

Resource Allocation Program

A collaborative effort among UCSF funding agencies



RAP Review Form **Global Cancer Pilot Award Proposals**

Cycle:

Applicant Name: ...

Proposal Title: ...

Grant Mechanism: Global Cancer Pilot Award

Review Committee: ...

Reviewer's Name: ...

Overall Score (from 1 to 9, whole number only): ...

Scoring System

Ratings are provided only in whole numbers, not decimals.

Note: scores 1-3 should represent no more than the top 30% of proposals.

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 weaknesses
	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			

General Review (Please provide a one-page review) These comments **WILL** be shared with the applicant.

Please include comments for each of the following sections:

1. General critique and summary of the proposal.
2. Significance. Does the study address an important problem related to reducing the global cancer burden in a low or middle-income country (LMIC, list found here: <http://data.worldbank.org/income-level/low-and-middle-income>)?
3. Feasibility. Is there a letter demonstrating clear support from a collaborating LMIC institution? Does the UCSF researcher have an existing relationship at the institution? Any concerns about the partnership?
4. Approach. Are methods, study design and analysis appropriate?

5. Innovation. Is the study original and innovative within the context of working in an LMIC?
6. Investigator(s). Is the applicant(s) trained to do the studies? Does the applicant have a strong track record in research? If an investigator is a resident, post-doc, or clinical fellow, is there a credible mentorship plan?
7. Environment/Departmental support. Is appropriate support available from department? This should include time away from clinical duties for any planned travel to LMIC? Does the applicant(s) have access to the necessary tools at UCSF and the LMIC institute?
8. Future potential. Is the research likely to lead to extramural funding for work in an LMIC?
9. Additional consideration: multi-disciplinary (preferred but not required). Is there a feasible combination of multiple disciplines? (Multiple disciplines can be combined within UCSF or through the UCSF-LMIC collaboration).
10. Any question or concern about the budget?

Confidential Comments

Please add any confidential comments or concerns about the application.

These comments **will NOT** be shared with the applicant.