RAP Review Form

Grant Mechanism: Independence Support Award

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) <u>These comments **WILL** be shared with the applicant.</u>

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?
3. Approach. Are methods, study design and analysis appropriate?
4. Innovation. Is the study original and innovative?
5. Investigator(s). Is the applicant(s) trained to do the studies? Does the applicant have a strong track record in research?
    a. Is there evidence of applicant having received an NIH career development program award or another extramural career development grant*?
    b. Is there evidence that their previous R01 (or equivalent) submission was not funded based on criticism of the research plan, e.g., a finding of insufficient preliminary data to support the hypothesis? The applicant should have provided the Summary Statement or Critique.
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 R01-type extramural funding?
    a. Has the applicant appropriately addressed the key research-based criticisms from the unfunded R01 (or equivalent) application, e.g., addressing critique of insufficient preliminary data to support the hypothesis?
    b. Has the applicant addressed how the Independence Support Award grant will improve the likelihood of funding success for the subsequent R01 (or equivalent) application?
    c. Is the proposed mentoring plan sufficient?
8. Any question or concern about the budget?

(*) Other foundation career development grants (e.g., American Cancer Society, American Heart Association, American Diabetes Associated, etc.) or a VA Career Development grant.

Confidential Comments
Please add any confidential comments or concerns about the application.
These comments **will NOT** be shared with the applicant.