

NATIONAL ASTHMA RESEARCH PROGRAM

PROJECT GRANT: GUIDE FOR APPLICANTS

Contents

General information for Applicants	2
Assessment Process	3
Applicant Guide – Full Application.....	4
Project Details (Scientific quality) (30%).....	4
Investigators, including track record (20%)	4
Impact and Translation (30%).....	5
Consumer Centred (10%).....	6
Collaboration (10%)	7
Budget.....	7
Applicant Guide – Consumer Review Form	8
Peer Review Guide.....	10
Project Details (Scientific quality) (30%).....	10
Investigators, including track record (20%)	11
Impact and Translation (30%).....	13
Consumer Centred (10%).....	15
Collaboration (10%)	16
Consumer Review Guide.....	17

General information for Applicants

Over the past ten years the Asthma Australia National Asthma Research Program has resulted in significant contributions to important discovery science, clinical, and population health research projects, as well as PhD Scholarships and research fellowships to promote emerging researchers in the field.

Asthma Australia invites applicants whose research project relates to people with asthma, to apply for Asthma Australia Project Grant.

Applicants for Asthma Australia's Project Grant must be conducting research in Australia.

Please refer to the advertisement for specific eligibility requirements.

Submission process

- Applications should be submitted to research@asthma.org.au. Late or incomplete applications will not be accepted.
- Full application and Consumer Review Form should be submitted as two documents and named as follows:
 - SURNAME OF APPLICANT_APPLICATION_PROJECTGRANT_YEAR_
 - SURNAME OF APPLICANT_CONSUMERFORM_PROJECTGRANT_YEAR
- Applications must be lodged electronically in Microsoft Windows Word or PDF format, using the forms provided. Applications not received in this format will not be accepted.
- Files should be no larger than 1mb in size
- Left margin should be at least 2.5cm with content aligned text left
- Font (body) should be Calibri 11 point

Reporting expectations

If successful, applicants will provide 6 monthly progress reports to Asthma Australia. Progress reports will include:

- Any changes to the research,
- Any issues or delays which might impact the completion of the project,
- Progress against key milestones,
- Outcomes, and
- Publications, presentations, collaborations and additional funding which have arisen as a result of the research.

These should be provided in language appropriate for a lay audience.

Affiliation and acknowledgment

Successful applicants must ensure (wherever possible) Asthma Australia's contribution and support of the Project is acknowledged in publications or presentations related to the research.

Assessment Process

Applications are assessed for their eligibility by Asthma Australia staff.

Eligible applications will undergo assessment by:

- Peer reviewers from Asthma Australia’s Research Advisory Committee or delegate/s
- Consumer Reviewers from Asthma Australia’s Research Advisory Committee or delegate/s

All applications are assessed against a standardised assessment criterion which is described in this document. Applicants will receive a score out of 100 for both peer review and consumer reviews.

Peer Review

Peer reviewers assess applications on the extent to which they address the five criteria below. Applications will be assessed against the category descriptors on the following pages. While the category descriptors provide peer reviewers with some benchmarks for appropriately scoring each application, **it is not essential that all descriptors relating to a given score are met.** The category descriptors are a guide to a ‘best fit’ outcomes. Peer reviewers will consistently refer to these category descriptors to ensure thorough equitable and transparent assessment of applications.

Peer Review Categories	Weight
Scientific quality	30%
Track record (relative to opportunity)	20%
Research Impact and Translation	30%
Consumer Centred	10%
Collaborative	10%

Consumer review

Consumer reviewers assess applications on the extent to which they address the criteria below, which are addressed in the Consumer Review Form. Like peer reviewers, consumer reviewers are provided with benchmarks for appropriately scoring each application, but **it is not essential that all descriptors relating to a given score are met.** The category descriptors are a guide to a ‘best fit’ outcomes.

Consumer Review Categories	Weight
Impact	25%
Equity	25%
Translation	25%
Consumer Centred	25%

Applicant Guide – Full Application

Project Details (Scientific quality) (30%)

This section should clearly demonstrate the need and rationale behind the research, aims and objectives, scientific quality of the methodology, expected outcomes, timeframes and feasibility of the research.

Applicants should address the following for each section:

Background	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe the rationale/need for the research Provide relevant background to the project including scientific aspects and any other relevant material
Aims	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe the specific aims and objectives Include a clear statement of the hypothesis to be tested or the research question to be addressed
Research Plan and expected outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outline the research plan in detail, including as appropriate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed description of design Techniques to be used Methods of statistical analysis Expected outcomes of the research project
Research Milestones and timeframe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detail the key research milestones and approximate timeframe in dot points, table or gantt chart form
Feasibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outline the team capacity and timelines to achieve targets Outline any previous relevant research which supports the feasibility of this research/method/approach Investigator track record will also be used to assess this section

Investigators, including track record (20%)

This relates to the quality and capability of the team/investigator(s) to achieve and/or deliver the proposed project. It will be judged on the most recent five years, except where there is career disruption. While Asthma Australia has a specific grant stream targeted at early-mid career researchers (EMCRs), we still encourage research teams to include EMCRs as part of the Investigator team for Project Grants. Assessors will consider the contribution of EMCRs and their capability and/or capacity to undertake the proposed research under the guidance (mentoring) of experienced members of the research team.

Team quality and capability may include:

- Research outputs (publications, awards or honours in recognition of achievements, outcomes of previous research that demonstrate effects on health care practices or policy).
- Contribution to discipline or area (invitations to speak at international meetings, editorial appointments, specialist and high-level health policy committee appointments), and
- Other research related achievements (influence on clinical/health policy or practice, provision of influential advice to health authorities, or impacts on health via the broad dissemination of research outcomes).

Track record should be detailed (including any considerations for career disruption) in a maximum 2-page document. Investigators should also provide a short CV or link to an online profile.

Impact and Translation (30%)

This relates to the potential knowledge gain about asthma nationally and internationally and the proposed impact on people with asthma. It includes the likely interest from other researchers, conference organisers, journals, community groups and policy makers. This should consider the translatable policy and practice implications of the research for people with asthma. Applicants should also address in this section, how the research addressed Asthma Australia’s research priority areas.

Impact and Translation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline the potential impact of this project for people with asthma • Describe the potential knowledge gains or fundamental outcomes of the research • Outline the expected pathway to translation for the research findings, and relevant considerations.
Research Priority area	<p>Outline how the project meets the Asthma Australia National Research Program Priority(s). If a specific priority area has been outlined in the application information, this criteria must be addressed adequately for the application to be eligible.</p> <p>The priority areas are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevention • Vulnerable groups • Models and system • Environment • Influencing policy <p>Please see the Research Strategy for more detail.</p>
Indigenous Research Excellence Criteria (if applicable)	<p>Asthma Australia is committed to advancing Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Research. Applications which specifically relate to the health of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander People, must address the NHMRC Indigenous Research Excellence Criteria, which is as follows;</p> <p>If applicable, please outline how your research addresses the Indigenous Research Excellence Criteria, which is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community engagement - the proposal demonstrates how the research and potential outcomes are a priority for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities with relevant community engagement by individuals, communities and/or organisations in conceptualisation, development and approval, data collection and management, analysis, report writing and dissemination of results. • Benefit - the potential health benefit of the project is demonstrated by addressing an important public health issue for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. This benefit can have a single focus or affect several areas, such as knowledge, finance and policy or quality of life. The benefit may be direct and immediate, or it can be indirect, gradual and considered. • Sustainability and transferability - the proposal demonstrates how the results of the project have the potential to lead to achievable and effective contributions to health gain for Aboriginal and

Torres Strait Islander peoples, beyond the life of the project. This may be through sustainability in the project setting and/or transferability to other settings such as evidence-based practice and/or policy. In considering this issue the proposal should address the relationship between costs and benefits.

- Building capability - the proposal demonstrates how Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, communities and researchers will develop relevant capabilities through partnerships and participation in the project.

Consumer Centred (10%)

Asthma Australia is committed to being a consumer centred organisation, that meets the diverse needs of people with asthma and carers. This section prioritises research which is informed by consumers, driven by consumers, involving consumers. There is no single best method of consumer involvement, and all research should incorporate some consumer involvement. Refer to the table below for clarity on effective and meaningful consumer roles in research.

Consumer roles in Asthma Australia's National Research Program

Partner	Valued for significant knowledge
Expert	Being recognised for expertise
Advisor	Giving experiential advice to influence decisions
Advocate	Representing the broad views and experiences of people affected by asthma
Personal engagement	Providing a personal perspective through story-telling, surveys, focus groups and discussions

Adapted from: National Framework for Consumer Involvement in Cancer Control

Applicants should outline how relevant informed consumers have been involved during the development of the research proposal and/or the plan for how they will continue to participate in the research once underway. You do not need to name the specific consumer/s involved in the project, but describe who/how they came to be involved. Detail how and when they are involved in the research and what activities this will include.

Some examples of consumer involvement are:

- Provide informed input on strategic priority setting and direction
- Work with researchers to define or refine the research topic
- Provide informed input on research design and proposed methods
- Participate in project advisory committees
- Conduct lay reviews of research proposals
- Participate in recruiting participants to research
- Assist researchers to develop links to hard-to-reach populations
- Conduct reviews of participant information sheets and consent forms
- Assist researchers to pilot a research questionnaire
- Produce newsletters for members of their organisation that chart the progress of research
- Support the development of lay summaries
- Assist in disseminating information to the wider community

Collaboration (10%)

This section acknowledges that for meaningful impact research should consider the broader context, at a national and internal level. It should consider if there is collaboration between primary healthcare and other healthcare providers; what collaborative processes are in place to support the translation of research evidence into practice; is and does the project display cross-disciplinary research and/or multiple site approaches.

Budget

All applications must provide a summary of eligible project costs over the life of the project in a table as shown below (inclusive of GST). This includes a description of each item, brief justification, priority and total value of the item requested for each year.

The description/justification column should take into account the following:

- **Staffing**
 - Detail of staff required
 - Role/duties within the project
 - Percentage of time spent on the project
 - If relevant, how this person is supported at present and when this support ceases
- **Equipment**
 - Functions of the requested item for the research project
 - Note: capital equipment is not funded by Asthma Australia. Minor equipment which is essential for the conduct of the project can be included. The total cost of minor equipment should not exceed \$5000.
- **Other/direct research costs**
 - Includes: additional overtime; additional specialist sessions; experimental animals not normally stocked by the institution; consumables (not normally available through the institution's stores); translation costs; computing; charges; travel and maintenance.
 - If relevant, note why these are not normally available through the institution's normal supplies or services
- **Institutional brokerage fees or grant administration levies**

Given the size of grants and their source (from charitable donors and supporters), the budget for administrative overheads (infatuation levy's, institutional brokerage, or administration costs) must:

 - Be waived when the grant awarded by Asthma Australia is 100,000 or less,
 - Not exceed 10% of the total project budget when the grant awarded by Asthma Australia is more than \$100,000.

Please indicate the **relative priority** of each budget item as A, B or C in the column provided.

A. Items otherwise unavailable and without this phase of the project could not commence

B. Items without which the rate of progress would be considerably slowed and the quality of the work affected

C. Items which are desirable but not essential and the absence of which would not have the same effect as those in the preceding categories

Other support

This section should provide information on financial or other assistance applied for, granted for or already received for (a) this project and (b) other projects in this year and subsequent years.

Please note that Asthma Australia grants are not intended as supplementary funding for larger studies or projects. Projects which are a prelude and possible introduction to NHMRC funding are welcomed.

Applicant Guide – Consumer Review Form

Asthma Australia is committed to being a consumer-centred organisation, which meets the diverse needs of people with asthma and carers. We seek to champion the expressed needs of people with asthma and ensure their inclusion in our research program. We believe research should be informed by consumers, involve consumers and be meaningful for consumer lived experience.

Please submit the completed Consumer Review Form as part of your application. Your responses to these criteria will be scored by an Asthma Australia consumer representative.

The Consumer Review Form must be completed in plain English and be able to be considered by the consumer reviewer as a stand-alone document and without reference to information provided in the full application. Please provide a simple concise definition of key technical concepts used. We suggest you ask someone without detailed research knowledge to read the completed form, prior to submission, to check for understanding.

This should include; why the research is being conducted, aims and objectives, how you will do the research and what the benefits of the research will be as well as explanations of any technical terms used.

The Consumer Review Form must then describe how the proposed research addresses the following criteria:

Impact (25%)	<p>Applicants should address which Asthma Australia research priority area/s this addresses, the need for the research, proposed outcomes and how these will lead to a benefit for people with asthma.</p> <p>Explain the potential for the proposed research to have a direct, beneficial impact on the lives of people with asthma, in the short, medium and/or long term. Applicants should include what the benefit/s are expected to be, how likely it is they will occur, and when the benefits might be realised. This shouldn't be confused with the benefits for research participants.</p>
Translation (25%)	<p>This section should explain how the current study will be applied to the real world over the short, medium and long term to achieve the proposed impacts.</p> <p>Consumers recognise that further steps are often required for the benefits of research to be realised. These steps might include additional research, changes in clinical practice, product development, regulation/law and/or policy changes. Consumers also recognise that outcomes achieved in a single body of work may make significant advances to the knowledge of asthma, but not necessarily benefit people with asthma immediately.</p> <p>Applicants should identify the further steps required for benefit to be achieved and detail these, dot points or numbered timeframe are appropriate. These steps should</p>

detail the pathway to realise the benefit of the research, rather than the steps required to complete the research project. It is understood these steps will likely extend beyond the requesting funding period.

Applicants should also note here any potential barriers to translation and how they propose to address them.

Equity
(25%)

This section should describe **who** benefits as a result of this research, and should address how the research benefits can be distributed to the wider population or how they benefit people most vulnerable to poor asthma outcomes (e.g. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People, people experiencing socioeconomic hardship and people with severe asthma for example).

If a research project focuses on a specific population, the applicant should provide an explanation for the rationale behind this focus, including how relevant groups have been considered/consulted. The applicant should also provide explanation around if/how the benefits could be expanded or apply to other groups in the future.

This is not to say research cannot have a focus on a specific population group to be equitable. In fact, research which prioritises the health of vulnerable populations is a priority of the Asthma Australia research program. However, a study of a new treatment may be inequitable if the results can only benefit people in metropolitan areas or those who can access and afford them.

Consumer
centred
(25%)

Asthma Australia is committed to being a consumer-centred organisation, which meets the diverse needs of people with asthma and carers. Applicants should outline how relevant informed consumers have been involved during the development of the research proposal and/or the plan for how they will continue to participate in the research once underway.

Some examples of consumer involvement are:

- Work with researchers to define or refine the research topic
 - Provide informed input on research design and proposed methods
 - Conduct lay reviews of research proposals
 - Participate in recruiting participants to research
 - Assist researchers to develop links to hard-to-reach populations
 - Conduct reviews of participant information sheets and consent forms
 - Assist researchers to pilot a research questionnaire
 - Support the development of lay summaries
 - Assist in disseminating information to the wider community
-

Peer Review Guide

Peer reviewers should assess applications on the extent to which they address the five criteria below. Applications will be assessed against the category descriptors on the following pages. While the category descriptors provide peer reviewers with some benchmarks for appropriately scoring each application, **it is not essential that all descriptors relating to a given score are met.** The category descriptors are a guide to a 'best fit' outcomes. Peer reviewers will consistently refer to these category descriptors to ensure thorough equitable and transparent assessment of applications.

Peer Review Categories	Weight
Scientific quality	30%
Track record (relative to opportunity)	20%
Research Impact and Translation	30%
Consumer Centred	10%
Collaborative	10%

Project Details (Scientific quality) (30%)

In their assessment, peer reviewers should consider:

Background

- Is there a clear need for the research?
- Has the method/framework/approach been partially tested?

Aims

- What outcome is sought in the proposed study and what is the measure?
- Is it well integrated and adequately developed?

Research Plan and expected outcomes

- Is the design appropriate for the aims of the research?
- What are the strengths and weakness of the study and its design?
- Have major problems been overlooked? Have alternative approaches been considered?
- Is the plan well informed by knowledge of the literature?

Research Milestones and timeframe

- Are key milestones and timeframes outlined? Are the reasonable?

Feasibility

- Will the research plan successfully address the states hypothesis or research objective?
- Are the goals concrete and achievable?
- Is the investigating team appropriate? Do they have the right skills and experience?

Description	Weight
The proposal has a research plan that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is well-defined, highly coherent and strongly developed • has a near flawless study design • is highly feasible with all the required expertise, research tools and techniques established • would be highly competitive with the best, similar research proposals internationally 	Outstanding (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is clearly defined, coherent and well developed • has a strong study design • is feasible with all required tools, techniques and expertise established 	Excellent (9–8)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is likely to be competitive with strong, similar research proposals internationally 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is generally clear in its scientific plan and is logical raises only very few minor concerns with respect to the study design is feasible in all, or almost all areas - required techniques and tools either established or nearly established may not be highly competitive with similar research proposals internationally 	Very good (7–6)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is generally solid in its scientific plan, but may not always be clear in its intent and may lack some focus raises several minor concerns regarding the study design raises doubts about the feasibility in some areas is not likely to be competitive with similar research proposals internationally 	Good (5–4)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is somewhat unclear in its scientific approach and goals contains some major design flaws raises major concerns about the feasibility and thus the likelihood of successful completion 	Marginal (3–2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is unclear in its scientific approach and goals contains several major study design flaws raises several major concerns about the feasibility and thus the likelihood of successful completion 	Unsatisfactory (1)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> contains a research plan which does not seem to be feasible is unlikely to be successfully completed 	Poor (0)

Investigators, including track record (20%)

This section should be considered in relation to opportunity with regard to factors such as:

- Career disruption - pregnancy, major illness/injury or carer responsibilities;
- Clinical, administrative and teaching load;
- Available resources including situations where research is being conducted in remote or isolated communities;
- Building relationships of trust with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities over long periods and subsequent impact on track record and productivity;
- Relocation of an applicant and his/her research laboratory or clinical practice setting or other similar circumstances that impact upon research productivity;
- Typical performance (including publications) for the field in question.

Description	Weight
Relative to opportunity, the applicant team:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has expertise that specifically targets the proposed research both in terms of its depth and/or breadth has over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement that is outstanding by international standards commensurate with their field of research research achievement may include contributions to translational outcomes such as patents, commercial outputs, and public policy or implementation of change in practice research quality as exemplified in the top 5 publications of each CI research productivity as exemplified by total outputs for the team has senior members with outstanding national and international reputations in the field of research relevant to the application 	Outstanding (10)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> may involve junior members who are very strong contributors to the overall team quality & capability or will have the capacity to do so due to the availability of very strong mentoring by other members of the team 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has expertise that is highly relevant to the proposed research both in terms of its depth and/or breadth has over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement that is excellent by international standards commensurate with their field of research research achievement may include contributions to translational outcomes such as patents, commercial outputs, and public policy or implementation of change in practice research quality as exemplified in the top 5 publications of each CI research productivity as exemplified by total outputs for the team has senior members with excellent national and/or international reputations in the field of research relevant to the application may involve junior members who are strong contributors to the overall team quality & capability or will have the capacity to do so due to the availability of strong mentoring. 	Excellent (9–8)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> raises only minor concerns regarding the depth and/or breadth of expertise relevant to the proposed research has over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement that is well above by international standards commensurate with their field of research research achievement may include contributions to translational outcomes such as patents, commercial outputs, and public policy or implementation of change in practice research quality as exemplified in the top 5 publications of each CI research productivity as exemplified by total outputs for the team members have very good and growing national and/or international reputations in the field of research relevant to the application may involve junior members who are valuable contributors to the team quality & capability or will have the capacity to do so due to the availability of some mentoring 	Very good (7–6)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> raises some significant concerns regarding the depth and/or breadth of expertise relevant to the proposed research has over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement that is average by international standards commensurate with their field of research research achievement may include contributions to translational outcomes such as patents, commercial outputs, and public policy or implementation of change in practice research quality as exemplified in the top 5 publications of each CI research productivity as exemplified by total outputs for the team members have good and growing national and/or international reputations in the field of research relevant to the application may involve some junior members who would have the potential to add to the team with mentoring, but there is little or no evidence of a mentoring framework to support them 	Good (5–4)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> members have made contributions to the field of research but there are significant concerns regarding the depth and breadth of relevant expertise has over the last 5 years, a combined record of research achievement quality (as exemplified by the top 5 publications of each CI) and productivity (totality of outputs) and/or translation into practice, that places them at an average level for their peers/cohort members have established national reputations but do not yet have strong international profiles 	Marginal (3–2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is deficient in some areas of expertise that will be required to successfully complete the proposed research 	Unsatisfactory (1)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has published only a few works in relevant and other fields of research members are not well known nationally or internationally in the relevant research fields 	Poor (0)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> is heavily underpowered in terms of relevant expertise required to successfully complete the research program is not productive to any significant extent in relevant fields members are not well known nationally or internationally in the relevant research fields 	

Impact and Translation (30%)

Peer reviewers should consider the five Asthma Australia research priority areas in their assessment. If applicants are asked to address a specific priority area to be eligible for the grant, reviewers will be advised. Otherwise, applicants can address one or more area.

- Research that focuses on primary and secondary **prevention**
- Research, interventions and other methods of enquiry which seek to address the inequity of asthma impact on **vulnerable groups** in Australia.
- Research or design and testing of **models and systems** which seek to address the systemic contributions to asthma health or illness.
- Research which explores and minimises the impact of the changing **environment** on asthma health.
- Influencing policy** through the consolidation of our experience, insights and consultations with the wider research community.

Description	Weight
The planned research: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> will result in a highly significant advance in knowledge in this field which addresses an issue of great importance to people with asthma will result in fundamental outcomes in the science underpinning human health issues will provide outcomes that represent outstanding value for money will translate rapidly into fundamental or commercialisable outcomes that will transform the practice of clinical medicine, public health or in health policy will almost certainly be the subject of invited plenary presentations at national and international meetings will almost certainly result in highly influential publications has a strong focus on one or more of the Asthma Australia priority areas 	Outstanding (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> will result in a significant advance in knowledge in this field which addresses an issue of importance to people with asthma is likely to result in fundamental outcomes in the science underpinning human health issues will provide outcomes that represent excellent value for money is likely to translate into fundamental or commercialisable outcomes that will transform the practice of clinical medicine, public health or in health policy will likely be the subject of invited plenary presentations at national and international meetings will likely result in influential publications has a clear focus on the Asthma Australia priority areas 	Excellent (9–8)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> will advance knowledge in this field which addresses an issue of importance to people with asthma may result in fundamental outcomes in the science underpinning human health issues 	Very good (7–6)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • will provide outcomes that represent good value for money with very few concerns regarding feasibility may translate into fundamental or commercialisable outcomes that will transform the practice of clinical medicine, public health or in health policy • could be the subject of invited plenary presentations at international and national meetings • is likely to result in some very strong publications • has some focus on an Asthma Australia priority areas 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • may incrementally advance knowledge in the field which addresses an issue of some importance to people with asthma • is unlikely to result in fundamental outcomes in the science underpinning human health issues • will provide outcomes that represent some value for money with several minor concerns regarding feasibility is unlikely to translate into fundamental or commercialisable outcomes that will transform the practice of clinical medicine, public health or in health policy • is unlikely to be the subject of invited plenary presentations at international meetings • may result in some good but not excellent publications • has some focus on an Asthma Australia priority area 	Good (5–4)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • addresses an issue of some importance to people with asthma • may result in some publications • will provide outcomes that don't provide good value for money • has some implications for an Asthma Australia priority area 	Marginal (3–2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • addresses an issue of some concern to people with asthma • provides a program of research which will not significantly advance current knowledge in the field • will provide outcomes that don't provide good value for money • has minor implications for an Asthma Australia priority area 	Unsatisfactory (1)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • does not address an issue of more than marginal concern to people with asthma • will not advance current knowledge in the field • will provide outcomes that don't provide good value for money • has no implications for an Asthma Australia priority area 	Poor (0)

Asthma Australia is committed to advancing Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Research. Applications which specifically relate to the health of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander People, must address the [NHMRC Indigenous Research Excellence Criteria](#), which is as follows;

- Community engagement - the proposal demonstrates how the research and potential outcomes are a priority for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities with relevant community engagement by individuals, communities and/or organisations in conceptualisation, development and approval, data collection and management, analysis, report writing and dissemination of results.
- Benefit - the potential health benefit of the project is demonstrated by addressing an important public health issue for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. This benefit can have a single focus or affect several areas, such as knowledge, finance and policy or quality of life. The benefit may be direct and immediate, or it can be indirect, gradual and considered.
- Sustainability and transferability - the proposal demonstrates how the results of the project have the potential to lead to achievable and effective contributions to health gain for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, beyond the life of the project. This may be

through sustainability in the project setting and/or transferability to other settings such as evidence-based practice and/or policy. In considering this issue the proposal should address the relationship between costs and benefits.

- Building capability - the proposal demonstrates how Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, communities and researchers will develop relevant capabilities through partnerships and participation in the project.

Consumer Centred (10%)

Asthma Australia is committed to being a consumer centred organisation, that meets the diverse needs of people with asthma and carers. This section prioritises research which is informed by consumers, driven by consumers, involving consumers. Peer reviews should consider the table below in their review for types of consumer roles in research.

Consumer roles in Asthma Australia's National Research Program

Partner	Valued for significant knowledge
Expert	Being recognised for expertise
Advisor	Giving experiential advice to influence decisions
Advocate	Representing the broad views and experiences of people affected by asthma
Personal engagement	Providing a personal perspective through story-telling, surveys, focus groups and discussions

Adapted from: National Framework for Consumer Involvement in Cancer Control

Description	Weight
The planned research:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has very high and meaningful consumer engagement throughout all aspects of the project • engages a very large number of consumers in several roles (see table above) in the project • will result in very high awareness and understanding of asthma in the community 	Outstanding (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has high and meaningful consumer engagement and engages consumers meaningfully throughout most aspects of the project • engages a large number of consumers in different roles (see table above) in the project • will result in high awareness and understanding of asthma in the community 	Excellent (9–8)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has strong and relevant consumer engagement throughout many aspects of the project • engages some consumers in at least 2 different roles (see table above) in the project • will result in clear awareness and understanding of asthma in the community 	Very good (7–6)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has good consumer engagement throughout some aspects of the project • engages consumers who may have different roles (see table above) in the project • will result in raised awareness and understanding of asthma in the community 	Good (5–4)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has consumer engagement throughout an aspect of the project • engages consumers in a role (see table above) in the project • will result in slightly raised awareness or understanding of asthma in the community 	Marginal (3–2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has consumer engagement throughout an aspect of the project that is not meaningful or relevant • engages consumers without a clear role (see table above) in the project • will result in the same awareness or understanding of asthma that currently exists in the community 	Unsatisfactory (1)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has no consumer engagement • will result in misinformation or a decline in the awareness or understanding of asthma in the community 	Poor (0)
---	---------------------

Collaboration (10%)

This section acknowledges that for meaningful impact research should consider the broader context, at a national and internal level. It should consider if there is collaboration between primary healthcare and other healthcare providers; what collaborative processes are in place to support the translation of research evidence into practice; is and does the project display cross-disciplinary research and/or multiple site approaches.

Description	Weight
The planned research:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has a clear, collaborative process to support the translation of evidence into practice • involves multiple disciplines and a multi-site approach • demonstrates clear leadership and supports asthma research at a national and international level 	Outstanding (10)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has a strong, collaborative process to support the translation of evidence into practice • involves some cross-disciplinary research and a multi-site approach • demonstrates leadership and supports asthma research at a national and international level 	Excellent (9–8)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has a collaborative process to support the translation of evidence into practice • involves at least 2 disciplines and/or a multi-site approach • demonstrates leadership and supports asthma research at a national and/or international level 	Very good (7–6)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has a mechanism to engage primary healthcare providers and other healthcare providers to encourage the translation of evidence into practice • has implications for multiple disciplines and/or at least 2 research sites • builds on current standards and leadership and has potential implications at a national and/or international level 	Good (5–4)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has no mechanism for translation but will result in evidence that could be translated into practice • has minor implications for multiple disciplines and/or has minor involvement from a second research site • follows well-established standards and current leadership 	Marginal (3–2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has no mechanism for translation and results cannot be easily translated into practice • is not cross-disciplinary or multi-site • does not follow current standards or show leadership or innovation 	Unsatisfactory (1)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has no implications for practice • is not cross-disciplinary or multi-site • reflects outdated standards and has poor leadership 	Poor (0)

Consumer Review Guide

Consumer reviewers independently score each of the review criteria on a scale of 1-10. The scoring guide below and the detailed description of each criterion is provided to consumer reviewers and is provided here for applicants' information.

Descriptions	Mark
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal is of the highest quality, provides all the information required, is easily understood, and there is no possibility for improvement. 	10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An impressive proposal that provides all required information clearly and in detail. 	9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal provides most of the information required in a clear and detailed way. Little else could be included. 	8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is sound but could be improved with addition of detail. The response contains minor gaps, or slight confusion in some parts. 	6-7
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A barely acceptable proposal which addresses the criterion but provides minimal detail, causes confusion and/or includes some irrelevant information. 	4-5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal suffers serious inadequacies such as little or no detail, irrelevant information and/or causes confusion. 	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal does not address the question except in the most fleeting way or is inappropriate to the question. The information provided is very brief or generally irrelevant. 	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no proposal, or a response that does not address the question. Nowhere else in the Consumer Review Form is there any information relevant to the question. 	1

In assigning your score, please refer to the general guide to scoring depicted on the scale and considering the following key points:

Impact (25%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the researcher explained the extent of the problem and its importance? Has the researcher explained how the research will lead to tangible benefit/s to people with asthma? Are there a number of benefits? Has the researcher indicated the probability, magnitude and/or duration of these potential benefits? Has the researcher indicated when in the future the potential benefits might be achieved? Does the research address at least one Asthma Australia research priority area?
Equity (25%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the researcher explained how the findings could be generalised or applied to other population groups who are not part of the research? Does the research have the potential to provide benefit across all relevant persons groups and/or places? Does the research address an under-studied or under-served population? Does the research address a population with a high burden of illness or poorer outcomes?

Translation (25%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Has the researcher explained how the research findings may be translated or further developed to enable translated into meaningful outcome for people with asthma?• Do you understand when in the future the benefits might be achieved?• Has the researcher provided a description of the broad steps or stages required to reach the stated benefits of the research?
Consumer involvement (25%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Has consumer consultation into the development of this specific project already been undertaken?• Are there formal processes/structures in place that link the researchers with consumers?• Is the nature of consumer involvement clearly described, including the matters on which consumers will be consulted and the mechanisms by which this consultation will occur, and is the involvement two-way?• Has an individual consumer, or a consumer organisation, agreed to act as the consumer representative on this project?• Given the nature of the research, does the extent and type/s of consumer involvement seem appropriate? Eg we would not expect a laboratory research project to include extensive consumer involvement• Is there a plan for ongoing consumer involvement in the research?• Has the researcher considered the role of consumers in the translation of their findings?

The Consumer Review Guide has been adapted from [Cancer Council NSW](#).