



## **REFEREE REPORT FORM**

**(The Sir Jules Thorn Award for Biomedical Research)**

### **THE REMIT**

Please see the following pages for information about the Award and the Trust's funding policy.

### **Please note:**

It is our policy to provide feedback to our applicants once the outcome of their submission is known. Copies of reviewers' comments are sent on a non-attributed basis.

If you wish to make any comments that should not be fed back to the applicant(s), please provide them in a covering letter or on an additional sheet, clearly marked "not for feedback".

Please return the form to

**The Director  
The Sir Jules Thorn Charitable Trust  
24 Manchester Square  
London W1U 3TH  
United Kingdom**

or by fax to 0207 224 3976  
or by email to [director@julesthorntrust.org.uk](mailto:director@julesthorntrust.org.uk)  
with a copy to [info@julesthorntrust.org.uk](mailto:info@julesthorntrust.org.uk)

Thank you for your help.

## INFORMATION FOR REVIEWERS

### GUIDANCE NOTES : CRITERIA AND POLICIES

1. At the discretion of the Trustees one Award of up to £1.7 million is offered to support an original programme of translational biomedical research, selected following a rigorous competition among applicants sponsored by the leading UK medical schools invited to participate. The Award extending up to five years enables successful applicants to pursue their own independent research programme.
2. UK medical schools and NHS organisations are eligible to apply, provided that they are able to demonstrate:-
  - a) A track record in international cutting edge clinical translational research,
  - b) Adequate infrastructure support; and
  - c) The commitment of internal resources for the synergy required.
3. Only one application per eligible institution/organisation is permitted and must be selected following an internal competition coordinated by the Research Dean, Head of the Medical School, or other appropriate person having delegated authority, who must provide written support for the submission.

Where a medical school and affiliated NHS organisation both have a prospective proposal, they must coordinate the selection process to decide which one should be submitted.

4. The work must involve research on patients. There must be a clear specification of the hypothesis based on pre-clinical experimental data supporting the rationale of the clinical study, arising from the applicant's own work, (not derivative of someone else's observations). Further work to support the hypothesis in the early phase of the grant or, indeed, to substantiate questions arising from clinical experiments may be supported by experimental animal models.
5. There must be a clear strategy defining how the research will translate into benefit for patients and the timescale within which this will take place.
6. The studies might include for example:-
  - Significant proposals which could lead to improved diagnosis and/or prognostic methods and to new treatments.
  - Concept validation.
  - Intervention trials.

All proposals must be based on appropriate bio-statistical analysis.

7. The research must have a justifiable claim to be at the leading edge of international science, and must be led by a clearly identified Principal Applicant of outstanding quality in the early years of an established research and academic career.
8. The work involved must be the major commitment of the Principal Applicant, comprising at least 70% of his/her research time or 50% of his/her total time, whichever is greater.
9. Any co-applicants are expected to be actively involved in the work. Their precise role and time commitment must be stated.
10. The Award may not be used to meet the salary costs of the applicant(s) who should be in institutionally funded posts for the duration of the grant.
11. There must be visible strategic commitment to the research by the host institution.
12. Grants are not available for research into cancer or HIV / AIDS related disease because they are amply funded elsewhere.
13. Funding is restricted to work, including data collection, carried out in the United Kingdom.
14. The Trust does not fund the overheads of the host institution or any costs incurred by the sponsoring organisation. The Trust is an NIHR partner organisation in England and its equivalent elsewhere in the United Kingdom.
15. The Trust is unable to provide a grant for an existing project, to cover expenditure already incurred, or to supplement support provided by other funding bodies.
16. Applications submitted concurrently to other funders will be accepted but subsequent short-listing would be conditional upon any such applications being withdrawn.
17. The Trust's charitable status does not permit the provision of a grant which might, whether directly or indirectly, contribute to a commercial profit for a manufacturer. An application cannot, therefore, be considered where a manufacturer is supplying a cash grant or equipment, materials, drugs etc. at no cost, whether express or implied, for commercial use of the findings of the project.

**Please note:**

- a. Referees are requested not to discuss the application and/or reference process with applicants.
- b. Referees wishing to contact applicants should do so through the Sir Jules Thorn Charitable Trust.
- c. Copies of applications are provided in confidence to assist referees in the assessment process.
- d. Referees are requested not to copy applications or pass applications to a third party without the express permission of the Sir Jules Thorn Charitable Trust.
- e. Any applications provided by the Trust must be destroyed/deleted on completion of the assessment process.
- f. Referees who consider that they may have a conflict of interest through having a direct association with the application, applicant, co-applicants or collaborators should contact the Trust for guidance.

**THE SIR JULES THORN AWARD FOR BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH**

**REFEREE ASSESSMENT FORM**

**1. THE APPLICATION**

<b>Application Title</b>	
<b>Applicant</b>	
<b>Co-Applicant 1</b>	
<b>Co-Applicant 2</b>	
<b>Co-Applicant 3</b>	

**2. THE REFEREE**

<b>Referee Name</b>			
<b>Field of Expertise</b>			
<b>Position</b>			
<b>Department</b>			
<b>Institution</b>			
<b>Address</b>			
<b>City</b>		<b>ZIP or Post Code</b>	
<b>Phone</b>		<b>Fax</b>	
<b>E-mail</b>		<b>Date</b>	

**3. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION**

Please indicate your selected score in the tick box below the following scale:

Should be supported as research of high scientific merit		➡	Worthy of support in principle but considered to be of a lower priority			➡	Reject
6	5	4	3	2	1	0	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**THIS PAGE WILL NOT BE PASSED ON TO THE APPLICANT(S)**

#### 4. DETAILED ASSESSMENT

In the sections below please indicate score below the scale. It would be appreciated if comments for scores of 5 and above, or 1 and below could be provided in the free text box.

##### a. Potential for scientific advance in the short and long term



Please indicate your selected score in the tick box below the following scale:

High potential			Moderate potential				Limited potential
6	5	4	3	2	1	0	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Please provide reasons for your assessment:

##### b. Originality

Please indicate your selected score in the tick box below the following scale:

Highly original & innovative			New perspective on existing work				Simple extension of existing work
6	5	4	3	2	1	0	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Please provide reasons for your assessment:

**THIS PAGE WILL BE PASSED ON TO THE APPLICANT(S)**

**c. Concerns, doubts or flaws (Risk)**

Please indicate your selected score in the tick box below the following scale:

Low risk – project well planned, soundly based etc.		Moderate risk			High risk – project contains significant flaws	
6	5	4	3	2	1	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide reasons for your assessment:

<b>Concerns</b>
<b>Doubts</b>
<b>Flaws</b>

**THIS PAGE WILL BE PASSED ON TO THE APPLICANT(S)**

**d. The importance of the problem on which this work is focused, and the importance of the contribution the work will make in furthering the trust's objectives**

Please indicate your selected score in the tick box below the following scale:

Highly important problem to which the work will make a major contribution		➡	Important problem but work will make a less significant contribution, or significant contribution to a lesser problem			➡	Problem of limited importance and work will make limited contribution	
6	5	4	3	2	1	0		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

**Please provide reasons for your assessment:**

**e. Scientific merit and feasibility of the work proposed**

Please indicate your selected score in the tick box below the following scale:

Work of substantial scientific merit and is eminently feasible		➡	Work of significant scientific merit with some feasibility concerns			➡	Work of limited scientific merit with significant feasibility concerns	
6	5	4	3	2	1	0		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

**Please provide reasons for your assessment:**

**THIS PAGE WILL BE PASSED ON TO THE APPLICANT(S)**

**f. The qualification and track record of the applicant(s) and his/her/their departments**

Please indicate your selected score in the tick box below the following scale:

Applicant(s) and department eminently qualified & experienced		➡ Applicant(s) and departments considered capable of bringing the work to fruition		➡ Significant doubt about the applicant(s) and/or departments		
6	5	4	3	2	1	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Please provide reasons for your assessment:**

**g. Is the support requested fully justified and do you consider that the investment of funds by the trust would represent value for money?**

Request is justified and represents excellent value for money		➡ Request appears justified and represents reasonable value for money		➡ Request does not appear justified &/or represents poor value for money		
6	5	4	3	2	1	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Please provide reasons for your assessment:**

**THIS PAGE MAY BE PASSED ON TO THE APPLICANT(S)**



**h. Any other comments or issues you wish to raise:**

**Please provide your comments etc.:**

**THIS PAGE MAY BE PASSED ON TO THE APPLICANT(S)**