Scoring Rubric for BSS Studentships

Category	Criteria	Score Range
1. Research	- Clearly defined research question(s) and aims focused on	0-10
Quality	sleep.	
·	- Methodological rigor (e.g., use of appropriate study	
	designs, controls, and measures for sleep-related	
	outcomes).	
2. Relevance to	- Alignment with topics in sleep research (e.g.,	0-10
Sleep Research	mechanisms of sleep regulation, sleep disorders, cognitive	
_	or health impacts of sleep, or interventions).	
	- Relevance to current gaps in the literature and clear	
	justification.	
	- Potential for practical or clinical implications in sleep	
	research (or education for example for educational project,	
	etc).	
3. Feasibility and	- Feasibility of proposed work within the timeline and	0-10
Timeline	budget.	
	- Realistic assessment of potential challenges and their	
	mitigation.	
	- Clear, specific milestones.	
4. Applicant	- Academic record of the applicant including research or	0-10
Qualifications	related areas.	
	- Appropriateness of the team (i.e supervisors).	
	- Potential for the grant to enhance the applicant's career	
	trajectory in sleep research.	
5. Dissemination	- Plans for sharing findings with the scientific community	0-10
and Impact	and the public (e.g., publications, presentations, public outreach).	
	- Potential to influence clinical practice, public health	
	policies, or broader understanding of sleep science.	
	-Considerations of Open Science Framework principles,	
	such as pre-registration, shared data.	
6. Ethical	- Attention to ethical considerations specific to sleep	0-10
Considerations	research (e.g., informed consent for vulnerable	
	populations like those with sleep disorders, handling of	
	sensitive data like polysomnography records).	
	- Plans to apply for ethics review are included in the	
	project timeline.	
	-Data management plan.	

Scoring Guidelines

- Excellent (9-10): Meets or exceeds all criteria in the category, with no significant weaknesses. Innovative, impactful, and well-justified.
- Good (7-8): Meets most criteria, with minor weaknesses. Strong contribution and well-designed but could improve in certain areas.

- Fair (4-6): Addresses criteria adequately, with some moderate weaknesses. Feasible but not highly innovative or impactful.
- **Poor (1-3):** Significant weaknesses in meeting criteria. Limited relevance, feasibility, or impact.
- Unacceptable (0): Does not address the criteria or is fundamentally flawed.

Final Score and Recommendations (Out of 60):

- **48-60:** High priority for funding. The proposal is excellent and has a significant potential to advance sleep research.
- **36-47:** Consider funding if resources allow. The proposal is solid but has some areas for improvement.
- **24-35:** Low priority for funding. The proposal has significant weaknesses or lacks sufficient relevance or impact in sleep research.
- **Below 24:** Not fundable. The proposal is fundamentally flawed or fails to meet the essential criteria.