Appendix 4 – Discovery Grants Rating Form

Applicant:		Department/University:

Applicant status:	

Title of proposal:

Selection criteria (See Instructions for complete details)

Excellence of the researcher	☐ **Exceptional**	☐ **Outstanding**	☐ **Very Strong**
	☐ **Strong**	☐ **Moderate**	☐ **Insufficient**

	Rationale for rating:		
• Knowledge, expertise, and experience of the researcher in the NSE • Quality and impact of contributions to the proposed research and/or other areas of research in the NSE • Importance of contributions to, and use by, other research and end-users			

Merit of the proposal	☐ **Exceptional**	☐ **Outstanding**	☐ **Very Strong**
	☐ **Strong**	☐ **Moderate**	☐ **Insufficient**

	Rationale for rating:		
• Originality and innovation • Significance and expected contributions to NSE research; potential for policy- and/or technology-related impact • Clarity and scope of objectives • Clarity and appropriateness of methodology • Feasibility • Extent to which the scope of the proposal addresses all relevant issues • Appropriateness of, and justification for, the budget • Demonstration that the Discovery Grant proposal is distinct conceptually from research supported (or submitted for support) through CIHR and/or SSHRC • Clear explanation why Discovery Grant funding is essential to carry out the research proposed in the DG application (for applicants who hold or have applied for a CIHR Foundation Grant)			

Contributions to the training of highly qualified personnel	☐ **Exceptional**	☐ **Outstanding**	☐ **Very Strong**
	☐ **Strong**	☐ **Moderate**	☐ **Insufficient**

	Rationale for rating:		

• Past contributions to the training of HQP
  • Training environment
  • HQP awards and research contributions
  • Outcomes and skills gained by HQP
• Training plan
  • Training philosophy
  • HQP research training plan			

Relative cost of research (cost of the proposed research program relative to the normal costs in the discipline)	☐ Normal	☐ High

Rationale for Cost of Research:

Other comments (e.g., duration should be less than norm, special circumstances, quality of samples of contributions provided, environmental impact, ethical concerns):

Comments from external referees (please also highlight any comments that would be deemed inappropriate for the members to have considered in their discussions):

Message to the applicant:

Discovery Accelerator Supplement (DAS)   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

Rationale for DAS recommendation:

This form is provided by NSERC as an aid to members for reviewing applications. Once completed, the form contains personal information, and like all other review material, must be stored in a secure manner to prevent unauthorized access (refer to Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Agreement for Review Committee Members, External Reviewers, and Observers).

The rating sheet focuses on the evaluation criteria and integrates, where appropriate, external reviewer comments and any other relevant information, e.g., delays in research. Using the rating sheet will help to ensure that you take all selection criteria into account when formulating your recommendation (refer to the Peer Review Manual for details). Note that NSERC does not collect these forms, and they should be destroyed in a secure manner after the peer review meetings.

(2017 version)