1. APPLICATION REVIEW

For all biological study applications received for review, the Biological Studies Steering Group (BSSG) Scientific Review Coordinator will identify:

- 3 BSSG members (internal review)
- Independent expert reviewer(s), if the BSSG considers more expert advice is required on the application (unless application has already been approved by a recognised funding body/organisation)

All selected reviewers will be electronically sent a copy of the application, review form and the criteria for scoring applications. Reviewers must confirm receipt of the request and if they can undertake the review within the defined time period. Reviewers will be required to submit their responses electronically within 3 weeks of receiving the request. A reminder will be sent to the reviewers after 2 weeks.

The Scientific Review Coordinator will then collate all review responses and calculate the average score.

Outcome of applications are as follows:

- **Approved** *(Average score = 3 or above in all 3 categories: science/ clinical relevance/ feasibility)*
- **Approved subject to satisfactory responses to comments from BSSG** *(Comments should be fed-back to applicant and responses to be received within 8 weeks, failure to do so will result in the application being automatically withdrawn.)*
- **Not Approved** *(Average score = <3 in all 3 categories or if a major concern regarding the study had been raised by a reviewer(s))*

Studies in the ‘Not Approved’ category will be discussed at the following BSSG meeting and led by the Scientific Review Coordinator. A decision on the response to the applicants will be made at that meeting.

2. COMPETING APPLICATIONS

If applications competing for the same samples are received, they should be reviewed. Prioritisation of samples will be discussed at the following BSSG meeting and guided by the scores in all 3 categories and the average score.
3. RESPONSE TO APPLICANTS

The BSSG Scientific Review Coordinator will respond to applicants notifying them of the outcome of their application. The categories of responses are as follows:

- **Approved** *(Standard approval letter including any additional comments/ conditions)*
- **Approved subject to satisfactory responses to comments from BSSG** *(Comments should be fed-back to applicants via email and responses are to be received within 8 weeks.)*
- **Not Approved** *(Standard letter including comments)*
PROCEDURE FOR REVIEW OF A CCLG BIOLOGICAL STUDY APPLICATION

1. Researcher submits a completed CCLG biological study application to the Biological Studies Administrator

2. Application is sent to BSSG Scientific Review Coordinator

3. Internally reviewed by 3 BSSG members or independent expert reviewers, if required

4. Review scores and comments are collated by BSSG Scientific Review Coordinator

Outcomes:
- Approved
- Approved subject to satisfactory responses to comments from BSSG (discussed at next BSSG meeting, if required)
- Not approved (discussed at next BSSG meeting)

Outcomes following discussion at BSSG meeting:
- Approved
- Approved subject to minor amendments
- Not approved

5. Notification of outcome to researcher
Please assign a score for the application in each of the 3 categories.
NOTE: Biological Studies Steering Group Reviewers and CCLG Tumour Interest Groups - please score for feasibility of study and clinical relevance. Only score for scientific excellence if you are confident that you have relevant expertise in the subject of the application.
Projects that score <3 in any category are unlikely to be approved.

### SCIENTIFIC EXCELLENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unoriginal.</strong></td>
<td>Scientifically valid but not novel.</td>
<td>Scientifically valid.</td>
<td>Scientifically excellent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not add any new knowledge to the field.</td>
<td>Innovative.</td>
<td>Innovative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likely to lead to data of major importance.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FEASIBILITY OF STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samples requested would not be available or would not be available in the timescale requested.</td>
<td>Samples available or would be available in the timescale requested.</td>
<td>Samples available or would be available in the timescale requested.</td>
<td>Samples available or would be available in the timescale requested.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No justification for the number of samples requested.</td>
<td>Valid justification for the number of samples requested.</td>
<td>Valid justification for the number of samples requested.</td>
<td>Good pilot data for the study demonstrating technology established.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient evidence that the group could undertake the work, for example no preliminary data.</td>
<td>No pilot data to demonstrate technology established.</td>
<td>Good pilot data for the study demonstrating technology established.</td>
<td>Clearly deliverable goals in the timescale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of maximum use of samples either within the project or through collaboration with other groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CLINICAL RELEVANCE OF STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project could be undertaken without the use of clinical samples.</td>
<td>Project could not be undertaken without the use of clinical samples but clinical relevance not very clear.</td>
<td>Project could not be undertaken without the use of clinical samples.</td>
<td>Project could not be undertaken without the use of clinical samples.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant to current clinical management.</td>
<td>High clinical relevance with potential for important impact on clinical management in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>