PATIENT PARTNER REVIEWER RUBRIC FOR OVARIAN CANCER CANADA-LED OPEN FUNDING COMPETITIONS

ADJUDICATION AREA	CONSIDERATIONS	OUTSTANDING	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	FAIR TO POOR
1. Relevance (UP TO 30 POINTS)	The extent to which the proposed study is closely connected to ovarian cancer.	Overall purpose and research questions of the proposed study are **highly relevant/closely connected** to ovarian cancer. **SCORE RANGE 27-30**	Purpose and research questions of the proposed study **seem to be relevant/connected** to ovarian cancer. **SCORE RANGE 24-26**	Purpose and research questions of the proposed study **could be more relevant/ connected** to ovarian cancer. **SCORE RANGE 21-23**	Purpose and/or **some** of the research questions of the proposed study **do not seem relevant/connected** to ovarian cancer. **SCORE RANGE 18-20**	Purpose and research questions of the proposed study are **not relevant/ connected** to ovarian cancer. **SCORE 0-17**
ADJUDICATION AREA	CONSIDERATIONS	OUTSTANDING	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	FAIR TO POOR
2. Importance (UP TO 30 POINTS)	Does the research address an issue important to patients? Are the outcomes being measured important to patients?	Proposed study addresses an issue of **great importance/ significance/value.** **SCORE RANGE 27-30**	Proposed study **seems** to address issues important to patients and outcomes being measured are generally significant and valuable. **SCORE RANGE 24-26**	Issues addressed in proposed study **could be of more** importance, significance or value. **SCORE RANGE 21-23**	Issues addressed are of **limited** importance, significance or value. **SCORE RANGE 18-20**	Issues addressed are **not** important, significant or valuable to patients. **SCORE 0-17**
ADJUDICATION AREA	CONSIDERATIONS	OUTSTANDING	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	FAIR TO POOR
3. Impact (UP TO 30 POINTS)	Does the research have the potential to change patient-centered research or clinical care? Are the potential benefits/ impacts of the study clearly outlined and aligned with the research findings? Do you feel that the proposed patient benefits are over-stated?	Potential outcomes and impacts are **clearly stated.** The relationship of the research to patient benefit/s in the short and long term is **well described and well aligned** with the stated purpose and research questions. **SCORE RANGE 27-30**	Potential outcomes and impacts are **stated** and **connected** to patient benefit. The stated benefit(s) **align** with the purpose and research questions. **SCORE RANGE 24-26**	Potential outcomes and impacts are stated but **could be clearer.** How the research could relate to patient benefit could be better described. **SCORE RANGE 21-23**	Potential outcomes and impacts are **poorly stated** and the relationship of the research to patient benefit is not well described. **SCORE RANGE 18-20**	Potential outcomes and impacts are **absent or unclear.** No relationship to patient benefit is made apparent. **SCORE RANGE 0-17**
ADJUDICATION AREA	CONSIDERATIONS	OUTSTANDING	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	FAIR TO POOR
4. Lay Summary (UP TO 10 POINTS)	Was the lay summary written in a clear and logical way? Were technical terms used without definitions? Did you understand the lay summary in its entirety?	Lay summary **clearly describes** the rationale, objective, questions, and potential impact in plain language. **SCORE RANGE 9-10**	Lay summary was **reasonably well-written** with an accessible description of the proposed study. **SCORE RANGE 8-8.9**	Lay summary of the proposed study could have been written in a more accessible way. **SCORE RANGE 7-7.9**	It was **challenging** to understand some parts of the lay summary. **SCORE RANGE 6-6.9**	Lay summary was not written in an accessbile way and was **very difficult to understand**. **SCORE RANGE 0-5.9**