



## **BBSRC/NC3Rs joint call: development of next generation non-animal technologies**

### **Assessment criteria**

The following table should be used as guidance when assessing applications. The score should be a whole number between 1 – 10 where 1 is the lowest score and 10 is the highest. 0.5 integers are not permitted. The table is not intended to be prescriptive but should rather act as a general framework and guide for assessing and scoring applications.

When assessing the potential of the proposal to replace the use of animal in a specific area, please consider the following questions:

- Is this technology likely to be a scientific improvement on the existing animal model and advance the field of research?
- What is the likely scale of replacement to result from the non-animal technology, taking into consideration both the number of animals and the severity of the procedure to be replaced?
- Is the technology likely to be adopted by other users, and is this at a local, national or international level?
- Have the applicants included plans for testing reproducibility of the non-animal technology? If validation plans are included, are they detailed and robust?
  
- Will the technology potentially be applicable to the use of animals in other scientific disciplines?

Score Indicators	Score
<p><b>Exceptional – Leading programme internationally or of exceptional national strategic importance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Addresses crucial scientific question.</li> <li>▪ Highly original and innovative project; robust methodology and design.</li> <li>▪ Highly relevant to BBSRC strategy and the NC3Rs mission.</li> <li>▪ Excellent replacement of animal use potential.</li> <li>▪ Outstanding track record of the team and environment (amongst the best in a broad field) – highly capable of delivering proposed research.</li> <li>▪ Ethical and/or governance issues fully considered.</li> <li>▪ High potential to provide a foundation for future investment or uptake of the non-animal technology.</li> <li>▪ Very high likelihood of successful delivery (risks well managed)</li> </ul>	<p>10</p> <p>Highest priority for funding</p>
<p><b>Outstanding – Internationally competitive and leading edge in most areas</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Addresses crucial scientific question.</li> <li>▪ Original and innovative project; robust methodology and design.</li> <li>▪ Highly relevant to BBSRC strategy and the NC3Rs mission.</li> <li>▪ Excellent replacement of animal use potential</li> <li>▪ Outstanding track record of the team and environment (amongst the best in a specialist area) – highly capable of delivering proposed research.</li> <li>▪ Ethical and/or governance issues fully considered</li> <li>▪ High potential to provide a foundation for future investment or uptake of the non-animal technology.</li> <li>▪ Very high likelihood of successful delivery (risks well managed)</li> </ul>	<p>9</p> <p>Very high priority for funding</p>
<p><b>Excellent – Internationally competitive and leading edge nationally</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Addresses very important scientific question.</li> <li>▪ Original and innovative project; robust methodology and design.</li> <li>▪ Highly relevant to BBSRC strategy and the NC3Rs mission.</li> <li>▪ Excellent replacement of animal use potential.</li> <li>▪ Excellent track record of the team and environment – highly capable of delivering proposed research.</li> <li>▪ Ethical and/or governance issues fully considered.</li> <li>▪ High potential to provide a foundation for future investment or uptake of the non-animal technology.</li> <li>▪ High likelihood of successful delivery (risks well managed)</li> </ul>	<p>8</p> <p>High priority for funding</p>

<p><b>Very Good – Leading edge nationally, internationally competitive in parts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Addresses important scientific question.</li> <li>▪ Robust methodology and design (innovative project in parts).</li> <li>▪ Highly relevant to BBSRC strategy and the NC3Rs mission.</li> <li>▪ Very good replacement of animal use potential.</li> <li>▪ Strong track record of the team and environment – capable of delivering proposed research.</li> <li>▪ Ethical and/ or governance issues fully considered.</li> <li>▪ High potential to provide a foundation for future investment or uptake of the non-animal technology.</li> <li>▪ High likelihood of successful delivery (risks well managed).</li> </ul>	<p>7</p> <p>Fundable</p>
<p><b>Good – Nationally competitive</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Addresses worthwhile scientific question.</li> <li>▪ Robust methodology and design.</li> <li>▪ Relevant to BBSRC strategy and the NC3Rs mission.</li> <li>▪ Good replacement of animal use potential.</li> <li>▪ Solid track record of the team and environment – likely capable of delivering proposed research.</li> <li>▪ Ethical and/or governance issues well considered.</li> <li>▪ Potential to provide a foundation for future investment or uptake of the non-animal technology.</li> <li>▪ Good likelihood of successful delivery (some concerns about risk mitigation plan).</li> </ul>	<p>6</p> <p>Unfundable</p>
<p><b>Average – Potentially competitive but with some weaknesses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Addresses potentially worthwhile scientific question.</li> <li>▪ Methodologically sound.</li> <li>▪ Partially relevant to BBSRC strategy and the NC3Rs mission.</li> <li>▪ Good replacement of animal use potential.</li> <li>▪ Solid track record of the team and environment – likely capable of delivering proposed research.</li> <li>▪ Ethical and/or governance issues adequately considered.</li> <li>▪ Unclear if would provide a foundation for future investment or uptake of the non-animal technology.</li> <li>▪ Reasonable likelihood of successful delivery.</li> </ul>	<p>5</p> <p>Unfundable</p>

<p><b>Below average – Potentially useful but with significant weaknesses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Addresses potentially worthwhile scientific question but outcomes not well defined.</li> <li>▪ Predominantly methodologically sound study but areas require revision.</li> <li>▪ Partially relevant to BBSRC strategy and the NC3Rs mission.</li> <li>▪ Low replacement of animal use potential.</li> <li>▪ Reasonable track record of the team and environment – likely capable of delivering proposed research.</li> <li>▪ Ethical and/or governance issues are adequately considered</li> <li>▪ Unclear if would provide a foundation for future investment or uptake of the non-animal technology.</li> <li>▪ Unclear on the likelihood of successful delivery.</li> </ul>	<p>4</p> <p>Unfundable</p>
<p><b>Major weaknesses – Potentially useful but with major weaknesses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Addresses potentially worthwhile scientific question but outcomes not well defined.</li> <li>▪ Predominantly methodologically sound study but areas require revision</li> <li>▪ Not relevant to BBSRC strategy and the NC3Rs mission.</li> <li>▪ Low replacement of animal use potential.</li> <li>▪ Unclear track record of the team and environment – may be able to deliver proposed research.</li> <li>▪ Ethical and/or governance issues not adequately considered</li> <li>▪ Unclear if would provide a foundation for future investment or uptake of the non-animal technology.</li> <li>▪ Unlikely to contribute to new knowledge generation.</li> </ul>	<p>3</p> <p>Unfundable</p>
<p><b>Poor – Poor quality proposal</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Scientific question is not well defined.</li> <li>▪ Methodologically weak study.</li> <li>▪ Not relevant to BBSRC strategy and the NC3Rs mission.</li> <li>▪ Very low replacement of animal use potential.</li> <li>▪ Lack of track record of the team and environment– unclear if could deliver proposed research.</li> <li>▪ Ethical and/or governance issues not adequately considered</li> <li>▪ Unlikely to provide a foundation for future investment or uptake of the non-animal technology.</li> <li>▪ Unlikely to contribute to new knowledge generation.</li> </ul>	<p>2</p> <p>Unfundable</p>

<p><b>Very Poor – Unacceptable quality or has serious ethical concerns</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Scientific question is poorly defined, flawed or duplicative.</li> <li>▪ Methodologically flawed study.</li> <li>▪ Not relevant to BBSRC strategy and the NC3Rs mission.</li> <li>▪ Very low replacement of animal use potential.</li> <li>▪ Lack of track record of the team and environment – unlikely could deliver proposed research.</li> <li>▪ Ethical and/ or governance issues are not considered</li> <li>▪ Unlikely to provide a foundation for future investment or uptake of the non-animal technology.</li> <li>▪ Will not contribute to new knowledge generation.</li> </ul>	<p>1</p> <p>Unfundable</p>
<p>Not in remit for funding (for Office use only)</p>	<p>0</p>