**Biomedical Research Committee**

**Guidelines for Reviews**

**Reviewer Responsibilities**

Please submit a review and score online using the appropriate Teams folder for all of your assigned applications at least one week prior to the scheduled committee meeting. Submit your critique using the form that has been provided. On the form, note that the headings are hyperlinked to the appropriate NIH instructions for that criteria.

Review Content / Format

**1. Overall Impact**. After considering all of the review criteria, briefly summarize the significant strengths and weaknesses of the application and state the likelihood of the project to set the foundation for a sustained research program. Give an overall score.

**2. Scored Review Criteria** (in addition to a narrative, provide a score for each of the following criteria):

**Significance**: Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in Biomedical Research? If the aims of the project are achieved, what new information/application will be obtained, how will this lead the PI to sustained research funding? Will the long terms aims of this project change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field?

**Investigator**: Are the PD/PIs, collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project? If Early Stage Investigators or New Investigators, do they have appropriate experience and training? Is an appropriate mentoring program established? If bridge funding is sought, has the PI demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s)?

**Innovation**: Are the concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions novel to one field of research or novel in a broad sense?

**Approach**: Are the overall strategies, methodologies, 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?

**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?

**3. Other Criteria (not scored).** Although these criteria are not evaluated with a specific score, the overall evaluation of the application should take this factor into account.

**Guidelines**: Is the P.I. eligible for funding under this program? How does the proposal fit within the guidelines for funding?

**Budget**: Is it reasonable? Suggested changes?

**Human and animal subjects or biohazards**:Any concerns?

**Resubmission**:If this is a resubmission, has the applicant adequately addressed the previous critique(s)?

**5. Additional Comments.** Provide any comments or guidance here that does not fit into the criteria categories described above.

**Scoring**

Applications are to be scored using the new NIH scale (1-9):

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 |
| **Non-numeric score options:** NR = Not Recommended for Further Consideration,  DF = Deferred, AB = Abstention, CF = Conflict, NP = Not Present, ND = Not Discussed | | | |
| **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 | | | |