April 2022

BHF Translational Award Review Form

Guidelines for Reviewers

Please evaluate the full application against the following criteria and associated questions and provide a grade (high/medium/low) and explanatory comments under each. Your comments will guide discussion at Committee and inform feedback to applicants.

- **Need and competitive advantage -** What is the need the proposal aims to help address? Is the need significant and does the proposal have a competitive advantage over other solutions?
- **Current project status -** Is there a good body of evidence and strong proof of concept data to support the proposed work? Is there a sound medical/scientific rationale for the project?
- **Design, methods and milestones -** Is the proposed project plan appropriate, realistic and feasible to deliver in the time proposed? Does the plan propose well defined GO / NO GO milestones with SMART criteria? Are the methods the best available for the purpose and do the applicants possess the necessary technical expertise?
- **Intellectual property and development plan -** Is there an appropriate intellectual property strategy in place to optimise the chances of downstream funding/partnering? Is there a viable market for the product? Have the applicants considered the regulatory pathway? Have the applicants considered the anticipated route to the market and/or adoption?
- **Value for money -** Are requested costs for staff, consumables, equipment and/or outsourcing justified and appropriate?

Criteria	Score	Comment
Need and competitive advantage - What is the need the proposal aims to help address? Is the need significant and does the proposal have a competitive advantage over other solutions?	**High Medium Low**	
Current project status - Is there a good body of evidence and strong proof of concept data to support the proposed work? Is there a sound medical/scientific rationale for the project?	**High Medium Low**	
Design, methods and milestones - Is the proposed project plan appropriate, realistic and feasible to deliver in the time proposed? Does the plan propose well defined GO/NO GO milestones with SMART criteria? Are the methods the best available for the purpose and do the applicants possess the necessary technical expertise? If the application proposes the use of animals, please comment on whether the project can be addressed without the use of animals, the species is justified, and the experimental design, the number of animals requested and the power calculations are appropriate.	**High Medium Low**	
Intellectual property and development plan - Is there an appropriate intellectual property strategy in place to optimise the chances of downstream funding/partnering? Is there a viable market for the product? Have the applicants considered the regulatory pathway? Have the applicants considered the anticipated route to the market and/or adoption?	**High Medium Low**	
Value for money - Are requested costs for staff, consumables, equipment and/or outsourcing justified and appropriate?	**High Medium Low**	

Reviewer confidential comments for the Translational Awards Committee -		
How would you rate the application overall? - 6 is the highest score, 1 is the lowest. Scores of 6 & 5 are a recommendation for an award. Scores of 4 & 3 are borderline-high and borderline-low, respectively. Scores of 2 & 1 are a recommendation to reject.		**N/A**