

Individual Reviewer Process

For COVID-19 and other Emerging Pathogens Research Fund competition, each proposal was evaluated by a primary and secondary reviewer, and possibly* by the group during the discussion meeting. Based on the application requirements, each application was assessed using the following parameters:

Significance and Impact of the Research: (maximum of 12.5 points)

- The project idea is creative, is in the area of Coronavirus (or other emerging pathogens) research, and the anticipated project contributions are likely to advance the field.
- The rationale of the project idea is sound and the overall goals and objectives of the project are well-defined.

Approaches and Methods: (maximum of 25 points)

- The approaches and outlined methodology is appropriate to deliver the proposed output(s) and achieve the proposed contribution(s).
- The timeline and related deliverables of the project are realistic.
- The proposal identifies potential challenges and appropriate mitigation strategies.

Expertise, Experience and Resources: (maximum of 12.5 points)

- The applicant(s) bring the appropriate expertise and experience to lead and deliver the proposed output(s) and achieve the proposed contribution(s).
- The applicant(s) demonstrate(s) an appropriate level of engagement and commitment.
- The environment is appropriate to enable the conduct and success of the project.

The points were translated to the following rating scale:

| <i>Descriptor</i> | <i>Range</i> | <i>Definition</i> |
|-------------------|--------------|--|
| Outstanding | 45 – 50 | The application excels in most or all relevant aspects. Any short-comings are minimal. |
| Excellent | 40 – 44 | The application excels in many relevant aspects, and reasonably addresses all others. Certain improvements are possible. |
| Good | 35 – 39 | The application excels in some relevant aspects, and reasonably addresses all others. Some improvements are necessary. |
| Fair | 30 – 34 | The application broadly addresses relevant aspects. Major revisions are required. |
| Poor | 0.0 – 29 | The application fails to provide convincing information and/or has serious inherent flaws or gaps. |

Final Adjudication Process

- *Applicants with a combined score of less than 40 points were not reviewed by the peer-review committee.
- Applicants with a combined score of 40 points or higher were discussed by the peer-review committee and further evaluated.
- The 6 grant proposals with the highest scores were funded.