



Michael Smith  
**Health  
Research BC**

# 2022 Health Professional-Investigator Program

---

## Full Application Peer Review Evaluation Criteria

### DEADLINES

Letter of intent: April 29, 2022, 4:30 p.m. PT

Full application: June 20, 2022, 4:30 p.m. PT

Applicant Expertise and Experience	Weighting – 20%
<p><b>Assessment Criteria</b></p> <p>Please assess the applicant’s potential as an independent researcher based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualifications of the applicant, including both clinical and research training and experience (relative to career stage and health profession), with consideration of how the applicant’s research experience and training align with the proposed research area and methods.</li> <li>• Expertise and research quality, productivity and leadership of the applicant as demonstrated by research and professional contributions, including awards and other forms of professional recognition.*</li> <li>• Evidence of the applicant’s ability to successfully employ knowledge translation (KT) strategies, activities and/or tools to contribute to changing policy/practice related to patient health and/or the health system.*</li> </ul> <p><b>*Productivity and track record should be weighed with consideration of the norms of the applicant’s career stage, and health profession and research area.</b></p>	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p><b>Outstanding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant’s combined clinical and research training and experience provide the expertise needed to complete the proposed research. Clinical expertise and research training are well aligned with the proposed research area and methods.</li> <li>• The applicant has an established record of quality research outputs indicative of a committed interest in research and proficiency as an independent researcher.</li> <li>• The applicant demonstrates proficiency with KT strategies, activities and/or tools and is well-positioned to contribute to changing policy/practice related to patient health and/or the health system.</li> </ul>	<p><b>4.5 – 4.9 may be funded</b></p>
<p><b>Excellent</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant’s combined clinical and research training and experience provide the expertise needed to complete the proposed research. Clinical expertise and research training are well aligned with the proposed research area and methods.</li> <li>• The applicant has a record of quality research outputs indicative of a committed interest in research and demonstrating ability as an independent researcher.</li> <li>• The applicant demonstrates some expertise with KT strategies, activities and/or tools and is well-positioned to contribute to</li> </ul>	<p><b>4.0 – 4.4 may be funded</b></p>

<p>changing policy/practice related to patient health and/or the health system.</p>	
<p><b>Very Good</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant’s combined clinical and research training and experience provide the expertise needed to complete the proposed research with only minor knowledge gaps. Clinical expertise and research training are mostly aligned with the proposed research area and methods.</li> <li>• The applicant has a record of quality research outputs that provides evidence of a committed interest in research and demonstrates that the applicant has the potential to become an independent researcher.</li> <li>• The applicant has some experience with KT strategies, activities and/or tools. The applicant is positioned to contribute to changing policy/practice related to patient health and/or the health system.</li> </ul>	<p><b>3.5 – 3.9 may be funded (above 3.8)</b></p>
<p><b>Fair</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant’s combined clinical and research training and experience provide some of the expertise needed to complete the proposed research; however, there are important knowledge gaps. Clinical expertise and research training are only partially aligned with the proposed research area and methods.</li> <li>• The applicant has a limited record of quality research outputs, indicating some interest in research, but it is not clear if the applicant has the potential to be an independent researcher.</li> <li>• The applicant has a limited experience with KT strategies, activities, and/or tools. It is not clear if the applicant is positioned to contribute to changing policy/practice related to patient health and/or the health system.</li> </ul>	<p><b>3.0 – 3.4 not fundable</b></p>
<p><b>Less than Adequate</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant’s combined clinical and research training and experience do not provide adequate expertise to complete the proposed research. Clinical expertise and research training are not aligned with the proposed research area and methods.</li> <li>• The applicant has very few quality research outputs and it is questionable whether the applicant is committed to research. It is not clear that the applicant has the potential to be an independent researcher.</li> <li>• The applicant has a limited experience with KT strategies, activities and/or tools. The applicant is not positioned to contribute to changing policy/practice related to patient health and/or the health system</li> </ul>	<p><b>0 – 2.9 not fundable</b></p>

Research Proposal	Weighting – 40%
<p><b>Assessment Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completeness of the background/literature review and relevance to the research question(s), research design, and methods.</li> <li>• Clarity and originality* of the research question(s) and potential of the research to address important knowledge gaps that directly impact patient health and/or the health system.</li> <li>• Clarity of rationale for the research design and methods.</li> <li>• Appropriateness and feasibility of the research design and methods.</li> <li>• Appropriateness and feasibility of the project timeline.</li> <li>• Appropriateness and feasibility of the budget statement.</li> <li>• Adequacy of the identification of risks and plans for management of potential difficulties that may be encountered during the term of the research.</li> <li>• Appropriateness and adequacy of the proposed knowledge translation tools and/or activities to influence policy and/or practice related to patient health and/or the health system.</li> <li>• Appropriateness and adequacy of any proposed collaborations required to carry out the research. (if applicable)</li> </ul> <p><b>*Originality refers to research that will generate new knowledge that may be vital to the progress of a field. Originality does not necessarily require innovation in research methods or approaches. Reference: <a href="https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/39914.html">https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/39914.html</a></b></p>	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p><b>Outstanding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The background/literature review is complete and relevant to the research question(s), research design, and methods.</li> <li>• The research proposal contains clear research question(s), is original, and will address important knowledge gaps that directly impact patient health and/or the health system.</li> <li>• The research design and methods are clearly described, feasible, and appropriate to address the research question(s).</li> <li>• The timeline is appropriate and feasible.</li> <li>• The budget statement is appropriate and feasible.</li> <li>• The research proposal identifies risks that may be encountered during the term of the research and how to manage/mitigate these risks.</li> <li>• The knowledge translation plan is clearly described and appropriate.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4.5 – 4.9 may be funded</b></p>

<p><b>Excellent</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The background and literature review is sufficient and provides adequate context on the research question(s), research design, and methods</li> <li>• The research proposal contains clear research question(s). The proposed research proposal is very likely to be original, and very likely to address important knowledge gaps that directly impact patient health and/or the health system.</li> <li>• The research design and methods are clearly described, feasible, and appropriate to address the research question(s), with only a few minor details lacking.</li> <li>• The timeline is appropriate and feasible.</li> <li>• The budget statement is appropriate and feasible, with only a few minor details lacking.</li> <li>• The research proposal identifies risks that may be encountered during the term of the research and how to manage/mitigate these risks.</li> <li>• The knowledge translation plan is clearly described and appropriate.</li> </ul>	<p><b>4.0 – 4.4 may be funded</b></p>
<p><b>Very Good</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The background/literature review may lack some details, but the information is sufficient to support the research question(s), research design, and methods.</li> <li>• The research proposal contains clear research question(s) and has the potential to be original. It is likely that the proposed research will address knowledge gaps that directly impact patient health and/or the health system.</li> <li>• The research design and methods are feasible, and appropriate to address the research question(s), with only some details lacking.</li> <li>• The timeline is appropriate and feasible but may be missing some details.</li> <li>• The budget statement is appropriate and feasible, with some details lacking.</li> <li>• The research proposal identifies all major risks likely to be encountered during the term of the research and how to manage/mitigate these risks. Some minor risks and mitigation approaches may be missing.</li> <li>• The knowledge translation plan is largely appropriate but may lack some details.</li> </ul>	<p><b>3.5 – 3.9 may be funded (above 3.8)</b></p>

<p><b>Fair</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The background/literature review does not provide adequate information to support the research question(s), research design, and methods</li> <li>• The research question(s) are unclear and/or they require major revision. It is unclear whether the research will be original and/or whether the proposed research will address knowledge gaps that directly impact patient health and/or the health system.</li> <li>• The research design and methods have major flaws and/or is not appropriate to address the research question(s).</li> <li>• The timeline is of questionable feasibility and/or lacks key details.</li> <li>• The budget statement is of questionable feasibility, lacks key details, or has multiple inaccuracies.</li> <li>• The research proposal fails to identify important risks that are likely to be encountered during the term of the research propose actions to manage/mitigate these risks.</li> <li>• The knowledge translation plan is poorly described and/or inappropriate.</li> </ul>	<p><b>3.0 – 3.4 not fundable</b></p>
<p><b>Less than Adequate</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The background/literature review is missing and/or does not provide adequate information to support the research question(s), research design, and methods.</li> <li>• The research proposal does not contain clear research question(s), the proposed research is not original, and/or the proposed research does not address knowledge gaps that directly impact patient health and/or the health system.</li> <li>• The research design and methods are poorly described, is not feasible, or is not appropriate to address the research question(s).</li> <li>• The timeline is inappropriate or not feasible.</li> <li>• The budget statement is incomplete, inaccurate or not feasible.</li> <li>• The research proposal is missing information on risk assessment and mitigation.</li> <li>• The knowledge translation plan is missing, poorly described and/or inappropriate.</li> </ul>	<p><b>0 – 2.9 not fundable</b></p>

Support for Research Activities	Weighting – 20%
<p><b>Assessment Criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of support from the applicant’s department head (or equivalent) for the required appointment, protected research time and a commitment of continued support post-award.</li> <li>• Availability and accessibility of personnel, facilities and infrastructure required to conduct the proposed research and perform the knowledge translation activities.</li> <li>• Availability and accessibility of collaborators and mentors to advise and support research and knowledge translation activities where appropriate.</li> </ul>	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p><b>Outstanding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrated commitment from the department/host institution to provide the required protection of time, research appointment, and continued support post-award.</li> <li>• The research support statement describes how the applicant plans to access all of the necessary supports for the research and knowledge translation activities.</li> <li>• The letters of support and reference provide good evidence that the applicant has established strong connections with mentors and/or collaborators to advise and support research and knowledge translation activities where appropriate.</li> </ul>	<p><b>4.5 – 4.9 may be fundable</b></p>
<p><b>Excellent</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong commitment from the department/host institution to provide the required protection of time, research appointment, and continued support post-award.</li> <li>• The research support statement provides details on how the applicant plans to access the necessary supports for the research and knowledge translation activities, with only minor details missing.</li> <li>• The letters of support and reference provide good evidence that the applicant has established connections with mentors and/or collaborators to advise and support research and knowledge translation activities where appropriate.</li> </ul>	<p><b>4.0 – 4.4 may be fundable</b></p>
<p><b>Very Good</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is evidence of a commitment from the department/host institution to provide the required protection of time, research appointment, and continued support post-award.</li> </ul>	<p><b>3.5 – 3.9 may be fundable (above 3.8)</b></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The research support statement describes how the applicant plans to access the necessary supports for the research and knowledge translation activities, with some details missing.</li> <li>• The letters of support and reference provide some evidence that the applicant has established connections with mentors and/or collaborators to advise and support research and knowledge translation activities where appropriate.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Fair</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is evidence of a commitment from the department/host institution to provide the required protection of time and research appointment, with some potential for continued support post-award.</li> <li>• The research support statement is missing important information on how the applicant plans to access the necessary supports for the research and knowledge translation activities.</li> <li>• The letters of support and reference do not provide sufficient evidence that the applicant has established connections with mentors and/or collaborators to advise and support research and knowledge translation activities where appropriate.</li> </ul>	<p><b>3.0 – 3.4 not fundable</b></p>
<p><b>Less than Adequate</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The commitment from the host institution is inadequate and does not guarantee the required protection of time, research appointment, and continued support post-award.</li> <li>• The research support statement is missing, or is missing vital information on how the applicant plans to access the necessary supports for the research and knowledge translation activities.</li> <li>• The letters of support and reference from key mentors and/or collaborators are missing, and it is unlikely that the applicant has sufficient support to complete the research and knowledge translation activities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>0 – 2.9 not fundable</b></p>



Impact of Award	Weighting – 20%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impact of the award on the applicant’s career progression as a health professional-investigator.</li> <li>For less established applicants, this may involve buy-out time and/or salaries for staff/trainees needed to establish a research program that will contribute to changing policy/practice related to patient health and/or the health system.</li> <li>For more established applicants, this may involve buy-out time and/or salaries for staff/trainees needed to advance their research program towards greater impact on policy/practice related to patient health and/or the health system.</li> </ul>	
Assessment Descriptor	Score
<p><b>Outstanding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The support from the award is vital to moving the applicant along a career trajectory toward a career as a successful independent health professional-investigator.</li> <li>For less established applicants, this may involve buy-out time and/or salaries for staff/trainees that will be vital to establishing their research program. In the absence of this award the researcher is at risk of not continuing as a health professional-investigator.</li> <li>For more established applicants, this may involve buy-out time and/or salaries for staff/trainees that is vital to advancing their research program towards more timely or greater translational, clinical or policy outcomes. In the absence of this award the program may not continue.</li> </ul>	<p><b>4.5 – 4.9 may be funded</b></p>
<p><b>Excellent</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The support from the award will clearly facilitate the applicant along a career trajectory towards a career as a successful independent health professional-investigator.</li> <li>For less established applicants, this may involve buy-out time and/or salaries for staff/trainees <i>that will enable</i> the establishment their research program. The absence of the award will delay or impede the establishment of their program.</li> <li>For more established applicants, this may involve buy-out time and/or salaries for staff/trainees <i>that will enable</i> the advancement of their research program towards more timely or greater translational, clinical or policy outcomes. The absence of the award will diminish or seriously delay research outputs, which may include the loss of employment/training opportunities for research talent.</li> </ul>	<p><b>4.0 – 4.4 may be funded</b></p>

<p><b>Very Good</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The support from the award will be helpful to progress the applicant along a career trajectory towards a career as a successful independent health professional investigator.</li> <li>• For less established applicants, this may involve buy-out time and/or salaries for staff/trainees <i>that will support</i> the establishment their research program. The absence of the award will slow the establishment of their program.</li> <li>• For more established applicants, this may involve buy-out time and/or salaries for staff/trainees <i>that will support</i> the advancement their research program towards more timely or greater translational, clinical or policy outcomes. The absence of the award may diminish or delay research outputs, including employment/training opportunities for research talent.</li> </ul>	<p><b>3.5 – 3.9 may be funded (above 3.8)</b></p>
<p><b>Fair</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The support from the award will assist the applicant along a career trajectory towards a career as a successful independent health professional investigator.</li> <li>• For less established applicants, this may involve buy-out time and/or salaries for staff/trainees <i>that will contribute</i> to the establishment their research program. The absence of the award will have a minor impact on the establishment of their program.</li> <li>• For more established applicants, this may involve buy-out time and/or salaries for staff/trainees <i>that will contribute</i> to the advancement their research program towards more timely or greater translational, clinical or policy outcomes. The absence of the award will not significantly diminish or delay research outputs.</li> </ul>	<p><b>3.0 – 3.4 not fundable</b></p>
<p><b>Less than Adequate</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The support from the award will have no impact on the applicant's career trajectory towards a career as a successful independent health professional-investigator.</li> <li>• For less established applicants, the requested buy-out time and/or salaries for staff/trainees <i>is of negligible consequence</i> to the establishment their research program. The absence of the award will have negligible impact on the establishment of their program.</li> <li>• For more established applicants, the requested buy-out time and/or salaries for staff/trainees <i>is of negligible consequence</i> to the advancement their research program towards more timely or greater translational, clinical or policy outcomes. The absence of the award will have negligible impact on research outputs.</li> </ul>	<p><b>0.0 – 2.9 not fundable</b></p>

## Mitacs Accelerate Application Proposal (if applicable)

### Assessment Criteria

Refer to the Mitacs Accelerate application proposal upload, and the relevant section in Additional Information of the HP-I application form. The assessment of this information is not to be included in the overall score of the HP-I application, but rather considered separately. Please comment on the following elements as they relate to the research proposal as a whole, including the Mitacs Accelerate application:

- Are the challenges associated with the research activities for each intern appropriate for their degree level?
- Will the research work potentially have adverse effects on the environment? Do you recommend that an additional environmental impact review be conducted?
- Please comment on the following question for Mitacs applications where section 1.10 of the Accelerate joint application is completed i.e., only if the Mitacs' project partner is a not-for profit organization:
  - To be eligible, the proposed project must have a clear economic or productivity orientation. Does this project have a demonstrable economic or productivity orientation?