Pilot Funding for Research Use of Core Facilities

Review Template

 *(based on the NIH critique template)*

Principal Investigator(s):

Title of application:

**1. Goal of the Program:** The Indiana CTSI Core Pilot Grants program has the specific goal of funding projects with outstanding scientific merit that can be linked to generating extramural funding or novel intellectual property (IP). Success of the program will be viewed, in part, by the fostering of new funded grants or providing significant contributions to grant renewals.

**2. Translation Research Definition:** *Translational research describes the steps between a fundamental discovery and its application in clinical medicine. For purposes of grant review, the CTSI defines translational research in the broadest sense and includes:*

*i. Basic science studies which seek to understand disease mechanisms, drug / device / technology development, and toxicology studies*

*ii. Early and late phase clinical studies*

*iii. Studies that seek to improve health outcomes, healthcare delivery, and/or public health.*

**3. Administrative Review**. Indiana CTSI administrative personnel will manage expressed concerns about eligibility, budgetary and/or regulatory approval issues. Please provide comments in the “Other Criteria’ section but they are not to be used in scoring.

*Please keep in mind that the reviews will be forwarded to the applicant.*

**The NIH scoring system defined below should be used for the scored criteria and the overall impact score (use only integer scores, no decimals).**

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

# Overall Impact

Reviewers will provide an overall impact score to reflect their assessment of the likelihood for the project to establish a sustained research program or significant new IP, in consideration of the following five scored review criteria, and the additional unscored review criteria. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major scientific impact.

|  |
| --- |
| [Overall Impact](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_overall) Score (1-9):       |
| **Strengths***

**Weaknesses***
 |

# 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.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. [Significance](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_01) Score (1-9):      Include whether the project clearly states the proposed work’s connection to human health |
| **Strengths** *

**Weaknesses***
 |

|  |
| --- |
| 2. [Investigator(s)](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_02) Score (1-9):       |
| **Strengths** *

**Weaknesses***
 |

|  |
| --- |
| 3. [Innovation](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_03) Score (1-9):       |
| **Strengths***

**Weaknesses***
 |

|  |
| --- |
| 4. [Approach](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_04) Score (1-9):       |
| **Strengths***

**Weaknesses***
 |

|  |
| --- |
| 5. [Environment](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_05) Score (1-9):       |
| **Strengths***

**Weaknesses***
 |

# Other Criteria (not scored)

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.** Although these criteria will not be evaluated with a specific score, the overall evaluation of the application should take these factors into account.

|  |
| --- |
| Guidelines |
| Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):*
 |

|  |
| --- |
| [Budget and Period of Support](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_budget) |
| Recommended budget modifications or possible overlap identified:*
 |

|  |
| --- |
| [Protections for Human Subjects](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_humans) |
| Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):*
 |

|  |
| --- |
| [Vertebrate Animals](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_animals) |
| Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable): *
 |

|  |
| --- |
| [Biohazards](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_biohazards) |
| Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):*
 |

|  |
| --- |
| [Resubmission](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_resubmission) |
| Comments (if applicable):*
 |

# Additional Comments to Applicant

Reviewers may provide guidance to the applicant or recommend against resubmission without fundamental revision.

|  |
| --- |
| [Additional Comments to Applicant](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_additional) (Optional) |
| *
 |