****

**Cochrane Review Support Programme (CRSP)**

# Background

1. In May 2015 the Cochrane Steering Group approved a one-year pilot of a Cochrane Review Support Programme aimed at providing funding support to identified reviews.
2. Cochrane recognises that these awards are insufficient to meet the full costs of conducting reviews, however, the UK NIHR’s Incentive Scheme, which is very similar, has been popular and successful in delivering high priority intervention reviews in a timely and efficient manner and we hope that this programme will be similarly effective. The awards are intended to be applied at the discretion of Co-ordinating Editors in ways that will facilitate, and ideally accelerate, activity that is already planned or underway.

# Scope of the 2016 Programme

1. Cochrane will give up to 10 awards of £5,000 each at two time points during 2016 (up to 20 awards in total).
2. The awards are open to all Cochrane Review Groups.
3. Groups may nominate either review updates or new reviews in progress or ready to commence*.*

# Criteria for review nominations

1. Submissions must meet the following essential criteria:
2. ***high priority review*** *with evidence that it will impact health care or policy (i.e. title* ***must be on the Cochrane Priority Review List, July 2016 version****);*
3. *use of* ***GRADE*** *and* ***‘Summary of findings’ table*** *essential;*
4. ***payment to be clearly linked to contribution****, but aimed primarily at review authors;*
5. ***strategic value*** *to Cochrane;*
6. In the ‘scientific/policy justification’ section of the form the potential importance and impact of the review topic should be described in no more than 350 words, specifically addressing the points below:

Evidence that the review is a high priority:

* 1. ***the impact*** *of the clinical condition or social problem or the potential for* ***benefit or harm of the selected intervention****(s);*
  2. *the* ***degree of uncertainty*** *that exists in the absence of an up-to-date systematic review, and the* ***‘cost’ to policy and practice*** *of operating in the face of such uncertainty;*
  3. *the likelihood of a review assisting or* ***changing policy or practice****;*
  4. *the* ***identified need*** *for a review by policy makers or health care commissioners;*
  5. *commissioned for* ***national or international guidelines*** *(if appropriate);*
  6. *the likely i****mportance and priority that would be given to the topic by consumers****, such as patients and their carers, and their involvement in the review.*

Evidence that grant will lead to a successful outcome

* 1. *an* ***estimate of the number and size of the studies*** *that are likely to be considered for inclusion in the review (for review updates, give information on the additional studies);*
  2. *an indication of whether the review* ***includes complex methodologies with further justification****;*
  3. *evidence of the* ***skills, knowledge, experience and capacity of the author team****.*

# Nominating candidate reviews and review updates

1. Co-ordinating Editors of all Cochrane Review Groups are invited to nominate **no more than two** **new reviews or review updates** that appear on the **July 2016 version of the Cochrane Priority Reviews List**, and for which they consider funding would lead to completion at a significantly earlier time.
2. Nominated titles **may be reviews or updates covered by any other funding programme(s)**, however theadditional funding source(s) must be declared along with a brief explanation of why CRSP top-up funds are required.
3. Nominations for this funding round must be submitted in electronic form to Ruth Foxlee, Cochrane Editorial Unit ([rfoxlee@cochrane.org](mailto:rfoxlee@cochrane.org)), by **5pm GMT Friday 4th November 2016**. The application template at the end of this paper must be used for each nomination. Late proposals and proposals that do not adhere to the template, exceed the word limit or do not address the criteria above will not be considered.

# Selection of reviews and review updates for incentive awards

1. The responses to this call for proposals will be considered by a scientific panel made up of experienced Cochrane contributors and consumers of Cochrane reviews. Decisions on this set of nominations are likely to be made in mid December 2016. In all cases, a date by which the review or review update must be completed and accepted for publication in the *Cochrane Library* will be agreed as a condition of the award, and will reflect stakeholder needs where necessary. The latest date to be agreed is likely to be 31 January 2018, i.e. a maximum of 13 months after the awards are notified. Failure to meet the deadline will result in the award being withdrawn.

# Administration

1. Funded reviews or review updates must be submitted to the Cochrane Editorial Unit for screening prior to publication.
2. Award payments will be made upon completion of the review or review update (if this is by the agreed completion date). It will be extremely unusual for extensions of agreed deadlines to be allowed. Wherever possible, payments will be made to the host institution of the Co-ordinating Editor.

# Enquiries

1. Any enquiries relating to this programme should be referred to Ruth Foxlee at [rfoxlee@cochrane.org](mailto:rfoxlee@cochrane.org) with ‘Cochrane Review Support Programme’ in the subject/title field.

Cochrane Review Support Programme

Call for proposals - September 2016

Name of Cochrane Review Group:

Name of Co-ordinating Editor:

Name/location of Co-ordinating Editor’s host institution:

Email address for correspondence:

Title of Cochrane Review or review update:

Lead author:

Email address of lead author:

**Name/location of lead author’s host institution:**

**How the funding will be used, including the named beneficiaries:**

**Is this review on the July 2016 version of the Cochrane Priority Reviews List?   
Yes / No**

**Is this review being funded through any other source(s)?   
Yes / No (If yes, please provide further details below)**

**Does this review require methodological support from the Complex Reviews Support Unit (CRSU)?   
Yes / No (If yes, please provide further details below)**

**Scientific/policy justification for review/review update (max 350 words):**

(Please address all the points outlined in Section 7 above)

**1.** Evidence that the review is a high priority

**2.** Evidence that grant will lead to a successful outcome