

Society for Endocrinology Early Career grant marking guidelines

Scientific quality (marks out of 30)

Proposals should not be over ambitious or complex. They should explain clearly the expected programme of work with a sensible timetable, objectives and clear milestones, and well thought through experiments. Scientific excellence will be paramount, although allowance may be made for less experienced researchers in the presentation of their proposal.

Consider the following:

- Clarity of hypotheses, aims, and objectives
- Strengths and weaknesses of the experimental design
- Feasibility of the work programme, given the preliminary data and/or track-record of the applicant

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | Exceptional Fundable | Work that is or is likely to be at the leading edge internationally, worthy in itself of publication or which may lead to a publication in a top general journal, if successful and where the impact is likely to be substantial. |
| | Excellent Fundable | Work that is of a high international standard and worthy in itself of publication or which may lead to a publication in a top specialist journal (eg Endocrinology, JCEM), if successful. |
| | Very Good Fundable | Work that is internationally competitive and worthy in itself of publication or which may lead to a publication in a second tier specialist journal, if successful. |
| | Good Fundable | Work that has merit and which is publishable or which may lead to work that is publishable. |
| | Not Competitive or unfundable Not Fundable | Work that is potentially of some merit, but which is not internationally competitive. OR Work that is of no significant scientific merit, flawed, or duplicative of other research |

Benefit to applicant (marks out of 20)

The proposal should be of clear benefit to the future career of the researcher. Ideally, the proposed work should lead towards independent research and should not merely provide bridging between grant funding or simply finish work off where it is not clear that this will substantially help the future career. Whilst PhD students may apply for funding to carry out work in support of a future fellowship application, funding to allow ongoing PhD thesis work will not be considered unless fully justified.

Consider the following:

- Is the work likely to be successful?
- Will the work provide preliminary data for a fellowship application or will preliminary data obtained be in support of a grant application by the applicant's PI?
- Who will benefit most from work to be finished for publication?

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | Exceptional Fundable | Work that will clearly be of benefit to the future independent career of the applicant. It will provide preliminary data for a fellowship application or will complete a piece of major work that will subsequently be published in an internationally competitive journal, or will convert a good piece of work into an outstanding piece of work and where the impact is likely to be substantial. |
| | Excellent Fundable | |
| | Very Good Fundable | Work that, if successful, will benefit the applicant and will improve his/her CV, but will be unlikely to make a large difference to future career prospects. |
| | Good Fundable | |
| | Not Competitive or Unfundable Not Fundable | Work that is unlikely to significantly advance the applicant's career or that will benefit the career of the applicant's PI rather than the applicant themselves. |

Benefit to endocrine science/medicine (marks out of 10)

Proposals should address a problem of endocrine significance, which may be of clinical, basic or translational importance. It should be of a quality that will make an international impact.

Consider the following:

- Will the proposal address a clinical endocrine need?
- Will the proposal address a fundamental question in endocrinology?
- Will the proposal translate findings in animals to human research?
- Will the proposal develop a model of a human endocrine disorder?

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | Exceptional Fundable | Work that addresses a major clinical need or an important basic question in endocrinology and where the impact is likely to be substantial |
| | Excellent Fundable | |
| | Very Good Fundable | Work that is relevant to endocrinology, but where impact on the field is unlikely to be great. |
| | Good Fundable | |
| | Not Competitive or Unfundable Not Fundable | Work that is of borderline significance to endocrinology and should be funded by an alternate body or not funded. |