**RPG/R01/R03/R21/R33/R34 Review**

Principal Investigator(s):

# 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.* 3 |
|  |

# 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.

|  |
| --- |
| **Significance.** Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field? Is there a strong scientific premise for the project? 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? |
| **Summary:**  **Strengths**      **Weaknesses** |

|  |
| --- |
| 4. **Approach.** Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Have the investigators presented strategies to ensure a robust and unbiased approach, as appropriate for the work proposed? 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? Have the investigators presented adequate plans to address relevant biological variables, such as sex, for studies in vertebrate animals or human subjects? Are statistics correctly and appropriately applied, including power analyses? |
| **Summary:**  **Strengths**  **Weaknesses** |
| **Writing Quality.** Is the proposal clearly and succinctly written? Is the hypothesis clearly articulated and are the aims well-defined? Etc. State what is good as well as the shortcomings of the proposal. |
| **Summary:**  **Strengths**  **Weaknesses** |