

## Rubrics for VCCIS grants

### Abstract review

<b>Score</b>	<b>Scientific merit and proposed approach</b>	<b>Potential impact</b>
<5 Does not proceed to full review	Study design contains fatal flaws Other components of application weak or fatally flawed (e.g. guideline infraction, scientific analysis lacking)	Topic not related to immunological disease in cats or dogs Topic is disease/issue that causes low morbidity in small number of animals
5-7 May proceed to full review	Study design contains moderate flaws but approach appropriate Timeline adequate	Topic causes high morbidity in small number of animals or low morbidity in large number Some need for research in this areas Research likely to make some impact
8-10 Will proceed to full review	Excellent, well-described study design with clearly stated aims, objectives and hypotheses Scientific design adequate to answer stated questions Objectives achievable in stated time	Topic causes high morbidity in large number of animals Great need for research in this area Research likely to make a considerable impact

Full proposal review

Criterion	Score
<b>Scientific merit:</b> is the proposal based on sound, up to date, scientific and immunological principles? Is the project supported by preliminary data or analysis?	1-5
<b>Quality of project design:</b> will the project achieve its scientific goals?	1-5
<b>Clarity of written application:</b> are the research questions and plan clearly defined and written?	1-5
<b>Appropriateness of budget:</b> is the budget well-justified and does it represent value for money?	1-5
<b>Achievability:</b> is the project achievable in the stated time frame, with the required budget, and with the expertise of the investigators?	1-5
<b>Clinical benefit and impact:</b> are the results of the project likely to achieve any benefits for animals in the clinic, immediately or after further development? What will be the likely impact of the work?	1-5