

2012-2013 Bankhead-Coley Program

New Investigator Research Grant Review Questions

Numerical Rating Scale for Core Questions

The following rating scale, using whole numbers only, will apply to all core review criteria. The overall impact score assigned will consider the five core review criteria scores as well as the additional review criteria, but it is not a calculation of individual scores.

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Descriptor</i>	<i>Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses</i>
<i>High</i>	1	<i>Exceptional</i>	<i>Exceptionally strong and essentially no weaknesses</i>
	2	<i>Outstanding</i>	<i>Extremely strong and negligible weaknesses</i>
	3	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Very strong and only some minor weaknesses</i>
<i>Medium</i>	4	<i>Very Good</i>	<i>Strong and numerous minor weaknesses</i>
	5	<i>Good</i>	<i>Strong and at least one moderate weakness</i>
	6	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>Some strengths and some moderate weaknesses</i>
<i>Low</i>	7	<i>Fair</i>	<i>Some strengths and at least one major weakness</i>
	8	<i>Marginal</i>	<i>A few strengths and a few major weaknesses</i>
	9	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses</i>
<p><i>Minor Weakness:</i> An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact <i>Moderate Weakness:</i> A weakness that lessens impact <i>Major Weakness:</i> A weakness that severely limits impact</p>			

CORE REVIEW CRITERIA

Each of the five review criteria below are considered in the determination of the overall impact. A separate score is also give for each criterion.

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, to what extent will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved? How much will successful completion of the aims change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field?

Rating: [1 to 9]

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

2012-2013 Bankhead-Coley Program

New Investigator Research Grant Review Questions

Investigator(s): Are the PI, Mentor(s), collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project? Does the Early Stage or New Investigator have appropriate experience and training?

Rating: [1 to 9]

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

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?

Rating: [1 to 9]

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

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?

Rating: [1 to 9]

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

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?

Rating: [1 to 9]

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

2012-2013 Bankhead-Coley Program

New Investigator Research Grant Review Questions

ADDITIONAL REVIEW CRITERIA

The following additional items will be factored into the determination of an overall impact score, as appropriate.

Mentorship: Does the Mentor appear to have the commitment, qualifications, and experience to guide the development of the New Investigator? Is there adequate description of the quality and extent of the Mentor's proposed role in providing guidance and advice? Evaluate the nature and extent of the proposed supervision that will occur during the mentored phase of support, i.e. is it adequate, and is the commitment of the Mentor(s) to the New Investigator's continued career development appropriate? Are there adequate plans for monitoring and evaluating the New Investigator's progress toward independence?

- a) Acceptable
- b) Unacceptable

Mentorship Comments: Description of any concerns and recommendations.

Institutional Support: What evidence is provided that the sponsoring institution is strongly committed to fostering the New Investigator's development and transition toward independence? Does it appear that the institution will provide the independent and protected research time needed to successfully support the New Investigator?

- a) Acceptable
- b) Unacceptable

Institutional Support Comments: Description of any concerns and recommendations.

Human Subjects: For research that involves human subjects, evaluate the justification for involvement of human subjects and the proposed protections from research risk relating to their participation according to the following five review criteria: 1) risk to subjects, 2) adequacy of protection against risks, 3) potential benefits to the subjects and others, 4) importance of the knowledge to be gained, and 5) data and safety monitoring for clinical trials.

- a) Acceptable Risks and/or Adequate Protections
- b) Unacceptable Risks and/or Inadequate Protections
- c) Not Applicable (No human subjects)

Protections for Human Subjects Comments: Description of any concerns and recommendations.

2012-2013 Bankhead-Coley Program

New Investigator Research Grant Review Questions

Vertebrate Animals: For research that involves live vertebrate animals, consider the following five points: 1) proposed use of the animals, and species, strains, ages, sex, and numbers to be used; 2) justifications for the use of animals and for the appropriateness of the species and numbers proposed; 3) adequacy of living conditions and veterinary care; 4) procedures for limiting discomfort, distress, pain and injury to that which is unavoidable in the conduct of scientifically sound research including the use of analgesic, anesthetic, and tranquilizing drugs and/or comfortable restraining devices; and 5) methods of euthanasia.

- a) Acceptable Risks and/or Adequate Protections
- b) Unacceptable Risks and/or Inadequate Protections
- c) Not Applicable

Vertebrate Animals Comments: Description of any concerns and recommendations.

OVERALL IMPACT

Please provide an overall impact score to reflect your assessment of the likelihood for the project to exert a sustained, powerful influence on the research field(s) involved, in consideration of the five core review criteria, and the additional review criteria previously described. Briefly summarize the most important points of your critique, indicating the relative importance of the major strengths and weaknesses of the application.

Rating: [1 to 9]

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

ADDITIONAL REVIEW CONSIDERATIONS

Separately from the overall impact score, peer reviewers will rate the following items.

Cancer Relatedness: All applicants must clearly demonstrate how the proposed project is relevant to cancer. Biomedical and biotechnological research must address the etiology, pathogenesis, prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and/or cure of cancer. Social scientific and behavioral proposals must address the development, implementation, and/or evaluation of existing or novel approaches to cancer prevention, diagnosis, or treatment. Proposed projects must demonstrate a close relationship with advancing progress toward cures for cancer or endeavor to dramatically improve cancer morbidity and mortality. Has the applicant made a compelling case for a strong cancer relationship?

- a) Definitely
- b) Yes, with minor reservations
- c) Somewhat
- d) Minimally
- e) Not at all

Cancer Relatedness Comments: Description of any concerns.

2012-2013 Bankhead-Coley Program

New Investigator Research Grant Review Questions

Disparate Groups: If the applicant indicated "Yes," did they present a convincing case that their proposed research will reduce the impact of cancer on disparate groups? Only select "N/A" if the applicant did not indicate "Yes" to the Disparate Group question.

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) N/A

Disparate Group Comments: Description of any concerns.

Budget and Period of Support: Are the budget and the requested period of support fully justified and reasonable in relation to the proposed research?

- a) Recommend as Requested
- b) Budget Modification Requested (in amount or time)

Budget and Period of Support Comments: Description of any concerns and recommendations for follow-up and/or modifications.

Scientific or Budget Overlap: Overlap, whether scientific or financial, or commitment of an individual's effort greater than 100 percent is not permitted. The goals in identifying and eliminating overlap are to ensure that sufficient and appropriate levels of effort are committed to the project; that there is no duplication of funding for scientific aims, specific budgetary items, or an individual's level of effort; and that funds not otherwise necessary to conduct the approved project are not included in the award. The proposed research also must not overlap with any research being conducted by the Mentor.

- a) No Overlap Concerns Identified
- b) Potential Overlap Identified (changes or investigation needed)

Scientific or Budget Overlap Comments: Description of any concerns and recommendations for follow-up and/or modifications.

Other Feedback: Beyond the items already addressed, is there any additional advice you are willing to offer the applicant?

Project Classification: Select which of the following categories best fits this proposed research project (choose one):

- a) Prevention
- b) Diagnosis
- c) Treatment
- d) Cure