

RAP Review Form

Grant Mechanism: Mentored Scientist Award Program in HIV/AIDS

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:

- General critique and summary of the proposal.
- Significance:** Does this study address an important problem applicable to the NIH HIV/AIDS research priorities? If the aims of the application are achieved, how will scientific knowledge or clinical practice be advanced? What will be the effect of these studies on the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field? If the aims of the project are achieved, how will the applicant's research career be enhanced?
- Approach:** Are the conceptual or clinical framework, design, methods, and analyses adequately developed, well integrated, well-reasoned and appropriate to the aims of the project? Does the applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative tactics? Are the administrative plans for the management of the research project appropriate, including plans for resolving conflicts? Is the research hypothesis-driven or hypothesis-generating?
- Innovation:** Is the project original and innovative? For example: Does the project challenge existing paradigms or clinical practice; address an innovative hypothesis or critical barrier to progress in the field? Does the project develop or employ novel concepts, approaches, methodologies, tools, or technologies for this area?
- Investigators:** Is the work proposed appropriate to the experience level of the applicant? How will this award enhance the applicant's career development? Do the letters of support document a strong commitment to helping the applicant develop his/her career?
- Environment:** Does the scientific environment(s) in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success? Do the proposed studies benefit from unique features of the scientific environment or subject populations, or employ useful collaborative arrangements? Is there evidence of institutional support?
- Future potential.** Is the research likely to lead to extramural funding?
- Research Mentor:** Is the mentor appropriate for the planned research activity? Have they indicated support for the submission (showing support for the application preparation) and committed to mentoring the applicant throughout the duration of the project? What is the continuing commitment of the UCSF faculty mentor to further develop the applicant's career and research interest?

9. (Non-Scoring Criteria) Any questions or concerns about the budget?
10. (Non-Scoring Criteria, If applicable) Adequacy of Plans for Protections of Human Subjects. Please note if the plans are acceptable and if not, please provide comments.

Confidential Comments

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