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): ...

Score System
Ratings are provided only in whole numbers, not decimals.
Note: scores 1-3 should represent no more than the top 30% of proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Very strong with only some minor weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Strong but with at least one moderate weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Some strengths but with at least one major weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>A few strengths and a few major weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.