**Indiana Traumatic Spinal Cord and Brain Injury Research Fund (ITSCBIRF)**

Review Template

Principal Investigator(s):       Title of application:

**SUMMARY**

Provide a brief summary of the proposal.

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

**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, significant new IP, or improved clinical outcomes, in consideration of the following five scored review criteria. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major impact. The overall impact of early commercialization projects must demonstrate a clear rationale to address unmet clinical need, innovation, scientific rigor and strong likelihood of successful commercialization.

Priority should be given to studies that will ultimately lead to new translational research or development of a new product. Both new and established investigators should be considered. Examples of studies that may significantly impact the outcomes of the ISCBIRF program include:

* 1. Pilot work with a strong potential for further development and federal funding (including SBIR/STTR grants) (or IP) or private investment.
  2. Well-designed innovative studies, basic or applied
  3. Studies with a strong potential to translate into practice in the near term (< 5 years)
  4. Studies focused on improving the lives of individuals with spinal cord and/or brain injury
  5. Development of new products that address unmet medical needs in the field

|  |
| --- |
| [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.

For evaluation of early commercialization grant applications, the following NIH guidance on review critiques should be used: <https://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/sbir-sttr.htm>

|  |
| --- |
| 1. [Significance](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_01) Score (1-9):  For basic science / clinical projects consider: Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field? If the aims of the project are achieved, how will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved?  For early commercialization projects consider: Is there a significant unmet need for the product or technology? How will successful development of the product change the traumatic spinal cord or brain injury field? Does the envisioned product have commercial potential for a marketed product? How will the proposed research enable the company or researcher to further develop the product and secure future funding (grants, private investment). |
| **Strengths**      **Weaknesses** |

|  |
| --- |
| 2. [Investigator(s)](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_02) Score (1-9):  For basic science / clinical projects consider: Are the PD/PIs, collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project? If early stage investigators or junior faculty, do they have appropriate experience and training? If established, have they demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s)? Do the investigators have complementary and integrated expertise; are their leadership approach, governance and organizational structure appropriate for the project and collaboration?  For early commercialization projects consider: Does the team have the needed technical and commercial expertise? Does the team have prior accomplishments in the product area? Does the team’s experience provide confidence in their ability to develop and commercialize the proposed product? |
| **Strengths**      **Weaknesses** |

|  |
| --- |
| 3. [Innovation](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_03) Score (1-9):  For basic science / clinical projects consider: Does the application challenge and seek to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilizing novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions? Are the concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions novel to one field of research or novel in a broad sense? Is a refinement, improvement, or new application of theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions proposed?  For early commercialization projects consider: Will the envisioned product be unique or an improvement to a current product? (e.g. how does it fit within the current market structure?)**.**  Product improvements may be innovative if the innovation leads to new capabilities not currently available. |
| **Strengths**      **Weaknesses** |

|  |
| --- |
| 4. [Approach](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_04) Score (1-9):  For all projects consider: Are the overall strategy, methodology, 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?  For early commercialization projects consider: Are the critical success factors for development of the new product including the time frame required for successful commercialization of the envisioned product described adequately? |
| **Strengths**      **Weaknesses** |

|  |
| --- |
| 5. [Environment](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_05) Score (1-9):  For basic science / clinical projects consider: 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?  For early commercialization projects consider: Are the resources (e.g., facilities and equipment, management, collaborators) in place to assure the project’s success? Has the founding team participated in a university or federally sponsored commercialization program (e.g., I-Corps, Notre Dame Commercialization Engine, IU Quarry, Purdue Foundry)? [Note this criterion is not intended as an assessment of the eligibility of the company] |
| **Strengths**      **Weaknesses** |

# Other Criteria (not scored)

As applicable for the project proposed, reviewers will consider **the following additional items 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.

|  |
| --- |
| Adherence to ISCBIRF Application Guidelines |
| Comments: |

|  |
| --- |
| [Budget and Period of Support](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_budget) (Recommended budget modifications or possible overlap identified) Is any travel requested well-justified? |
| Comments (if applicable): |

|  |
| --- |
| [Protections for Human Subjects](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_humans) |
| Comments (if applicable): |

|  |
| --- |
| [Vertebrate Animals](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_animals) |
| Comments (if applicable): |

|  |
| --- |
| [Biohazards](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_biohazards) |
| Comments (if 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) |
|  |