

## Application summary

### Application title

This is the title of your proposal.

### Proposed duration of funding (months)

### Proposed start date

### Name of administering organisation

If your application is successful, this is the organisation that will be responsible for administering the award.

### Lead applicant's address at administering organisation

If your application is successful, we will use this address in your award letter.

Department/Division

Organisation

Street

City/Town

Postcode/Zipcode

Country

### Research area

Select the most relevant area, based on the key aims of the research. This allocates your application to the relevant Grants team. We may reallocate your application to another area if we consider it appropriate.

## Lead applicant

### Lead applicant details

Full Name

Department

Division

<b>Organisation</b>	
<b>Address Line 1</b>	
<b>City/Town</b>	
<b>Postcode</b>	
<b>Country</b>	
<b>Telephone No.</b>	
<b>Email Address</b>	

<b>Career history (current/most recent first)</b>				
<b>From</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	

<b>Education/training</b>				
<b>From</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Qualification</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Organisation</b>

<p><b>Source(s) of personal salary support</b>          State all your sources of salary funding (for example, through your organisation's block grant from a higher education funding body), and the percentage of your salary they contribute. Answer 'not applicable' if you are not currently employed.</p>
<p><i>Your source of salary may affect your eligibility - please check the scheme webpage.</i></p> <p><i>If your source of salary places any restrictions on intellectual property rights or publications arising from your research, contact us as this may also affect your eligibility.</i></p>

<p><b>Career contributions</b>          What are your most important research-related contributions? These may be from any stage of your research career. State what each contribution was, when it came about, why you think it is important and what impact it has had. Examples include publications, patents and impacts on policy.          (350 words max.)</p>
---

<p><b>Research outputs</b>          List up to 20 of your most significant research outputs; at least five of these must be from the last five years. For 10 of these outputs, provide a statement describing their significance and your contribution (up to 50 words maximum per output).</p> <p>Research outputs may include (but are not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer-reviewed publications and preprints;</li> <li>• Datasets, software and research materials;</li> <li>• Inventions, patents and commercial activity.</li> </ul> <p>For original research publications, indicate those arising from Wellcome-funded grants in <b>bold</b>, and provide the PubMed Central ID (PMCID) reference for each of these. You can find more information</p>
--

on this in the guidance to this question.

Give the citation in full, including the title of paper and all authors (unless more than 10, in which case you may use 'et al', ensuring that your position as author remains clear). Citations to preprints must state "Preprint", the repository name and the articles persistent identifier (e.g. DOI).

*Include here systematic reviews (e.g. Cochrane Reviews) and meta analyses, but exclude abstracts and literature reviews. We encourage you to include articles published via open research publishing platforms, such as Wellcome Open Research, providing they have passed peer review.*

*Only include preprints, complete manuscripts that have been submitted to a preprint repository or service (for example, bioRxiv, PeerJ Preprints, arXiv, SocArXiv or PsyArXiv), if they have a permanent identifier such as a DOI or arXiv identifier.*

**How many peer-reviewed publications have you authored/co-authored?**

Include systematic reviews and meta analyses but exclude abstracts and literature reviews.

*We encourage you to include articles published on open research publishing platforms, such as Wellcome Open Research, providing they have passed peer review.*

**Current and recent research funding (including Wellcome grants)**

List all research funding you have held in the last five years and any key funding before then.

List the most recent first. State the name of the funder, name(s) of grantholder(s), title of the project, total amount awarded (and how much of this you received), your role in the project, and the start and end dates. State the percentage of your time spent on the research; if the grant is active state the number of hours per week that you spend on the research.

*Include details of any recurrent or core funding you have held. Explain your role in obtaining the funding. For example, whether you held them in your own right as lead applicant, coapplicant, or as part of a consortium.*

*We look at your success in getting research funding when we assess your track record. We also want to understand how this proposal is distinct from other funding you hold.*

## Applicants

*An applicant is someone who has significant input into the project. We allow up to a maximum of ten applicants (lead applicant plus up to nine other applicants).*

1

Applicant	
Full Name	
Department	
Division	
Organisation	
Address Line 1	
City/Town	
Postcode	

<b>Country</b>	
<b>Telephone No.</b>	
<b>Email Address</b>	

<b>Career history (current/most recent first)</b>				
<b>From</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	
<b>Education/training</b>				
<b>From</b>	<b>To</b>	<b>Qualification</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
<i>An applicant is someone who has significant input into the project.</i>				

<p><b>Source(s) of personal salary support</b> State all your sources of salary funding (for example, through your organisation's block grant from a higher education funding body), and the percentage of your salary they contribute. Answer 'not applicable' if you are not currently employed.</p>
<p><i>Your source of salary may affect your eligibility - please check the scheme webpage.</i></p> <p><i>If your source of salary places any restrictions on intellectual property rights or publications arising from your research, contact us as this may also affect your eligibility.</i></p>

<p><b>Career contributions</b> What are your most important research-related contributions? These may be from any stage of your research career. State what each contribution was, when it came about, why you think it is important and what impact it has had. Examples include publications, patents and impacts on policy. (350 words max.)</p>
---

<p><b>Research outputs</b> List up to 20 of your most significant research outputs; at least five of these must be from the last five years. For 10 of these outputs, provide a statement describing their significance and your contribution (up to 50 words maximum per output).</p> <p>Research outputs may include (but are not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer-reviewed publications and preprints;</li> <li>• Datasets, software and research materials;</li> <li>• Inventions, patents and commercial activity.</li> </ul> <p>For original research publications, indicate those arising from Wellcome-funded grants in <b>bold</b>, and provide the PubMed Central ID (PMCID) reference for each of these. You can find more information on this in the guidance to this question.</p> <p>Give the citation in full, including the title of paper and all authors (unless more than 10, in which case you may use 'et al', ensuring that your position as author remains clear). Citations to preprints must state "Preprint", the repository name and the articles persistent identifier (e.g. DOI).</p>
<p><i>Include here systematic reviews (e.g. Cochrane Reviews) and meta analyses, but exclude abstracts and literature reviews. We encourage you to include articles published via open research publishing platforms, such as Wellcome</i></p>

Open Research, providing they have passed peer review.

Only include preprints, complete manuscripts that have been submitted to a preprint repository or service (for example, bioRxiv, PeerJ Preprints, arXiv, SocArXiv or PsyArXiv), if they have a permanent identifier such as a DOI or arXiv identifier.

**How many peer-reviewed publications have you authored/co-authored?**

Include systematic reviews and meta analyses but exclude abstracts and literature reviews.

We encourage you to include articles published on open research publishing platforms, such as Wellcome Open Research, providing they have passed peer review.

**Current and recent research funding (including Wellcome grants)**

List all research funding you have held in the last five years and any key funding before then.

List the most recent first. State the name of the funder, name(s) of grantholder(s), title of the project, total amount awarded (and how much of this you received), your role in the project, and the start and end dates. State the percentage of your time spent on the research; if the grant is active state the number of hours per week that you spend on the research.

Include details of any recurrent or core funding you have held. Explain your role in obtaining the funding. For example, whether you held them in your own right as lead applicant, coapplicant, or as part of a consortium.

We look at your success in getting research funding when we assess your track record. We also want to understand how this proposal is distinct from other funding you hold.

**Details of proposal**

**Summary**

Summarise the equipment, resource, technology, LPS core support, or LPS enabling structure requested.  
(200 words max.)

For core support for a Longitudinal Population Study, the balance of funds requested should be on creating/maintaining the resource rather than doing research on the resource.

Enabling structures for Longitudinal Population Studies could include, but are not limited to: 1) understanding the acceptability and feasibility of creating integrated data resources for researchers, policy makers, participants, and citizens; 2) defining new ethical and consent frameworks to enable data from multiple sources to be linked for research; 3) exploiting and extending existing governance frameworks for population-level datasets to allow LPS to gain access to additional sources; and 4) driving approaches to allow data interoperability, accessibility, and analysis (e.g. harmonising and sharing data across different LPS).

Biomedical Resource, Multi-user Equipment and Technology Development applicants only:

**Outline the community need for the resource/technology/multi-user item of equipment**

List the names of potential users (including applicants) and indicate how the resource/technology/multi-user equipment will enhance their research. For non-applicants, state the employing organisation and main sources of funding.

We expect that the users of multi-user equipment will be primarily researchers funded by Wellcome. Where a significant proportion of users of the equipment are not funded by Wellcome, we expect applicants to seek financial contributions from alternative sources, including other funding bodies. (300 words max.)

LPS applicants only:

**Outline the community need and value of the resource**

If you are applying for core support for an LPS, describe how it meets the quality criteria. Refer to the guidance for this question.

If you are applying for enhancing value for LPS, describe how it maximises the value of LPS and/or their data. Make sure you fully outline the methods and/or approaches you will be using. (1000 words max.)

*The quality criteria for LPS core support, along with associated metrics, are detailed below. At the preliminary application stage, core resources should describe how they will meet these criteria during the grant. Existing resources do not need to report on how well the LPS meets the metrics associated with each criteria, though this will be required at the full application stage.*

*Criterion 1: A clear vision with unique scientific impact and potential - relating broadly to human health*

- *Describe the evidence that the LPS is, or will be, a valuable resource for the wider community, and outline how it is or will become a robust, cost-effective, and innovative way of answering a range of important research questions*
- *A clear strategy outlining potential pathways to future impact*
- *For existing resources: describe the main impacts of the resource, which may be unique scientific findings, impact on policy and practice, or developing new scientific techniques.*

*Criterion 2: Robust leadership, management, training and governance structures*

- *Operational management with clear decision making structures and an appropriate balance of skills/responsibilities (e.g. project management, data management and access, sample maintenance, fieldwork, etc.)*
- *Scientific leadership with vision, credibility, and succession planning, within clear decision making structures*
- *An engaged external advisory mechanism with a clear purpose, which is actively used for scientific advice and horizon scanning, with membership of the advisory mechanism justified*

*Criterion 3: Effective recruitment, and rigorous data and sample quality*

- *Robust ethical oversight should be in place with ongoing engagement and appropriately phrased consent that is not too complicated*
- *Participants should be representative as appropriate to the scientific purpose of study, and attrition rates closely monitored to ensure that the resource remains scientifically useful*
- *Collection of samples should be well justified and, where possible, all sample and assay handling should be performed in accredited facilities according to ISO standards. Where this is not possible, LPS should seek to achieve standards equivalent to those of accredited units.*
- *All data should be obtained/linked using defined ethical, clinical and industry standards where available, and should be stored in accredited facilities with appropriate backup procedures. Where relevant, measures to ensure the security of shared data should also be in place.*
- *A clear, transparent and justifiable policy with regard to return (or not) of findings to individual participants, and this should be clearly articulated to participants.*

*Criterion 4: Organised data accessibility and sharing*

- *Information about available data should be clearly described and freely available (e.g. directory, website, platform)*
- *A data access management process should be in place, which should be proportionate and transparent*
- *Optimum use of data and/or samples within the framework of an access management plan (e.g. % of approved application with narrative and turnaround time)*
- *Breadth and scope of 'Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)' outputs*

Criterion 5: Maximised value through linkage with other data sources relevant to the scientific vision of the LPS

- (Plans for) successful linkage to the range of data sources needed to achieve scientific vision
- (Plans for) the collection of appropriate consents to link to relevant data sources
- (Plans for) the collection of relevant data items to enable linkage with range of data sources
- Networks only: (Plans to) bring together data from member LPS to allow for standardised cross-LPS comparisons
- Networks only: (Plans to) share best practice through network

Criterion 6: Meaningful engagement with external stakeholders (including participants, wider public, industry, policy makers and practitioners) in the research process

- Effective two-way engagement between the study team and participants
- Where relevant, describe effective models of two-way engagement between the study team, the wider public, policy makers, practitioners, industry, and other LPS to maximise the impact of the resource

### Unmet need

Provide details of similar resources/technologies/items of equipment/studies that are available to you (specifically for equipment, available either locally or nationally). Describe the unmet need(s) that this proposal will address.  
(300 words max.)

### Guidance for LPS applicants

Demonstrate the strategic context, including how it fits in the population research landscape, including other national and international resources.

### Management

Briefly describe how the equipment, resource, technology or LPS will be managed and plans for long term sustainability.  
(300 words max.)

## Related applications

**Is this a resubmission of an application submitted to Wellcome within the last 24 months?**

Contact us before resubmitting an application.

How is this application different?  
(200 words max.)

## Approximate costs

### Currency requested

Select the currency requested for award

Biomedical Resource, Technology Development and LPS applicants only:

### Summary of costs requested

Provide an approximate budget. You should only include costs you are requesting from Wellcome. Do not include contributions from other sources.

Salaries	
Materials and consumables	
Animals	
Equipment	
Miscellaneous (including travel costs)	
<b>Total ()</b>	

*For LPS core support, funds to allow the resource to meet the quality criteria can be requested. For both core support and enabling structures, adequate project and data management resources should be built into the proposal.*

Multi-user Equipment applicants only:

**Summary of costs requested**

Provide an approximate budget. You should only include costs you are requesting from Wellcome. Do not include contributions from other sources.

Salaries	
Equipment	
Miscellaneous	
<b>Total ()</b>	

Technology Development, Multi-user Equipment and LPS applicants only:

<b>Contributions</b>				
List all financial contributions, or equivalent, the host organisation or other sources are providing. Includes confirmed or potential co-funding.				
Contributor	Details of contribution	Confirmed or expected	Value	Currency
				-
<p><i>For multi-user equipment grants, we normally expect a contribution from the host organisation or other source. If a complete piece of equipment costs £100,000 or more, we expect a contribution of at least 25%. Contributions are not limited to cash and can include appropriate benefits in kind, such as refurbishment or the underwriting of a key support post.</i></p> <p><i>We expect equipment to be used primarily (but not exclusively) by Wellcome Trust-funded researchers. Where a significant proportion of users of the equipment are not funded by us, we expect applicants to seek an appropriate financial contribution from alternative sources, including other funding bodies.</i></p>				

<b>Brief justification for financial support requested</b>
For example, where salary support is requested, detail the types of posts that these costs relate to. (200 words max.)

**Institutional support**

<b>Supporting statement from host organisation</b>
Attach a supporting statement from the host organisation, signed by an appropriate senior authority. This should state the contributions, financial or otherwise, that will be provided by the organisation and/or other sources, if appropriate.
For <b>biomedical resource and LPS</b> grant applications, ensure that the statement demonstrates the



host organisation's commitment to the longer-term sustainability of the resource.

For **multi-user equipment** grant applications, ensure that the statement includes an indication as to how the request for equipment fits with the overall strategic context of the organisation, taking into consideration regional and national contexts, if appropriate.

Letters of support, other than that requested above, will not be included with your preliminary application for consideration by the Committee. You must ensure that all essential information is included within the preliminary application form.

Sample