

# ECD Global Alliance Grant Application Review

If you cannot access the hyperlinks below,  
visit <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm>.

Application #:

Principal Investigator(s):

Overall Score:

Reviewer:

Date Completed:

## OVERALL IMPACT

Reviewers will provide an overall impact score to reflect their assessment of the likelihood for the project to exert a sustained, powerful influence on the research field(s) involved, in consideration of the following five scored review criteria, and additional review criteria. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major scientific impact.

Overall Impact Write a paragraph summarizing the factors that informed your Overall Impact score.

## 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

#### Strengths

- 

#### Weaknesses

- 

### 2. Investigator(s)

#### Strengths

- 

#### Weaknesses

- 

### 3. Innovation

#### Strengths

- 

#### Weaknesses

-

4. <a href="#">Approach</a>
<b>Strengths</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <b>Weaknesses</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

5. <a href="#">Environment</a>
<b>Strengths</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> <b>Weaknesses</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

### ADDITIONAL REVIEW CRITERIA

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.

- Responses for Protections for Human Subjects, Vertebrate Animals, and Biohazards **are required for all applications**.
- A response for Inclusion of Women, Minorities and Children **is required** for applications proposing Human Subjects Research.

<a href="#">Protections for Human Subjects</a>
Click Here to Select Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul> Data and Safety Monitoring Plan (Applicable for Clinical Trials Only): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Click Here to Select</li> <li>Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<a href="#">Inclusion of Women, Minorities and Children</a> Applicable Only for Human Subjects Research
Click Here to Select Gender Code Click Here to Select Minority Code Click Here to Select Children Code Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>

[Vertebrate Animals](#)

Click Here to Select

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

- 

[Biohazards](#)

Click Here to Select

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

- 

[Resubmission](#)

Comments (if applicable):

- 

[Renewal](#)

Comments (if applicable):

- 

[Revision](#)

Comments (if applicable):

- 

### ADDITIONAL REVIEW CONSIDERATIONS

**As applicable** for the project proposed, reviewers will address each of the following items, but will not give scores for these items and should not consider them in providing an overall impact/priority score.

[Applications from Foreign Organizations](#)

Click Here to Select

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

- 

[Select Agents](#)

Click Here to Select

Comments (Required if Unacceptable):

-

[Resource Sharing Plans](#)

Click Here to Select

Comments (Required if Unacceptable):

- 

[Budget and Period of Support](#)

Click Here to Select

Recommended budget modifications or possible overlap identified:

- 

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO APPLICANT**

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

[Additional Comments to Applicant](#) (Optional)

-

## Scoring

The scoring system described below was modified from the NIH scoring criteria that can be found in its entirety at - [http://grants.nih.gov/Grants/peer\\_review\\_process.htm](http://grants.nih.gov/Grants/peer_review_process.htm). This information has been copied here for the sake of convenience.

Before the Application Review meeting, each reviewer and discussant assigned to an application will give a separate score for each of five review criteria (i.e., Significance, Investigator(s), Innovation, Approach, and Environment for research grants and cooperative agreements; see above). For all applications, even those not discussed by the full committee, the individual scores of the assigned reviewers and discussant(s) for these criteria are reported to the applicant.

In addition, each reviewer and discussant assigned to an application gives a preliminary overall impact/priority score for that application. The preliminary scores are used to determine which applications will be discussed in full. For each application that is discussed at the meeting, a final impact/priority score is given by each eligible committee member (without conflicts of interest) including the assigned reviewers. Each member's score reflects his/her evaluation of the overall impact that the project is likely to have on the research field(s) involved, rather than being a calculation of the reviewer's scores for each criterion.

The scoring system utilizes a 9-point rating scale (1 = exceptional; 9 = poor). The final overall impact/priority score for each discussed application is determined by calculating the mean score from all the eligible members' impact/priority scores, and multiplying the average by 10; the final overall impact/priority score is reported on the summary statement. Thus, the final overall impact/priority scores range from 10 (high impact) through 90 (low impact). Numerical impact/priority scores are not reported for applications that are not discussed (ND), which may be reported as \*.\* on the face page of the summary statement and typically rank in the bottom half of the applications.

An application may be designated Not Recommended for Further Consideration (NRFC) by the Grant Application Review Committee if it lacks significant and substantial merit; presents serious ethical problems in the protection of human subjects from research risks; or presents serious ethical problems in the use of vertebrate animals, biohazards, and/or select agents.

The following guidance has been given to reviewers to determine individual review criterion and overall impact/priority scores:

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>	<b>Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses</b>
High	1	Exceptional	Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses
	2	Outstanding	Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
	3	Excellent	Very strong with only some minor weaknesses
Medium	4	Very Good	Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses
	5	Good	Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
	6	Satisfactory	Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses
Low	7	Fair	Some strengths but with at least one major weakness
	8	Marginal	A few strengths and a few major weaknesses
	9	Poor	Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses
<p><b>Non-numeric score options:</b> NR = Not Recommended for Further Consideration, DF = Deferred, AB = Abstention, CF = Conflict, NP = Not Present, ND = Not Discussed</p>			
<p><b>Minor Weakness:</b> An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact  <b>Moderate Weakness:</b> A weakness that lessens impact  <b>Major Weakness:</b> A weakness that severely limits impact</p>			