

# Resource Allocation Program

A collaborative effort among UCSF funding agencies



## RAP Review Form

Cycle:

Applicant Name: ...

Proposal Title: ...

Grant Mechanism: **Research on Secondhand Tobacco Smoke**

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    |
| <b>Minor Weakness:</b> An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact<br><b>Moderate Weakness:</b> A weakness that lessens impact<br><b>Major Weakness:</b> 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?
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?
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.