

Procedure for Appointment of Assessors

Clinician Research Fellowship Applications and Raine Priming Grant Applications (2024 Application Round)

The Raine Medical Research Foundation's procedure for the appointment of assessors is now well-established and one that has proven to be transparent and equitable. It is a rigorous process where each application is reviewed independently by at least two top national or international researchers who are experts in the field of the application.

Overview

An overview of the procedure adopted for appointment of assessors is outlined below with separate details provided for Clinician Research Fellowships (pg.3) and Raine Priming Grants (pg.4).

- 1) A Medline search as well as a search using bespoke proprietary Raine software is carried out:
 - (a) to review the published literature in the field;
 - (b) to identify researchers who are working directly in the relevant discipline and have a substantial record of scientific papers;
 - (c) to ensure assessors (nominated or otherwise) are independent - both of each other and of the applicant (ie, they have not participated in collaborative research nor co-authored publications, and there is no evidence of a link to co-investigator(s) or associated researchers within the last six years;
 - (d) to ensure that a researcher identified as "do not approach" by the applicant is not invited to review.
- 2) Other scientific databases are consulted; most notably *The Web of Science*, *Scopus*, *Google Scholar* and *PubMed*, to further identify discipline-specific experts and to build up a more comprehensive picture of the individual research profiles of potential assessors.
- 3) The list of references relevant to the research field, as provided by in the application form, is also taken into consideration when selecting potential assessors.
- 4) Nominated assessors may be used if they have no conflict of interest and have expert knowledge in the field of the application.
- 5) In the event that expert knowledge is required to further identify high-ranking international scientists:
 - (a) Advisory Committee members are available for consultation; and/or
 - (b) enquiries are directed to leading international scientists known to have a long publishing record in the relevant discipline.

- 6) Prior to establishing contact with prospective assessors, Scopus as well as their Institution's webpages are checked to confirm:
 - (a) the current status of the proposed assessor; and
 - (b) the details of their research program and publication list.

An approach is not made to a specialist researcher where it is evident that they work for a pharmaceutical company.

- 7) Each project is assigned three assessors, with 2 completed reviews being the minimum accepted number; however, some situations necessitate ensuring a third completed review is received. These include:
 - (a) a comparatively narrow field of research where more than two potential assessors are approached and accept.
 - (b) a recommendation to seek the opinion of another researcher with specific expertise;
 - (c) widely divergent assessor opinions (where time permits).

Assessors are informed of the Raine Foundation's non-disclosure policy, which was introduced to protect confidential information, particularly relating to intellectual property and potential commercial material. Assessors who agree to review an application accept on this basis.

Appointment of Assessors in the 2024 Application Round

Assessors who accepted to assess an application for a Clinician Research Fellowship or a Raine Priming Grant were each sent full details of the selection procedure in a position paper entitled: *Guide for Assessors*, which included a copy of the respective Guidelines and Conditions. Assessors of both programs received a scoring guide and were asked to provide comments and scores against each assessment criteria.

Assessors were asked to notify the Raine Management Office if, on reflection, they found that the project was not within their area of expertise, or if they subsequently recognised that they were involved directly or indirectly with the applicant or co-investigator(s)/mentor through any scientific collaboration or personal connection. Assessors were assured that Assessor Reports were afforded a high level of confidentiality. It was further explained that the assessor reports were released anonymously to applicants who were invited to submit a response. The reports were also released anonymously to the local Advisory Committee. In order to ensure anonymity of assessors, all document metadata relating to the author was removed.


Clinician Research Fellowship Applications (2024)

A total of 18 applications were received for Clinician Research Fellowships to commence in 2025 and all met eligibility requirements. After a lengthy and comprehensive review of each individual application, the Advisory Committee reached the decision that 12 applications were unsuitable for external review on the basis that they were not sufficiently competitive in the current cohort. A total of 6 applications were shortlisted for external review. All applicants were advised of the outcome of the preliminary screening process.


In total, 222 international scientists were identified using the procedure described above. Of these, 21 accepted and were allocated an application to review. 90.5% were international assessors, predominantly from the USA. All assessors were distinguished researchers in their field of health and medical research.

Of the six applications, all were assigned at three independent assessors. All these reviews were received. There were no Western Australia based assessors appointed. Particular care was taken to honour the request of applicants who nominated a researcher/group that they indicated not to approach.

Country of Origin



Status of Assessors




Raine Priming Grants (2024 Application Round)

A total of 64 Expression of Interest (EOI) applications were received for Raine Priming Grants to commence in 2025 and 5 did not meet eligibility requirements. The Advisory Committee identified 49 applications where it was considered the application was ‘premature’ and/or uncompetitive in the current cohort. These applicants were advised accordingly. A total of 10 applications were shortlisted for external review and were invited to submit a full application.

In total, 298 national and international scientists were identified using the procedure described above. Of these, 40 accepted and were allocated an application to review. 23% were national assessors and 77% were international assessors, predominantly from the USA. All assessors were distinguished researchers in their fields of health and medical research.

Of the 10 applications, all were assigned at least three independent assessors. At least three reviews were received for all applicants. There were no Western Australia based assessors appointed. Particular care was taken to honour the request of applicants who nominated a researcher/group that they indicated not to approach.

Country of Origin



Status of Assessors

