



**UK Research  
and Innovation**

## **Future Leaders Fellowships: Reviewers' Guidance**

Version 6 – September 2020

## Contents

1. The Future Leaders Fellowships Scheme .....	3
1.1.Overview .....	3
1.2.How the scheme differs from existing fellowship schemes .....	3
2. Principles of Peer Review .....	4
2.1.Integrity .....	4
2.2.Confidentiality .....	4
2.3.Anonymity .....	4
2.4.Information Rights Legislation .....	4
3. Considerations when completing a Review .....	5
3.1.Bias .....	5
3.2.Journal Impact Factors .....	5
3.3.Career Break and Flexible Working .....	5
3.4.Assessment Criteria .....	6
3.5.Job Share Applications .....	6
3.6.Covid-19.....	6
4. Completing the Review Form .....	7
4.1.Declaration of Interest .....	7
4.2.Applicant, Training and Development .....	7
4.3.Programme .....	8
4.4.Host Organisation.....	9
4.5.Resources Requested .....	9
4.6.Ethics and Data Management.....	10
4.7.Relevance to the Aims of this Scheme.....	10
4.8.Reviewer Expertise .....	10
4.9.Overall Assessment.....	11
5. Timescales.....	11
6. Queries .....	11
Annex A Conflicts of Interest .....	12
Annex B Animal use .....	13

# 1. The Future Leaders Fellowships Scheme

## 1.1. Overview

The UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) [Future Leaders Fellowships scheme](#) will support early career researchers and innovators with outstanding potential in universities, UK registered businesses, and other research and user environments including recognised Independent Research Organisations (IROs), and Research Councils' institutes and laboratories. The objectives of the scheme are:

- To develop, retain, attract and sustain research and innovation talent in the UK
- To foster new research and innovation career paths including those at the academic/business and interdisciplinary boundaries, and facilitate movement of people between sectors
- To provide sustained funding and resources for the best early career researchers and innovators
- To provide long-term, flexible funding to tackle difficult and novel challenges, and support adventurous, ambitious programmes.

Fellowships are not restricted to work that would be seen as formal research in their area but can also lead and develop innovation. Innovation is defined as the practical translation of disruptive ideas into novel, relevant and valued products, services, processes, systems or business models, making them readily available to markets, government and society.

Innovation means creating economic and/or social value from ideas. Within the Future Leaders Fellowships scheme, innovation projects will be those that aim to move research through the development pathway towards commercialisation and/or application.

## 1.2. How the scheme differs from existing fellowship schemes

The Future Leaders Fellowships scheme will provide long-term support, for four to seven years, to enable fellows to tackle ambitious programmes or multidisciplinary questions, and new or emerging research and innovation areas and partnerships. It is the first UKRI-wide investment and will provide assessment and support across UKRI's remit, with no barriers to multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary research/innovation.

In order to support excellent research and innovation wherever it arises and to facilitate movement of people and projects between sectors, Future Leaders Fellows can be based in universities, businesses or other eligible independent research organisations. To ensure the successful development of the fellow, Future Leaders Fellowships come with a requirement for the Host Organisation to commit significant support. For fellows in academia, this includes the commitment to providing a pathway to an open-ended UK based independent research/innovation position, to be taken up during or upon the completion of the fellowship (in line with organisational employment policies and practices).

## **2. Principles of Peer Review**

Peer review is governed by several underlying principles, including those of integrity, confidentiality and anonymity.

### **2.1. Integrity**

The integrity of peer review is of paramount importance. This means that any personal interests as a reviewer must never influence or be seen to influence the outcome of the review.

Please see [Annex A](#) for further details on conflicts of interest.

Please contact the office prior to completing a review if you are unsure whether there is a conflict of interest.

### **2.2. Confidentiality**

Our assessment process is confidential in order to protect the innovative research ideas proposed by the applicants. When you agree to review for UKRI you are bound by a confidentiality agreement, either through the Je-S terms and conditions and reviewer protocol, or a standalone agreement.

This means that everything we send you is confidential and must be treated as such at all times. You must not discuss or share the proposal with anyone. If you do not consider that you have the expertise to provide a useful review, without discussing it with a colleague for example, you should decline the invitation. When reviewing proposals, it is important that reviewers avoid storing confidential UKRI data on their local IT system, computer or mobile device.

### **2.3. Anonymity**

Peer Review is anonymous to support the free and frank exchange of views. You should ensure that you do not inadvertently identify yourself in the text of your review, for example by describing aspects of your own research or by identifying where you have worked. All comments made should be suitable to be fed back to the applicant without alteration. Any information entered into the 'Declaration of Interests' and 'Reviewer Expertise' sections will be removed before the review is shared with the applicant but will be available to the Panel.

### **2.4. Information Rights Legislation**

All information we hold, including information around peer review, is subject to the Data Protection Act and the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). All requests are considered on a case by case basis and in some cases, it might be necessary to seek your view on releasing information relating to the review you have provided.

Further information on how the peer review process is used by UKRI to make funding decisions and how information relating to peer review and the funding of proposals is managed by UKRI is available in the [UKRI Peer Review Framework](#).

### 3. Considerations when completing a Review

Your review must be evidence-based and the evidence used should be stated clearly in your comments. In order to ensure that your review is as useful as possible to both the applicant and panel please:

- Familiarise yourself with the [assessment factors](#) and [scoring matrix](#) before you begin.
- Provide clear comments and recommendations that justify, and are consistent with, your scores.
- Ensure that your comments are comprehensive and concise, clearly identify the strengths and weaknesses of the application in a constructive manner and raise any concerns in the form of questions for the applicant.
- Avoid the use of jargon, bearing in mind that the panellists who rely on your review for their decisions may not be specialists in your field.

We also ask reviewers to consider other aspects of the research and/or innovation, including the potential impact and the pathways to achieving this impact, ethical issues, appropriate use of animals and/or human tissue, methodology and experimental design and [data management plans](#).

Guidance on animal usage can be found in [Annex B](#).

#### 3.1. Bias

You must avoid bias in your assessment including on the grounds of a protected characteristic such as age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage/civil partnership, pregnancy, maternity, race, religion/belief, sex or sexual orientation. Before writing a review, you should familiarise yourself with UKRI's [Equality, Diversity and Inclusion policy](#).

#### 3.2. Journal Impact Factors

We are committed to support the recommendations and principles set out by the [San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment \(DORA\)](#). You should not use journal-based metrics, such as journal impact factors, as a surrogate measure of the quality of individual research articles, to assess an investigator's contributions, or to make funding decisions.

For the purpose of research assessment, please consider the value and impact of all research outputs (including datasets, software, inventions, patents, preprints, other commercial activities, etc.) in addition to research publications. You should consider a broad range of impact measures including qualitative indicators of research impact, such as influence on policy and practice.

The content of a paper is more important than publication metrics, or the identity of the journal, in which it was published, especially for early-career applicants. Therefore, you should not use journal impact factor (or any hierarchy of journals), conference rankings and metrics such as the H-index or i10-index when assessing UKRI grants. Reviews that do not adhere to this may be returned for amendment and both the applicant and Panel will be asked to disregard these comments.

#### 3.3. Career Break and Flexible Working

These fellowships support applicants from diverse career paths, including those returning from a career break or following time in other roles. Proposals may also be from those wishing to work part-time in order to combine the fellowship with personal responsibilities. Your review should consider time spent outside an active research or innovation environment, whether through career breaks, flexible working or as a consequence of working in other roles. Further guidance can be

found in the [Career breaks and flexible working](#) document.

### 3.4. Assessment Criteria

Proposals will be assessed according to the scheme's four [Assessment Criteria](#):

- Research & Innovation Excellence
- Applicant & their Development
- Impact & Strategic Relevance
- Research and Innovation Environment & Costs

Before writing your review, you should familiarise yourself with these criteria and ensure that each one is addressed at some point. Across all four factors, a key issue will be whether the added value of the fellowship mechanism of support is well demonstrated, as opposed to more standard project grant support.

For business applications, consideration of the added value will include, for example, whether the novelty and levels of risk involved in the project mean that it is beyond the normal activity of the business.

### 3.5. Job Share Applications

Joint applications from those wishing to hold a Future Leaders Fellowship on a job-share basis are encouraged as one of the mechanisms through which UKRI supports applications from those wishing to combine the fellowship with personal responsibilities. More information can be found in the [Job share FAQs](#).

Please take the following into consideration when completing your review:

- Research & Innovation Excellence - This should include assessment of the applicants' joint track record in producing outstanding research or innovation. The proposed research or innovation activity should be a single coherent programme rather than separate activities.
- Applicant & their development - The applicants should both be recognised in their research/innovation community, as well as being ambassadors and advocates for their field. The applicants should both demonstrate how they intend to use the fellowship to develop as future leaders, noting that their roles may be split somewhat depending on how their team may be structured.
- Impact & Strategic Relevance - No further considerations.
- Research and Innovation Environment & Costs - The Head of Department's Supporting Statement from the host organisation should indicate that they are committed to supporting this joint arrangement and the careers of both applicants, as well as describing the commitment to open-ended positions for both applicants following completion of the fellowship. It should be clear how the fellowship and any associated staff will be jointly managed by the applicants.

### 3.6. Covid-19

We recognise that due to circumstances surrounding COVID-19, applicants may have been unable to secure Letters of Support (LoS) associated with their application. In these situations an "FLF Missing Letter of Support Form" for each letter they have been unable to provide should be present. Reviewers must not disadvantage applicants who use this template and must presume that a LoS will be provided ahead of award for applicants who are recommended for funding.

## 4. Completing the Review Form

This is a UKRI scheme, hosted by the MRC for system purposes. Please ignore the MRC logo.

A key aspect of the assessment will be whether the added value of the fellowship mechanism of support – e.g. the scale, flexibility and duration offered – is well demonstrated, as opposed to more standard project grant support. For business applications, consideration of the added value will include, for example, whether the novelty and levels of risk involved in the project mean that it is beyond the normal activity of the business. This should be considered throughout the review.

All sections of the review must be completed and all assessment factors in each section must be commented on. Do not enter 'N/A' for any section. Doing so may result in the review being returned to you for amendment or being considered unusable.

### 4.1. Declaration of Interest

Before you complete a review please ensure that you do not have a conflict of interest with the proposal. UKRI, as a publicly funded organisation, is accountable to the Government and the public for its actions and the way it conducts its business. UKRI has a [Conflicts of Interest policy](#) in place to protect both the organisation and the individuals involved in providing it with knowledge and advice and to reduce the risk of impropriety or any perception of impropriety. This section is not shared with the applicant.

Depending on the type of conflict, we may not be able to accept your review even if you declare it, so we request that you make yourself familiar with the policy available at [Annex A](#) and inform us as soon as possible if you have or suspect any conflicts of interest with the proposal you have been asked to review by email to [fellowsppeerreview@ukri.org](mailto:fellowsppeerreview@ukri.org).

### 4.2. Applicant, Training and Development

Please comment on the applicant considering their:

- **Track record and current research standing** – Whether they have a track record of producing challenging, original and productive research and/or innovation outputs that stand out in their field. and whether their current research and/or innovation standing relative to their career stage puts them on a trajectory to become world-class.
- **Expertise and skill set** – Whether they have the potential to progress to a long-term research and/or innovation career path and they understand the research and/or innovation landscape at both the national and international level.
- **Ability to carry out the proposed work** – Whether they have the necessary level of skills, knowledge and experience to take forward the proposed project/programme.
- **Training and development plans for themselves and, if applicable, for team members** – Whether they have identified opportunities to access career development support, mentorship and relevant training courses that will underpin their future career ambitions and learning, supporting not only the programme but also their broader professional development and that of their team.
- **Leadership potential** – Whether they have demonstrated independence and thought leadership beyond the level normally expected of their current position and their ability to be, or become, a clear communicator and disseminator of knowledge and innovation, able to inspire and lead others; and their ability to develop new relationships and influence across multiple disciplines and sectors.
- **Proposed placements or collaborations** – Whether they have demonstrated the ability to choose and develop appropriate collaborations and networks nationally, internationally or across disciplines.

When assessing applicants undertaking their fellowship within a business, please also consider that:

- Applicants may not have a PhD and should not be penalised if this is the case, however applicants should be able to demonstrate equivalent experience.
- Applicants may not have a comparable publication record to an applicant from academia and may use their CV and Outputs list to demonstrate their involvement in trade publications, patents, etc. Business applicants should not be penalised if they have a limited number of or no publications or choose to use their CV and Outputs list to demonstrate alternative achievements as listed above.

### 4.3. Programme

Please comment on the importance, competitiveness and impact of the proposed research and innovation, including:

- **Strength of the research/innovation case** – The importance, novelty, feasibility and timeliness of the proposed programme of work and whether long-term fellowship support is needed to enable this. Whether the proposal aligns with a specific priority area identified by UKR and how strongly the proposal fits within the aims for the area and what it will contribute alongside other proposals and activities in the same priority area.
- **Level of innovation, and whether this is likely to lead to significant new understanding** – Whether the potential short and/or long-term impacts, and how significant they are, are well articulated and whether the fellowship has the potential to establish or maintain a distinctive and outstanding research and/or innovation activity.
- **Appropriateness and rigour of the methods and study designs** – Whether the methodology is robust and whether there is appropriate consideration of research and/or innovation reproducibility, openness, governance and ethical/social responsibility issues.
- **Whether the plans and scope of the programme justify long-term support** – Whether plans to achieve the aims of the fellowship are well understood and feasible and whether there is sufficient justification for the fellowship to achieve these aims above and beyond other funding options.
- **Potential economic and societal impact of the proposed research/innovation and plans to deliver this** – The importance and potential impact of the research and/or innovation for society and/or the economy and whether the plans for maximising impact (from the applicant and host organisation) are proportionate, timely and credible.

When assessing applicants undertaking their fellowship within a business, please also consider:

- Applicants may not be in a position to disclose commercially sensitive information and their proposal should not receive a lower score if this is the case. The excellence of the research and/or innovation must still be clearly conveyed.
- Business hosted fellowships may directly benefit the business and/or generate IP for business use; both outputs are acceptable under the Future Leaders Fellowships scheme and a business applicant should not be penalised in this situation.

#### 4.4. Host Organisation

Please comment on the suitability of the host organisation(s) where the proposed Fellowship will be based, including:

- **Appropriateness for the work proposed** – Whether the proposed environment(s) for their research and/or innovation are suitable and will allow maximum impact.
- **Level of commitment from supervisors, mentors and host institution** – Whether the applicant has secured the backing of an institution that is prepared to host them/the business that employs them and whether the level of commitment to realising the potential of the fellow and establishing them as a research and/or innovation leader has been demonstrated by their supervisor(s), host institution(s) and, where applicable, mentor(s) (e.g. plans for supporting the fellow's programme of work; enabling the time commitment needed; ensuring access to space, equipment/facilities, other resources and other relevant programmes and ability to enable the applicant to maximise the social/economic impact of their work.). Whether consideration has been given to equality, diversity and inclusion aims of UKRI in support for the fellow and (where applicable) their wider team and in using the fellowship's provision for flexible working.
- **Opportunities for training and career development actively supported** – Whether the host organisation(s) have supported opportunities for development as impactful and influential research and/or innovation leaders (e.g. time for work in other environments, developing international links, development of new skills, mentoring and professional training and development, and relevant training courses that will underpin their future career ambitions and learning).

#### 4.5. Resources Requested

Please comment on:

- **Whether funds requested are appropriately justified to deliver the proposed project, highlighting any costs that you feel may be excessive, inappropriate or insufficiently justified** – Whether all funds have been addressed in the Justification of Resources and whether the justification for these funds is clearly described and appropriate.
- **Whether the proposal demonstrates value for money in terms of the resources requested** – Whether funds requested for the first four years for the project plan and management arrangements are proportionate to the scale and complexity of the activity to be undertaken.
- **Whether any animal use is fully justified in terms of need, species, number and conformance to guidelines** – Refer to [Annex B](#) for information.

When assessing applicants undertaking their fellowship within a business, please also consider:

- Business hosted applications are subject to different funding regulations to academic hosted applications. You should not comment or score an application based on the percentage contribution requested as this is pre-determined by legal requirements.
- Business hosted applications do not enter their costings in Je-S when submitting their application. Instead, business-based applicants will have completed a 'Finance Form for Business Applicants' to indicate their costings.

## 4.6. Ethics and Data Management

Please comment on any ethical and/or research governance issues, including:

- **Whether the proposed research/innovation is ethically acceptable in relation to risks to humans, animals or the environment** – Whether there are any ethical considerations that have not been adequately addressed including (where applicable): the need to use animals and lack of realistic alternatives; evaluation of the scientific strengths and weaknesses of proposed animal use, and plans to obtain ethical approval from the relevant bodies.
- **If applicable, whether the Data Management Plan indicates the applicants have a sound plan for managing the data funded through the award and in the long-term** – Whether the plans for data management in the first 4/7 years and beyond have been sufficiently considered and are feasible including: the methodologies for data collection/generation; storing and curating data; data repository, and suitability for sharing.

When assessing applicants undertaking their fellowship within a business, please also consider:

- Businesses hosted applicants may be under commercial constraints with regard to data sharing. An applicant should not be penalised for abiding by their organisational policies and practices on data management.

## 4.7. Relevance to the Aims of this Scheme

Please comment on how this proposal meets the scheme specific criteria outlined in the [Overview of the scheme](#) document, including:

- Whether the proposal develops, retains, attracts or sustains research and/or innovation talent in the UK.
- Whether the proposal fosters new research and/or innovation career paths including those at the academic/business and interdisciplinary boundaries.
- Whether the proposal facilitates the movement of people between disciplines, organisations or sectors.
- Whether the proposal would provide sustained funding and resources to a world-class, early career researcher and/or innovator.
- Whether the proposal would provide long-term, flexible funding to tackle a difficult and novel challenge and support an adventurous, ambitious programme.

## 4.8. Reviewer Expertise

Recognising the potential multidisciplinary nature of the applications, you should, without specifically identifying yourself, comment on your areas of expertise and experience and indicate whether you have provided comment on the whole of the application or specific portions, indicating which sections of the proposal you have provided comment on. This section is not shared with the applicant.

For business applications, if you do not feel able to confidently review the commercial aspects, please indicate that here and only comment on the portion of the proposal that is relevant to your expertise.

## 4.9. Overall Assessment

Having provided comment against each of the above headings, please also provide a score for the proposal as detailed in **Table 1** below:

Table 1: Overall Assessment Score descriptions

Score	Overall Assessment
1	This proposal is scientifically or technically flawed
2	This proposal does not meet one or more of the assessment factors
3	This proposal meets all assessment factors but with clear weaknesses
4	This is a good proposal that meets all assessment factors but with minor weaknesses
5	This is a strong proposal that broadly meets all assessment factors
6	This is a very strong proposal that fully meets all assessment factors

Because of the interdisciplinary nature of the scheme, there are no specific guidelines or examples for what a proposal needs to do to achieve each score and instead you should score a proposal based on which assessment description best matches your overall comments.

Additionally, this score will not directly affect whether a proposal is successful or unsuccessful; all proposals will be reviewed by the sift panel regardless of the reviews' scores.

## 5. Timescales

If you cannot comment within the suggested timescale, please confirm this immediately so we can discuss extending the deadline.

## 6. Queries

If you have any queries about the review process or concerns regarding your written review, please contact the FLF team via either:

Email: [fellowspeerreview@ukri.org](mailto:fellowspeerreview@ukri.org)

Phone: 01793 416409 (please note that, due to COVID-19, the FLF Team are not working from the office and this number is not currently active)

Further guidance on using Je-S can be found on the [Je-S handbook](#), or by contacting them directly via either:

Email: [je-shelp@je-s.ukri.org](mailto:je-shelp@je-s.ukri.org)

Phone: 01793 44 4164

## **Annex A      Conflicts of Interest**

UKRI defines a conflict of interest as a set of circumstances that creates a risk that an individual's ability to apply judgement or act in one role is, or could be, impaired or influenced by a secondary interest. Even a perception of competing interests, impaired judgement or undue influence may be damaging to UKRI's reputation.

As a reviewer for the Future Leaders Fellowships scheme, a conflict of interest occurs if you:

### **Relationship with applicant(s):**

- Have a close family relationship (e.g. spouse, partner, parent, sibling, child, in-law) or share a household with any individual named on the proposal.
- Have an existing close business or professional relationship with any individual named on the proposal.
- Have had a PhD/PhD Supervisor relationship with any individual named on the proposal within the last five years.
- Have collaborated on a research project and/or have co-published with any individual named on the proposal in the last three years.
- Are directly involved in the work that the applicant proposes to carry out and/or have assisted the applicant with their application for funding.

### **Organisational conflict:**

- Are a current, visiting or honorary member of staff or a Professor Emeritus/Emerita at the same research organisation as any individual named on the proposal.
- Are at a past research organisation or have recently moved from the current organisation of any individual named on the proposal.
- Are at the same research organisation as another reviewer on the proposal.
- Are at a research organisation that is named as a project partner on the proposal or is the same organisation as that of a visiting researcher on the proposal.
- Have a vested interest, or stand to gain a financial or professional advantage from a particular outcome for an application which they are asked to review.

### **Current involvement with UK Research and Innovation:**

- Have submitted a proposal to the same round of the scheme as the application which they have been asked to review.
- Have been approached and agreed to be a member of a committee connected with a research project, for example an advisory group or steering committee.
- Are a member of the panel for which the application is being moderated.

Please note that this list is not exhaustive, if you are in doubt whether or not you should assess a proposal due to a conflict of interest please contact the Future Leaders Fellowships Team before completing the review at [fellowsppeerreview@ukri.org](mailto:fellowsppeerreview@ukri.org).

## **Annex B     Animal use**

### **Use of animals**

The elaboration of a compelling research or innovation case is an essential prerequisite for justifying the use of animals. Over the past few years there have been a number of important initiatives that have been aimed at raising the sometimes-inadequate standard of reporting of animal experiments in scientific literature. The NC3Rs' ARRIVE guidelines, for example, lay out criteria that should be met in reporting animal studies in order that their results and conclusions can be appropriately evaluated by readers. These criteria address a range of issues relating to transparency and validity of experimental design, the avoidance or minimisation of bias and the adequacy of statistical aspects of the study including statistical power and appropriate statistical analysis.

In light of these initiatives UKRI has revised and updated its guidelines on what information needs to be provided to allow appropriate and thorough evaluation of the scientific strengths and weaknesses of proposals for funding involving animal use. In some cases, adherence to the principles defined in this section will require additional resources e.g. for animal identification such as 'microchipping', increased maintenance charges resulting from the randomisation procedure, or salary costs associated with obtaining statistical support. We recognise this and will support such costs where fully justified in the appropriate sections.

The NC3Rs has developed [guidance](#) for applicants when choosing contractors for animal research and the expectations of UK public funders, including a [presentation](#) detailing the information that applicants should provide.

All applications involving the use of non-human primates, cats, dogs, pigs and equines will be referred to the NC3Rs via their peer review service. In some circumstances, applications involving the use of other species may also be referred at the discretion of UKRI.

### **Home Office licences and ethical and welfare standards**

Experiments using animals must comply with the [Animals \(Scientific Procedures\) Act 1986 \(ASPA\)](#), amended 2012 and any further embodiments. Institutions and grant holders are responsible for ensuring that all appropriate establishment, personal and project licences required under the Act have been granted by the Home Office, including gaining approval via their institution's local ethical review process. All awards are made on the absolute condition that no work that is controlled by the Act will begin until the necessary licences have been obtained.

In addition, applicants must ensure that they are following best practice in relation to animal husbandry and welfare. Where proposed work is not covered under an existing ASPA project license, applicants should make certain that their proposals are received by their local Animal Welfare and Ethical Review Body (AWERB), prior to submission and ensure that any ethical or welfare implications raised are addressed.

## **Replacement, reduction and refinement of animal experiments**

Applicants are expected to have developed their applications in accordance with the cross funder guidance for the use of animals in research: [Responsibility in the Use of Animals in Bioscience Research](#) and [NC3Rs Guidelines: Primate Accommodation, Care and Use](#).

Experiments using animals funded by UKRI must comply with ASPA in:

- Using the simplest possible, or least sentient, species of animal appropriate.
- Ensuring that distress and pain are avoided wherever possible.
- Employing an appropriate design and using the minimum number of animals consistent with ensuring that objectives of the proposal will be met.

Advice on opportunities and techniques for implementing these principles can be found on the [NC3Rs website](#). This includes the [Experimental Design Assistant \(EDA\)](#), a free online tool from the NC3Rs to help optimise experimental design and ensure that the number of animals used is consistent with the objectives of the proposal.

## **Proposals involving animal use**

Applicants are strongly advised to read the following section carefully before preparing a proposal to ensure all the relevant information required is included in the appropriate sections of their application. Applicants should ensure their proposal clearly sets out and justifies the following:

- Research objectives and how the knowledge generated will advance the field.
- The need to use animals and lack of realistic alternatives.
- Choice of species of animals to be used.
- Type of animal(s), for example, strain, pathogen free, genetically modified or mutant.
- Planned experimental design and its justification.
- Numbers of animals and frequency of measurements/interventions to be used.
- Primary outcomes to be assessed.
- Planned statistical analyses.

Applicants proposing to use animals must complete the following sections of the Je-S form:

### **Animal Costs**

Detailing the costs associated with the purchase, breeding and maintenance of each species of animal.

### **Animal Research**

Detailing any procedures categorised as moderate or severe (in accordance with the maximum prospective severity rating in the Home Office licence under which the work will be carried out) in order that the assessment of the proposal can balance the importance of the potential scientific advancement to the welfare of the animals.

## **Animal Species**

Detailing scientific reasons for the use of animals and an explanation as to why there are no realistic alternatives must be given, with an explanation of how the choice of species complies with ASPA.

## **Use of animals overseas**

If the proposal involves the use of animals overseas, applicants must submit a signed statement (uploaded as a Letter of Support to the Je-S application) from both UK and overseas partners confirming that:

- They will adhere to all relevant national and local regulatory systems in the UK and overseas.
- They will follow the guidelines laid out in the NC3Rs' [Responsibility in the use of animals in bioscience research](#) document and ensure work is carried out to UK standards.
- Before initiation of the proposed work, appropriate approvals from Organisational and/or central animal ethics committees will be obtained for experimental protocols to be adopted in their projects. Successful applicants may be expected to provide copies of these permissions before funding is released.
- Details on where the animal research will take place (UK or overseas) and through which funder the resources are being sought.