arisen in their evaluations. However, we recognise that there are limited circumstances where communication with the BHF is necessary outside the feedback to the applicants.

The following Confidential Comments section will not be directly copied into in the feedback to the applicants and should only contain comments from the approved list as indicated. Please do not use the section to summarise your assessment of the proposal or provide a funding recommendation.

Please indicate the type of comments you are providing by selecting from the approved list for the Confidential Comments section:

- **Conflicts of Interest**

Please disclose any potential conflicts of interest with the scientific ambition, applicant or institution. Note that ideally conflict of interest concerns should be raised at the earliest available opportunity and ideally at the point of accepting an assignment.

- **Qualifying reviewer expertise**

Please let us know if you have focused your review on a specific part of the application that aligns with your expertise and would prefer not to comment on other parts of the application. Alternatively, please let us know if your expertise offers specific insights that cannot be shared anonymously.

- **BHF internal communication**

Other BHF internal communications regarding your assessment of the application e.g. any comments on alignment with BHF's strategic priorities, or BHF policies and values.

- ☐ Conflicts of Interest
- ☐ Qualifying reviewer expertise
- ☐ BHF internal communication

Any additional confidential comments to the committee (Optional)

--