1. Alignment with MIRA's priorities in research on aging and mobility
Projects should meet MIRA's mandate to promote excellent potential for scientific impact and the potential to improve the experience of aging and mobility. (see Application Form question 1)
5 – Project addresses a compelling problem in aging, demonstrates potential benefits for older adults, and this is central to the project. **3** – Project provides adequate description of aging aspects under consideration and is connected to aging. **1** – Connection of research to aging/mobility is unclear and/or tangential.

2. Interdisciplinary approach
Does the research involve multiple disciplines and is there a clear plan for interacting with the mentor(s) and expert(s)? (see Application Form question 2; see also methods section of proposal)
5 – Strong interdisciplinary plan with clearly integrated mentor input. Mentors offer complementary expertise and are well aligned with the project's goals. **3** – Mentors have relevant expertise, clearly defined roles, but their input is peripheral rather than central to the project. **1** – Limited interdisciplinarity. Mentor roles and expertise are unclear, with no defined plan for collaboration or integration of diverse perspectives.

3. Incorporation of stakeholder or end-user population
Are appropriate stakeholders or end–users identified (such as industry partners, clinicians, policy makers, older adults, caregivers, other academic fields)? Does the project have plans to interact with them to ensure uptake, knowledge translation and/or implementation are likely and feasible? (see Application Form question 3)
5 – Carefully considered description of how stakeholders/end–users' perspectives will be included in the project.

3 – Consideration is given to stakeholders/end–users, and their perspectives collaterally rather than centrally. **1** – Little or inadequate description of stakeholder/end–users or their perspectives.

4. Incorporation of equity, diversity, inclusion
Is there a consideration of **equity, diversity, inclusion (EDI)** in the project (if applicable) and training/career path? (see Application Form question 4)
5 – EDI considerations for project and/or career path are clear and well articulated. **3**– EDI considerations for project and/or career path are ambiguous. **1** – EDI considerations are altogether missing.

5. Knowledge mobilization plan
Is there a clear plan for knowledge mobilization? (see Application Form question 5)
5 – Clear and actionable knowledge mobilization strategy. The Voice Canada platform is clearly included as part of this plan. **3**– Knowledge mobilization strategy is ambiguous and/or does not include plans for using the Voice Canada platform. **1** – Knowledge mobilization strategy is altogether missing.

6. Research potential and experience, academic excellence
Does the applicant demonstrate competence, motivation, research productivity, or leadership ability? Do they have a strong academic record? Letters of support and curriculum vitae will provide insights.
5 – Student is well suited to the project, and demonstrates high degree of competence, motivation, or leadership ability with strong research potential. **3** – Student is competent and capable of completing the project. Candidate has good research potential. **1** – Student will require a large degree of support to complete project.

7. Background and research methods
Is the research question well defined and supported by literature? (see Application Form question 2 and proposal/appendices)
5 – Clear articulation of the research gap with strong command of relevant literature and methods. Writing is excellent and cohesive. Methods are valid, rigorous, and potentially novel. Sample size is appropriate, with power analyses and recruitment strategies clearly outlined. Analyses are well-designed, thorough, and use appropriate statistical tests. **3** – Background is clear and jargon-free, with a well-defined research question and adequate connection to literature. Methods are sound and feasible, with appropriate sample size and power analysis. Recruitment strategy is reasonable. Analyses are generally appropriate but could be more refined. **1** – Background is unclear or overly technical, showing limited understanding of literature or methods. Research question is vague or unsupported. Methods lack clarity or rigor. Sample size is insufficient or unjustified. Recruitment strategy is weak or absent. Analyses are incomplete or use inappropriate statistical tests.

8. Anticipated outcomes and novel contributions
Is the project novel, or innovative and does the research have potential for impact within the discipline and in the broader world? Will anticipated results inform the literature and are implications and next steps well defined? (see Application Form question 2 and proposal/appendices)
5 – Project is novel and impactful, advancing both the discipline and broader societal understanding. Findings will offer original insights, clearly address the research question, and contribute meaningfully to the literature. Conclusions and next steps are well-defined and insightful. **3** – Project has limited impact and adequately addresses the research question and contributes to the literature. Conclusions and next steps are thoughtfully considered. **1** – Project offers limited contribution to the literature and weakly addresses the research question. Conclusions and next steps lack clarity or depth.