

2019 Clinical and Translational Research Funding Program

Review Criteria Reference for Proposal Reviewers

This is meant to be a reference tool for reviewers to provide criteria to consider during proposal review. Do NOT return with the Evaluation Form.

Key Review Criteria (Also see Program Specific considerations on page 2.)

Significance:

- Does this study address an important problem in clinical and/or translational research?
- If the aims of the application are achieved, how will scientific knowledge or clinical practice be advanced? What will be the effect of these studies on the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services or preventative interventions that drive this field?
- What is the intellectual merit of the proposed activity to advance knowledge across its own field and across different fields? Are there broader impacts to the clinical and/or translational project to benefit society and advance desired societal outcomes?
- Is there a strong scientific premise for the project?

Innovation:

- To what extent do the proposed activities suggest and explore creative, original and potentially transformative concepts? For example: Does the project challenge existing paradigms or clinical practice; address an innovative hypothesis or critical barrier to progress in the field?
- Does the project plan develop or employ novel concepts, approaches or methodologies, tools, or technologies for this area?

Approach:

- Are the conceptual or clinical framework, design, methods and analyses adequately developed, well-integrated and appropriate to the aims of the project?
- Does the applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative tactics? For applications designating multiple investigators, is the leadership approach, including the designated roles and responsibilities, consistent with and justified by the aims of the project and the expertise of each of the investigators?
- Does the applicant identify the next steps in research or clinical endeavor to move the concept forward in the translational continuum?
- Has the investigator presented strategies to ensure a robust and unbiased approach, as appropriate for the work proposed?
- Has the investigator presented adequate plans to address relevant biological variables, such as sex, for studies in vertebrate animals or human subjects?

Environment:

- Does the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success?
- Does the proposed study benefit from unique features of the environment, or subject populations, or employ useful collaborative arrangements?

Investigator(s):

- Are the investigators appropriately trained and well suited to carry out this work?
- Is the work proposed appropriate to the experience level of the investigator? Do the investigators bring complementary and integrated expertise to the project (if applicable)?
- If the applicant is a new or junior investigator, is there adequate supervision and mentorship described and how does the proposed work fit with his/her overall professional development?
- If the applicant is an established investigator, is there clear description about how this project is different from their previous work?

Additional Review Considerations

Human/Animal Use:

___ Have protections for human subjects and/or appropriate use of animals been addressed?

Success/Potential for Subsequent Funding:

___ Is there a plan or set of criteria by which to judge whether the proposal has been successful?

___ If this project is successful, would it likely lead to external peer-reviewed funding?

Budget: (Budget does not contribute to the priority score)

___ Does the documentation demonstrate that the funds requested will meet the research needs?

___ Is the proposed budget and duration reasonable in relation to the proposed project?

___ Is there potential funding overlap?

___ Is it clear how funds will be used to uniquely advance the proposed clinical or translational research?

Authentication of Key Biological and/or Chemical Resources:

___ For projects involving key biological and/or chemical resources, are the proposed plans for identifying and ensuring the validity of those resources appropriate?

Program Specific Considerations

___ Does the project have the potential to promote the translation of scientific discoveries into improvements in human health?

___ Are the aims appropriate for a 1-year grant?

___ Does the project clearly describe how this research applies to one or more of the acceptable research themes?

- Improving Quality of Patient Care
- Enhancing Patient Safety
- Improving Patient Outcomes
- Improving Transfer to Practice
- Translating Genetic/Genomic Findings
- Development/Evaluation of Therapeutics

___ For collaborative projects, are the partners fully engaged in the research, or listed in name only?

___ Does the project promote team science?

___ Does the study population include participants across the lifespan and groups that are frequently underrepresented in clinical and translational research (e.g., pregnant women; older adults; individuals with disabilities; gender or sexual minorities; rural communities; racial, ethnic or cultural minorities)? If not, is strong scientific justification provided for their exclusion?

For Community-Engaged Research proposals:

___ Is the research question relevant to the community of interest? Is the project a community-defined priority?

___ What is the role of the partner? Are there benefits for the partner?

___ Does the research present an opportunity for sustained impact?

___ Does the research team have a track record in building and sustaining community partnerships?

___ Does the proposal outline a clear plan for involving key stakeholders and communities in the conceptualization, implementation, interpretation, or dissemination of study findings? If not, is a compelling rationale for their exclusion provided?