Principal Investigator(s):

# Overall Impact

|  |
| --- |
| [Overall Impact](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_overall)  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. *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](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_01)  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? How will successful completion of the aims change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field? |
| **Strengths**      **Weaknesses** |

|  |
| --- |
| 2. [Investigator(s)](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_02)  Are the PD/PIs, collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project? If Early Stage Investigators or New Investigators, or in the early stages of independent careers, do they have appropriate experience and training? If established, have they demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s)? If the project is collaborative or multi-PD/PI, do the investigators have complementary and integrated expertise; are their leadership approach, governance and organizational structure appropriate for the project? |
| **Strengths**      **Weaknesses** |

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

|  |
| --- |
| 4. [Approach](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_04)  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?   If the project involves human subjects and/or NIH-defined clinical research, are the plans to address 1) the protection of human subjects from research risks, and 2) the inclusion (or exclusion) of individuals on the basis of sex/gender, race, and ethnicity, as well as the inclusion (exclusion) of children, justified in terms of the scientific goals and research strategy proposed? |
| **Strengths**      **Weaknesses** |

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

**Additional Review Criteria**

|  |
| --- |
| [Protections for Human Subjects](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_humans) |
| Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):      Data and Safety Monitoring Plan (Applicable for Clinical Trials Only):  Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable): |

|  |
| --- |
| [Inclusion of Women, Minorities and Children](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm#rpg_inclusion) **Applicable Only for Human Subjects research and not IRB Exemption #4.** |
| * Sex/Gender: * Race/Ethnicity: * Inclusion/Exclusion of Children under 21:   Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable): |

**Reviewer Scoring Guidelines**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Overall Impact or Criterion Strength | Score | Descriptor | Guidelines |
| High | 1 | Exceptional | * High importance or interest in the field * Many strengths * No weakness or some minor weakness |
| 2 | Outstanding |
| 3 | Excellent |
| Medium | 4 | Very Good | * High importance or interest in the field with at least one significant weakness * Moderate importance or interest in the field with no weakness or some minor weakness * At least one significant weakness * Demonstrates minimum competency |
| 5 | Good |
| 6 | Satisfactory |
| Low | 7 | Fair | * Low importance or interest in the field * Several significant weaknesses * Does not demonstrate minimum competency |
| 8 | Marginal |
| 9 | Poor |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Primary Review Criteria** |  | **High** | | |  | **Medium** | | |  | **Low** | | |
| A. | *Overall Impact* |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 1. | Significance |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 2. | Investigator |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 3. | Innovation |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 4. | Approach |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 5. | Environment |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Core Competencies** |  | **High** | | |  | **Medium** | | |  | **Low** | | |
| 1. | Demonstrated a critical review research in the area |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 2. | Demonstrated skill/knowledge of research design |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 3. | Demonstrated knowledge of appropriate measurement techniques, including quantitative and qualitative |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 4. | Demonstrated knowledge of appropriate statistical analysis techniques |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 5. | Demonstrated an ability to ground the proposal in an appropriate theory |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 6. | Demonstrated an ability to design an appropriate health behavior intervention |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 7. | Demonstrated knowledge of appropriate research ethics |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |

**Reviewer Scoring Form**

Please provide a score for the Overall Impact, each of the 5 additional Primary Review Criteria and each of the 7 Health Behavior Track Core Competencies.