

2009-2010 James & Esther King Program Tech. Transfer/Comm. Partnership Grant Reviewer Questions

Proposed Project

Scientific Merit: Does the project challenge existing paradigms or clinical practice, or address an innovative hypothesis or critical barrier to progress in the field?

- a) Most definitely
- b) Yes, with minor reservations
- c) Moderately
- d) Minimally
- e) Not at all
- f) I don't know

Technical Merit: Does the project develop or employ novel concepts, approaches, methodologies, tools, or technologies for this area?

- a) Most definitely
- b) Yes, with minor reservations
- c) There is modest innovation
- d) Very limited innovation
- e) Not at all
- f) I don't know

Comments on Proposed Project: Please identify the apparent strengths and weaknesses in the scientific and technical quality of the work proposed in this application.

Commercial Potential

Commercial Potential: What is the likelihood that the outcome of this project will lead to significant commercial products, processes, services and/or societal benefits?

- a) Extremely likely
- b) Very Possible
- c) Moderate
- d) Somewhat unlikely
- e) Very unlikely
- f) I don't know

Potential for Follow-on Funding: What is the likelihood that the outcome of this project will lead to additional funding, such as commercial investment or a successful SBIR/STTR proposal at the Federal level?

- a) Extremely likely
- b) Very Possible
- c) Moderate
- d) Somewhat unlikely
- e) Very unlikely
- f) I don't know

2009-2010 James & Esther King Program Tech. Transfer/Comm. Partnership Grant Reviewer Questions

Comments on Commercial Potential: Please provide comments regarding commercial potential of the work proposed in this application.

Work Plan

Approach: Are the conceptual or clinical framework, design, methods, and analyses adequately developed, well integrated, well reasoned, and appropriate to the aims of the project?

- a) Most definitely
- b) Yes, with minor reservations
- c) Moderately well
- d) I have significant concerns
- e) Not at all
- f) I don't know

Feasibility: Can the proposed work be accomplished by the investigators in the specified time frame, given their documented experience and expertise, past progress, preliminary data, requested and available resources, and institutional commitment? If the project involves a clinical trial, consider also whether the study design contains the statistical power, patient availability, and patient recruitment and retention strategies so that meaningful data will be produced within the planned project timeframe.

- a) Most definitely
- b) Yes, with minor reservations
- c) Moderately well
- d) I have significant concerns
- e) Not at all
- f) I don't know

Comments on Work Plan: Please comment on the approach, and feasibility of the work plan and include explanation of any concerns.

Partnership Information

PI Qualifications: Is the Principal Investigator appropriately trained and well suited to carry out the work proposed?

- a) Most definitely
- b) Yes, with minor reservations
- c) Moderately well
- d) I have significant concerns
- e) Not at all
- f) I don't know

2009-2010 James & Esther King Program Tech. Transfer/Comm. Partnership Grant Reviewer Questions

Partnership Qualifications: Will the proposed partnership bring complementary and integrated expertise to the project?

- a) Most definitely
- b) Yes, with minor reservations
- c) Satisfactory
- d) I have significant concerns
- e) Not at all
- f) I don't know or does not apply

Comments on the Partnership: Please comment on the qualifications and/or perceived gaps in expertise of the proposed investigator(s) and supporting team to carry out the project described. Explain any concerns regarding existing or planned agreements between the partners.

Resources and Environment

Resources and Environment: Will the available resources and the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success?

- a) Most definitely
- b) Yes, with minor reservations
- c) Moderately well
- d) I have significant concerns
- e) Not at all
- f) I don't know

Comments on Resources and Environment: Please comment on the suitability and sufficiency of the resources and environment in which the proposed research will be completed.

Numerical Rating

Numerical Rating: Considering only the questions presented up to this point and not the questions that follow in the Programmatic Feedback section, please select a numerical rating for this application that reflects its overall merits using the following scale:

- 1.0 – Outstanding
- 2.0 – Excellent
- 3.0 – Satisfactory
- 4.0 – Fair
- 5.0 – Poor

2009-2010 James & Esther King Program Tech. Transfer/Comm. Partnership Grant Reviewer Questions

Programmatic Feedback

Tobacco Relatedness: All applicants must clearly demonstrate how the proposed project is relevant to tobacco use or tobacco-related diseases. Biomedical and biotechnological research proposals may address the etiology, pathogenesis, diagnosis, treatment, or cure of tobacco-related diseases like cancer, cardiovascular disease, stroke, and pulmonary disease. Social scientific and behavioral research proposals must address the development, implementation, and/or evaluation of existing or novel approaches to tobacco control, tobacco education, nicotine addiction, or address the health needs of current and/or former smokers. Has the applicant made a compelling case for a strong tobacco relationship?

- a) Definitely
- b) Yes, with minor reservations
- c) Somewhat
- d) Minimally
- e) Not at all
- f) I don't know

Explanation of concerns: Please explain any concerns regarding the tobacco relatedness of the proposed research.

Alternative Funding Sources: Has the applicant provided a compelling case that the grant would be filling a genuine funding gap?

- a) Most definitely
- b) Yes, with minor reservations
- c) Moderately
- d) Minimally
- e) Not at all
- f) I don't know

Explanation of concerns: Please explain any concerns regarding funding gaps or funding challenges provided in the proposal.

Project Classification: Please select which of the following categories best fits this proposed research project (choose one): Prevention, Diagnosis, Treatment, Cure

Scientific or Budget Overlap: Overlap, whether scientific, 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. Do you have concerns regarding apparent scientific or budgetary overlap with active or pending support? (Y/N)

Explanation of concerns: Please explain any concerns regarding overlap for the proposed research.

2009-2010 James & Esther King Program Tech. Transfer/Comm. Partnership Grant Reviewer Questions

Budget vs. Period: Do you have concerns regarding the proposed budget and the requested period of support in relation to the proposed research? (Y/N)

Explanation of concerns: Please explain any concerns regarding the budget for the proposed research.

Human or Animal Subjects: Do you have concerns regarding the use of human or animal subjects in the proposed research? (Y/N)

Explanation of concerns: Please explain any concerns regarding the use of human or animal subjects in the proposed research.

Overall

Overall Evaluation Comments: After considering your responses to the previous questions, briefly summarize the most important points of your critique, indicating the relative importance of the major strengths and weaknesses of the application.

Recommendations and other Comments: Beyond the items already addressed, is there any additional advice you are willing to offer the applicant?