

ONS FOUNDATION RESEARCH CAREER DEVELOPMENT AWARD

REVIEWER COMMENT-SCORING FORM

(Adapted from NIH Review Criteria)

Proposal #: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

Title of Proposal: _____

PRIMARY REVIEW

SECONDARY REVIEW

COLLATERAL REVIEW

OVERALL IMPACT

Reviewers will provide an overall impact score to reflect their assessment of the likelihood for the career development award to exert a sustained, powerful influence on the research training of the Awardee to develop a program of research for each of the following 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 impact.

Overall Impact - After considering all of the review criteria, briefly summarize the significant strengths and weaknesses of the application and state the likelihood of the activities to exert a sustained powerful influence on the research training of the Awardee to develop a program of research. Be sure to provide sufficient information for the applicant to clearly understand the strengths and weaknesses that led to the overall score.	
Preliminary Score:	<i>(Score Needed)</i>
FINAL SCORE:	
Strengths	<i>(Please provide comments or state "None Noted")</i>
•	
Weaknesses	<i>(Please provide comments or state "None Noted")</i>
•	

SCORED REVIEW CRITERIA

Assigned 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 - Does the plan address an important problem in oncology and nursing care of people with cancer? If the aims of the are achieved, how will the Awardee's program of research develop and, if applicable, scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved? How will successful completion of the aims contribute to the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive cancer care?	
Score:	<i>(Score Needed)</i>
Strengths	<i>(Please provide comments or state "None Noted")</i>
•	
Weaknesses	<i>(Please provide comments or state "None Noted")</i>
•	

2. Investigator(s) - Are the PI and mentor(s) well suited to the project? Does the PI have a beginning track record and potential to develop a strong record of independent (extramural) research funding and publications and does the application address a critical piece of a planned change in direction or expansion of their existing program of research? Is the mentor a recognized expert in the area needed (do the expertise and accomplishments of the mentor fit the aims of the Awardee?). Is the mentor's area of expertise, e.g. instrument development and/or conceptual/theoretical expertise relevant to the aims and does the mentor provide other opportunities available to the Awardee, such as access to the mentor's laboratory, to a research sample, or existing database described? Does the mentor clearly describe how he/she will contribute and help the Awardee accomplish the specific aims?	
Score:	<i>(Score Needed)</i>
Strengths	<i>(Please provide comments or state "None Noted")</i>
•	
Weaknesses	<i>(Please provide comments or state "None Noted")</i>
•	

ONS FOUNDATION RESEARCH CAREER DEVELOPMENT AWARD

REVIEWER COMMENT-SCORING FORM

3. Innovation - Does the application describe how the aims will challenge and seek to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms by learning and applying novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions?	
Score:	(Score Needed)
Strengths	(Please provide comments or state "None Noted")
•	
Weaknesses	(Please provide comments or state "None Noted")
•	

4. Approach – Does the abstract and the body of the narrative (3 pages) fully and clearly describe the purpose/specific aims of the research career development plan, expected outcomes, background and future directions? Does the application include a well-defined educational/training component? Is the educational/training component central to the development of the Awardee? Does the application include how the aims will be evaluated? Do the aims build on prior training, past accomplishments and future directions of the Awardee? Is the timeline realistic for the accomplishment of the aims?	
Score:	(Score Needed)
Strengths	(Please provide comments or state "None Noted")
•	
Weaknesses	(Please provide comments or state "None Noted")
•	

5. Environment - Will the scientific environment in which the career development activities will be done contribute to the probability of success? Are the institutional support, equipment and other physical resources available to the Awardee adequate? Will the awardee benefit from unique features of the scientific environment, subject populations, or collaborative arrangements?	
Score:	(Score Needed)
Strengths	(Please provide comments or state "None Noted")
•	
Weaknesses	(Please provide comments or state "None Noted")
•	

ADDITIONAL REVIEW CRITERIA

As applicable for the activities/research training proposed, reviewers will consider the following additional items in the determination, but will not give a separate score for these items, as they are not part of the scientific review. No budget matters should be listed in the above scored criteria. Budget matters should NOT be discussed during the review until after final scoring has been completed. At that point the Chair will ask if there are any concerns about the budget.

Protections for Human Subjects –If applicable, did the application describe how informed consent will be obtained and the steps taken to protect participants' rights or the welfare of animals? Did the application identify any potential risks associated with participation in the project? Is there a data safety and monitoring plan?		
	(Comments Required if <u>Not Appropriate</u> is checked)	
<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Appropriate	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
Comments:		
Data and Safety Monitoring Plan (Comments Required if <u>Not Appropriate</u> is checked)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Appropriate	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable
Comments:		

Budget and Period of Support – Is the budget and the requested period of support fully justified and reasonable in relation to the proposed activities. For more details, please see <i>Budget Information</i> .	
Recommended budget modifications or possible overlap identification	(Provide comments or state "Adequate")
<input type="checkbox"/> Adequate	
Comments:	

ONS FOUNDATION RESEARCH CAREER DEVELOPMENT AWARD

REVIEWER COMMENT-SCORING FORM

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO APPLICANT

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

Additional Comments to Applicant (Optional) – Please provide any additional guidance to the applicant or recommend against resubmission without fundamental revision.

•

IMPACT SCORE CRITERIA			
Impact	Score	Descriptor	Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses
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

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