

Please remember that providing a great deal of helpful detail in your comments – about both strengths and weaknesses – will be enabling the single most important function that the Development Core offers ... the mentoring of new investigators in the skills needed to write applications that will pass peer review at the NIH level. [Title]

CFAR Application Review

If you cannot access the hyperlinks below, visit <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm>.

Application cycle:

Principal Investigator(s):

Reviewer name:

Overall Impact Score:

50% of the impact score should derive from your assessment of criteria #1-2 and 50% from criteria #3-7

OVERALL IMPACT

Provide an overall impact score to reflect your assessment of **the likelihood for the project to contribute to a fundable NIH application** as well as the probability that it will exert a sustained, powerful influence on the research field(s) involved, in consideration of the five traditional NIH scored review criteria below (Significance, Investigators, Innovation, Approach, Environment). An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major scientific impact.

Overall Impact Write a paragraph summarizing the factors that informed your Overall Impact score.

SCORED REVIEW CRITERIA

Give a separate score (on a scale of 1-9) for each criterion below and **please provide comprehensive, highly detailed comments about strengths/weaknesses**. The comments you provide are a key part of our grantsmanship mentoring program.

1. Potential to contribute to a fundable NIH application:

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

2. Writing quality – is the document well written enough to pass NIH review?:

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

3. Significance:

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

4. Investigator(s):

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

5. Innovation:

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

6. Approach:

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

7. Environment:

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

ADDITIONAL REVIEW CRITERIA

As applicable for the project proposed, reviewers will consider the following additional items in the determination of scientific and technical merit, but will not give separate scores for these items.

- Responses for Protections for Human Subjects, Vertebrate Animals, and Biohazards **are required for all applications**.
- A response for Inclusion of Women, Minorities and Children **is required** for applications proposing Human Subjects Research.

HUMAN SUBJECTS PROTECTION

Click Here to Select

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

-

Data and Safety Monitoring Plan (Applicable for Clinical Trials Only):

Click Here to Select

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

-

[Inclusion of Women, Minorities and Children](#) Applicable Only for Human Subjects Research

Click Here to Select Gender Code

Click Here to Select Minority Code

Click Here to Select Children Code

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

-

[Vertebrate Animals](#)

Click Here to Select

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

-

[Biohazards](#)

Click Here to Select

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

-

[Resubmission](#)

Comments (if applicable):

<ul style="list-style-type: none">•

ADDITIONAL REVIEW CONSIDERATIONS

Reviewers will address the following items, but will not give scores for these items and should not consider them in providing an overall impact/priority score.

Budget and Period of Support
Click Here to Select
Recommended budget modifications or possible overlap identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none">•

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO APPLICANT

A critical function of the CFAR application review process is to provide applicants with feedback that will be useful in strengthening their skills as NIH-level grant writers. Please provide any additional concrete, detailed feedback below that will be helpful to the applicant in identifying his or her writing strengths and rectifying his or her application writing weaknesses.

Additional Comments to Applicant
<ul style="list-style-type: none">•

CFAR-SERIES REVIEW CRITERIA

Weight	Item	Section of application scored
40%	Future: Does the proposed project have a high potential of contributing to a future NIH K- or R-level application?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Entire narrative • “Future Plans for NIH Applications” statement • “Applicability to NIH/OAR Research Priorities” statement
20%	Writing: Does quality of writing in the application (including grammar and spelling) meet the standard found in successful NIH applications?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entire narrative
25%	<p>Approach: Does the application describe how the experimental design and methods will achieve robust and unbiased results? Does the proposal explain how relevant biological variables, such as sex, are factored into research designs and analyses? For example, is strong justification provided for applications proposing to study only one sex? Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well reasoned and appropriate for accomplishing the specific aims of the project? Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented?</p> <p>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 human subjects research, are the plans for 1) protection of subjects from research risks, and 2) decisions about the inclusion or not of minorities, women, children, and/or vulnerable peoples justified in terms of the scientific goals and research strategy proposed?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific Aims • Research Strategy: (c) “Approach” • Letters of support • Protection of Human Subjects • Inclusion of Women and Minorities • Inclusion of Children • Vertebrate Animals
15%	<p>Significance*: Does the proposal describe a research problem considered to be High Priority by NIH/OAR? Does the proposal describe the scientific premise for the proposed project? Will successful completion of the aims lead to larger research studies that can change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Strategy: (a) “Significance” • “Applicability to NIH/OAR Research Priorities” statement
	<p>Innovation: Does the application seek to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilizing novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions? Are they 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?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research Strategy: (b) “Innovation”
	<p>Investigators: Is the research team well suited to the project? Do the PI(s) have appropriate experience and training? If dual PI, do the PIs have complementary and integrated expertise; are their leadership approach, governance and organizational structure appropriate for the project?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biosketches • Dual PI Leadership Plan
	<p>Environment: 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 CFAR scientific environment, subject populations, or collaborative arrangements?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources page • Letters of support • “CFAR Scientific Core” statement