RPG/R01/R03/R15/R21 Review

If you cannot access the hyperlinks below, visit http://grants.nih.gov/grants/psser/rg/rg.htm

Application #:
Principal Investigator(s):

OVERALL IMPACT

Reviewers will provide an overall impact score to reflect their assessment of the likelihood for the project to exert a sustained, powerful influence on the research field(s) involved, in consideration of the following five scored review criteria, and additional review criteria. 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

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Investigator(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.

**Protections for Human Subjects**
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):

**Recaught**
Comments (if applicable):

**Revision**
Comments (if applicable):

---

### ADDITIONAL REVIEW CONSIDERATIONS
As applicable for the project proposed, reviewers will address each of the following items, but will not give scores for these items and should not consider them in providing an overall impact/priority score.

**Applications from Foreign Organizations**
Click Here to Select
Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

**Select Assets**
Click Here to Delist
Comments (Required If Unacceptable):

**Resource Sharing Plans**
Click Here to Select

---

**Comments (Required If Unacceptable):**

**Budget and Period of Support**
Click Here to Select
Recommended budget modifications or possible overlap identified:

---

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO APPLICANT**
Reviewers may provide guidance to the applicant or recommend against resubmission without fundamental revision.

**Additional Comments to Applicant (Optional)**

---
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Help Your Reviewers Write Their Reviews! (I)

- **SIGNIFICANCE**
  - Discuss significance of both problem and contribution by the application.
  - Will the project, if completed successfully, make a difference in the existing body of scientific knowledge and on the concepts or methods that drive this field?

- **INVESTIGATOR**
  - Is the PI appropriately trained and well suited to carry out this work? This includes the research and grant records of the PI and the rest of the investigative team, the leadership the proposed PI and the credibility of the PI's past work
  - Get boost in priority for being new investigator or early stage investigator

- **INNOVATION**
  - Does the project employ novel concepts, approaches or methods? Are the aims original and innovative? Does the project challenge existing paradigms or develop new methodologies or technologies?
Help Your Reviewers Write Their Reviews! (II)

• APPROACH
  – Assess the scientific and technical strengths and weaknesses of the proposed project. Are the conceptual framework, design, methods and analyses well integrated and appropriate to the aims of the project? Does the applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative tactics.

• ENVIRONMENT
  – Are the institutions suitable environments for the research described in this project?

• PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS FROM RESEARCH RISK:

• INCLUSION OF WOMEN, MINORITIES & CHILDREN IN RESEARCH
Help Your Reviewers Write Their Reviews! (III)

- Overall impact:
  This is an (new, revised/competing continuation) application from a (new, experienced, established, outstanding) Principal Investigator with the major goals of ..., using ... methodology and the ... data set(s) to ....... This is a (highly significant, significant, insignificant) application because .... It is a (highly innovative, innovative, not very innovative) application because .... The major strengths of the application are ..., ..., ..., ..., and .... Its major weaknesses are ..., ..., ..., ..., and .... There are (some, no) human subjects issues and inclusion is (adequate, inadequate) with respect to gender; minority group status; and children. By and large, these weaknesses are (minor, easily fixable, difficult to address). The application's strengths (greatly outweigh, outweigh, somewhat outweigh, partially offset) its weaknesses.
Common Weaknesses of Applications

- Lack of new, original, or interesting ideas
- Lack of knowledge of relevant published work
  - Lack of respect or acknowledgment for work on the topic from other disciplines/fields
- Superficial or vague research plan
  - “Underdeveloped” is a lethal adjective from a reviewer
- Research team lacks strength in relevant disciplines or methods
- Weakness in methods (esp. in data) that are not addressed (e.g., selectivity, endogeneity)
- Approach inadequately justified
- Propose to use relatively modest sample but lack power calculation
- Data will be collected but there is no/inadequate data sharing plan
- For resubmissions: “Insufficiently responsive” to previous reviews
- For renewals: achieved far less than promised on original grant, now want more $$ (worst of all: want $ to achieve what was funded before but not finished!)