**Eli Lilly-Stark Neurosciences Predoctoral** and **Postdoctoral Research Fellowship in Neurodegeneration**

Program Review Template

*(based on the NIH critique template)*

Principal Investigator(s):

Title of application:

**SUMMARY**

Provide a brief summary of the proposal.

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary***
 |

**Note these should be viewed as research grants rather than training grants.**

**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 impact on the research field in consideration of the following scored 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 review criteria below in the determination of scientific merit, and give a separate score for each.

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

**Weaknesses***
 |

|  |
| --- |
| 2. [Significance](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_01) 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. [Translational](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_05) Component Score (1-9):       |
| **Strengths***

**Weaknesses***
 |

|  |
| --- |
| 6. [Training Environment](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_02) Score (1-9):       |
| **Strengths** *

**Weaknesses***
 |

# 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) |
| *
 |