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Preliminary Scoring Guidance:

TIMELY REVIEW
Reviewers use this scoring template when rating each assigned application. PLEASE RETURN YOUR REVIEW(S) AS SOON AS POSSIBLE, AND BY THE REQUESTED DUE DATE (which varies).

Because the Research Division has a limited time to conduct the review process—which includes distribution and collection of 125+ individual reviews—a Peer Reviewer’s failure to submit reviews will automatically trigger an administrative decision to triage an application.

RATING SCALE
When rating the core criteria and the application’s impact/priority, reviewers should use the FULL RANGE of the rating scale to discriminate among applications. An application does not need to be strong in all categories in order to be judged as likely to have a major impact. The impact/priority score should reflect an overall evaluation, rather than a weighted average of the core criteria.

SCALE: All scores are on a 9-point rating scale, with 1 = Very High and 9 = Very Low.

1 VERY HIGH
2
3 SOMEWHAT HIGH
4
5 MODERATE
6
7 SOMEWHAT LOW
8
9 VERY LOW

A score of 1 denotes an exceptionally strong application (or exceptionally strong Significance, Investigators, Innovation, Approach) with essentially no weaknesses. A score of 9 denotes serious and substantive weaknesses with very little strength. For each criterion rating, the strengths and weaknesses within that review criterion should be considered. In determining the rating, reviewers should consider not only the relative number of strengths and weaknesses noted, but also the importance of these strengths and weaknesses to the criteria or to the overall impact when determining a score. For the impact/priority score rating, strengths and weaknesses across all of the review criteria should be considered.

EXAMPLES:
[Example 1] A major strength may outweigh several minor and correctable weaknesses.

[Example 2] Similarly, each review criterion may be weighted differently for each application, depending on how important each review criterion is to the proposed project. A reviewer may give only moderate scores to some of the review criteria, but still give a high overall impact/priority score because the review criterion critically important to the work is rated highly.

[Example 3] A reviewer could give mostly high criterion ratings but rate the overall impact/priority score lower, because the criterion critically important to the work being proposed is not highly rated.

**NEXT STEPS**

Only when significant reviewer disagreement exists across impact scores, meetings will be held to discuss applications.
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**Administrative Project Director/Principal Investigator (PD/PI) Name**

Only one administrative PD/PI can be named.

**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 field(s) involved, 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 scholarly impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERALL IMPACT - COMMENTS**

Include specific STRENGTHS and WEAKNESSES to support your rating above.
**SIGNIFICANCE** *

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/scholarly knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

VERY HIGH  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○  VERY LOW

**SIGNIFICANCE - COMMENTS** *

Include specific STRENGTHS and WEAKNESSES to support your rating above.

INVESTIGATOR(S) *

Are the PD/PIs, collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project? If Early Stage Investigators or New Investigators, do they have appropriate experience and training? If established, have they demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s)?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

VERY HIGH  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○  VERY LOW

**INVESTIGATOR(S) - COMMENTS** *

Include specific STRENGTHS and WEAKNESSES to support your rating above.

INNOVATION *

Does the application challenge and seek to shift current research, other scholarly activities, or clinical practice paradigms by utilizing novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

VERY HIGH  ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○  VERY LOW

**INNOVATION - COMMENTS** *

Include specific STRENGTHS and WEAKNESSES to support your rating above.
**APPROACH**

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?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

VERY HIGH ◼ ◼ ◼ ◼ ◼ ◼ ◼ ◼ VERY LOW

**APPROACH - COMMENTS**

Include specific STRENGTHS and WEAKNESSES to support your rating above.

**BUDGET ALIGNMENT**

As a reviewer with expertise in your field, please give your opinion of whether the budget as proposed is appropriately justified. YOUR ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION SHOULD IN NO WAY INFLUENCE SCORING; IT IS INTENDED TO ASSIST THE RESEARCH DIVISION IN DISCERNING WHETHER A BUDGET REVISION WOULD BE RECOMMENDED PRIOR TO AWARDDING FUNDS.
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