**Lessons learnt from previous funding calls and tips to bear in mind:**

* Give really clear methods on how you’re going to address the question - be specific and give granular details.
* Be exploratory; look at things in a new way – there is an opportunity to work with radical ideas.
* Bring together different disciplines to work together.
* Co-creation - can mean so many different things; beware of it meaning simply that students are consumers; if you select them in a certain way, it can feel like ticking boxes rather than a genuine engagement.
* There is a possibility that a non-psychologist will be assessing your bid - further highlighting the need to be clear in your detail and avoid jargon.
* Students will be on the funding panel, again; think about appropriate, non-technical language.

**Reasons that bids were rejected from previous funding calls:**

* Reviewers couldn’t envisage how applicants would be able to build on the initial funding from the SMaRteN seed funding.
* The team was too strong, and too successful, and we couldn’t see how our funding would fit - if the work is sufficiently well established that you could be going to a bigger funder. Our preference is to give funding to less established work.
* Applications that focussed on **developing** a new intervention - our focus is on funding scoping work or the initial research that would give evidence of how successful the intervention would be / why there was justification to do the intervention.