

### CIHR – Rating Scale

Descriptor*	Range**	Outcome
Outstanding	4.5 – 4.9	May be funded – Will be discussed by the Committee
Excellent	4.0 – 4.4	
Very Good	3.5 – 3.9	
Acceptable, but low priority	3.0 – 3.4	Not Fundable – May or may not be discussed by the Committee
Needs Revision	2.5 – 2.9	
Needs Major Revision	2.0 – 2.4	
Seriously flawed	1.0 – 1.9	
Rejected	0.0 – 0.9	

\*Only applications **rated 3.5** or higher are eligible for CIHR funding.

\***3.0-3.4** will be used for applications which, while technically and conceptually acceptable, are not considered to be a high priority for CIHR funding, perhaps because the topic is not considered relevant to an important health issue, or because the work proposed seems unlikely to yield major advances in knowledge, or because the approach is not particularly innovative.

NOTE: Applications rated 3.0-3.4 are not eligible for CIHR funds, including those from partnership programs, and might not be discussed by the committee; however, applicants are encouraged to re-apply after addressing the reviews.

\*Applications **below 3.0** are so flawed in some respect that they do not represent a good investment of public funds, and would require significant rewriting to be considered acceptable. Such applications will normally be streamlined, and not discussed by the committee. (*Streamlining* is a process used to determine which applications are discussed at the peer review meeting. Reviewers submit an initial rating and complete an assessment of overall quality one week before the committee meeting which is used to determine whether or not applications are discussed at that meeting.)

\*\*In the committee meetings, reviewers assign scores to one decimal place, but the final average rating is calculated to two decimal places.