SRF, SBE, CCCRF Review Sheet

Application Title:

Overall Impact

Reviewers will provide an overall impact score to reflect their assessment of the overall scholarly merits of the proposal, encompassing the five criteria below, together with consideration of the likelihood for successful completion, the impact that the project will have on the applicant's career development, and the potential for future extramural support. Please score the application on its own merits. Descriptions of the five criteria are at the end of this document.

Overall Scholarship Impact Score: *Write a brief paragraph summarizing the factors that informed your Overall Impact score.*

Scored Review Criteria

Reviewers will consider each of the five review criteria below in the determination of scientific and technical merit, and give a separate score for each. Please provide brief bullet points in support of your score.

1. Significance:
Strengths • Weaknesses •

2. Investigator(s):
Strengths • Weaknesses •

3. Innovation:
Strengths • Weaknesses •

4. Approach:
Strengths • Weaknesses •

5. Environment:
Strengths • Weaknesses •

GUIDANCE FOR THE FIVE REVIEW CRITERIA

1. Significance. Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field? If the aims of the project are achieved, how will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved? How will successful completion of the aims change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field?

2. Investigator(s). Are the PI/PIs, collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project? If the PI/PIs are in the early stages of independent careers, do they have appropriate experience and training? If established researchers, have they demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s)? If the project is collaborative, do the investigators have complementary and integrated expertise; are their leadership approach, governance and organizational structure appropriate for the project?

3. Innovation. Does the application challenge and seek to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilizing novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions? Are the concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions novel to one field of research or novel in a broad sense? Is a refinement, improvement, or new application of theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions proposed?

4. Approach. Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented? If the project is in the early stages of development, will the strategy establish feasibility and will particularly risky aspects be managed?
If the project involves clinical research, are the plans for 1) protection of human subjects from research risks, and 2) inclusion of minorities and members of any sex/gender, as well as the inclusion of children, justified in terms of the scientific goals and research strategy proposed?

5. Environment. Will the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success? Are the institutional support, equipment and other physical resources available to the investigators adequate for the project proposed? Will the project benefit from unique features of the scientific environment, subject populations, or collaborative arrangements?