

Resource Allocation Program

A collaborative effort among UCSF funding agencies



RAP Review Form

Cycle:

Applicant Name: ...

Proposal Title: ...

Grant Mechanism: **Alzheimer Disease Research Center (ADRC) Developmental Projects**

Review Committee: ...

Reviewer's Name: ...

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

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 Alzheimer's disease and related disorders (ADRD)?
3. Approach. Are methods, study design and analysis appropriate? Pilot study designs are appropriate, but upon completion of the project the recipient is expected to have used the award to develop their research program adequately to be in a position to obtain NIH-level research funding and further solidify their career trajectory in the ADRD domain, thus the approach should be designed to yield this outcome.

4. Innovation. Is the study original and innovative? This award is intended to provide adequate funding to establish a new line of investigation, such as a pilot study, a new approach, or the initial data collection or analysis required to promote an innovative hypothesis, thus innovation is a key criterion.
5. Investigator(s). Is the applicant(s) trained to do the studies? This award is targeted to early career researchers. Fellows, Instructors, and Assistant level faculty are eligible.
6. Environment/Departmental support. Is appropriate support available from department? Does the applicant(s) have access to the necessary tools?
7. Future potential. Is the research likely to lead to extramural funding?
8. 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.