

Sent by email: [REDACTED]

19 February 2025

Dear [REDACTED]

Freedom of Information request: FOI2025/00066

Thank you for your Freedom of Information request received on the 23 January in which you requested the following:

Your request:

For the Biomedical Catalyst 2024 Round 1: Industry-led R&D please can I request:

1. *The total number of submitted applications.*
2. *The number of assessed applications.*
3. *The number of successful applications.*
4. *The success rate.*
5. *The minimum successful score.*
6. *The maximum successful score.*
7. *Maximum score of failed applications.*
8. *Average grant fund value per project.*
9. *The score distributions of the applications (e.g. % (or number) of applications which scored: <70, 71-75, 76-80, 81-85, 86+)*
10. *The count of applications by innovation area.*
11. *The count of successful projects by innovation area.*
12. *The number of successful projects that were a consortium of 2 partners.*
13. *The number of successful projects that were a consortium of 3+ partners.*
14. *The number of successful projects which included a university or research partner.*
15. *The number of applications which included a university or research partner.*
16. *The number of 1) applications and 2) successful projects with total project cost within £100k increments.*
17. *The number of submissions which got through to interview, and how many were successful*
18. *The number of unsuccessful applications, if any, which scored above the minimum funded score*

Our response

I can confirm that UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) hold information relevant to your request. Please see the information below.

Table 1, Question 1 – 9:

Question	Total
1. The number of applications.	483
2. The number of assessed applications.	463
3. The number of successful applications.	31
4. The success rate.	6.4%
5. The minimum successful score. ¹	79.6
6. The maximum successful score. ¹	89.8
7. Maximum score of failed applications. ¹	89.0
8. Average grant fund value per project. ²	£588,160.76
9a. Average score of funded projects. ^{1,3}	84.0

Where indicated please see points below for additional context:

¹ All scores are the written assessment scores and are given as percentages

² Average value of funding sought for 'successful' applications at the assessment stage

³ Figures are based on 'successful' applications at the assessment stage, 'successful' applications are still subject to due diligence process and may not be funded

Table 2, Question 9b. “The score distributions of the applications (e.g. % (or number) of applications which scored: <70, 71-75, 76-80, 81-85, 86+)”

Score ¹ Range	Number			Percentage		
	>£500K	<£500K	Total	>£500K	<£500K	Total
<=70	41	111	152	27.0%	73.0%	100.00%
70.1-75	31	68	99	31.3%	68.7%	100.00%
75.1-80	37	64	101	36.6%	63.4%	100.00%
80.1-85	42	45	87	48.3%	51.7%	100.00%
85.1-90	9	15	24	37.5%	62.5%	100.00%
90.1-95	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.00%
95.1-100	0	0	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.00%

Table 3, Question 10. “The count of assessed applications by innovation area”.

Innovation Area	<£500K	>£500K	Total number
Diagnostics, medical technology and devices	303	160	463

Table 4, Question 11. “The count of successful projects by innovation area for each strand”.

Innovation Area	<£500K	>£500K	Total number
Diagnostics, medical technology and devices	23	8	31

Table 5, Questions 12 – 15:

Question	Total
12.The number of successful projects that were a consortium of 2 partners	5
13. The number of successful projects that were a consortium of 3+ partners	3
14.The number of successful projects which included a university or research partner	6
15.The number of applications which included a university or research partner	113

Table 6, Question 16. “Successful projects with total project cost within £100k increments”

Amount £	Number of successful projects
200,000	2
300,000	2
400,000	4
500,000	7
600,000	2
700,000	4
900,000	3
1,100,000	1
1,400,000	1
1,700,000	1
2,200,000	1
2,300,000	2
4,000,000	1
Total	31

Question 17. *“The number of submissions which got through to interview, and how many were successful.”*

25 projects were invited to interview, 8 of these were successful.

Question 18. *“The number of unsuccessful applications, if any, which scored above the minimum funded score”*

93 – applications scored above the minimum funded score but were unsuccessful in their application.

In line with [published guidance for this competition](#)¹, a portfolio approach was applied. More information on the portfolio approach can be found on Innovate UK’s general guidance page [here](#)².

If you have any queries regarding our response, please do let us know. If you are dissatisfied with the handling of your request, you have the right to ask for an internal review, explaining which elements of this decision you disagree with and why.

Internal review requests should be submitted within 40 working days of the date of our response and should be addressed to:

Head of Information Governance

Email: foi@ukri.org

Please quote the reference number above in any future communications.

If you are still not content with the outcome of the internal review, you may apply to refer the matter to the Information Commissioner for a decision. Generally, the ICO cannot make a decision unless you have exhausted the review procedure provided by UKRI. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at: www.ico.org.uk.

If you wish to raise a complaint regarding the service you have received or the conduct of any UKRI staff in relation to your request, please see [UKRI’s complaints procedure](#)³.

Yours sincerely,


Information Governance
Information Rights Team
UK Research and Innovation
foi@ukri.org | dataprotection@ukri.org

¹ <https://apply-for-innovation-funding.service.gov.uk/competition/2015/overview/c68e00d5-ba8a-4c91-a615-ef3e780fda7#scope>

² <https://www.ukri.org/councils/innovate-uk/guidance-for-applicants/general-guidance/what-happens-after-you-have-submitted-your-application/#contents-list:~:text=The%20portfolio%20approach>

³ <https://www.ukri.org/who-we-are/contact-us/make-a-complaint/#skipnav-target>