FY2017-2018 James and Esther King Biomedical Research Program Peer Review Rating Sheet

Instructions:

- Enter evaluations in PeerNet using this document as a reference.
- Evaluate each application as compared to the evaluation criteria. Provide narrative comments to fully support your rating. Describe the application's strengths and weaknesses with enough detail for the Department to make funding decisions as well as to debrief the applicant.
- Provide comments for both panels in PeerNet:
    - Core Criteria panel – in addition to comments on strengths and weaknesses, provide a separate score for each criterion, and an overall impact score. The overall impact score assigned will consider the six core review criteria as well as the additional review criteria, but it is not a calculation of individual scores.
    - Additional Considerations panel – in addition to comments on strengths and weaknesses provide a rating for each criterion.
- Below rating scale, using whole numbers only, will apply to all scored review criteria.

Impact	***Score***	***Descriptor***	***Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses***
High	*1*	*Exceptional*	*Exceptionally strong and essentially no weaknesses*
	2	*Outstanding*	*Extremely strong and negligible weaknesses*
	3	*Excellent*	*Very strong and only some minor weaknesses*
Medium	*4*	*Very Good*	*Strong and numerous minor weaknesses*
	5	*Good*	*Strong and at least one moderate weakness*
	6	*Satisfactory*	*Some strengths and some moderate weaknesses*
Low	*7*	*Fair*	*Some strengths and 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*

CORE REVIEW CRITERIA

Each of the six review criteria below are considered in the determination of the overall impact. A separate score is also give for each criterion.

Significance: Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field? If the aims of the project are achieved, to what extent will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved? How much will successful completion of the aims change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field?

Rating: [1 to 9]

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Investigator(s): Are the PI, collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project? Have they demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s)? If the project is collaborative, do the investigators have complementary and integrated expertise; are their leadership approach, governance, and organizational structure appropriate for the project?

Rating: [1 to 9]

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Innovation: Does the application challenge and seek to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilizing novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions? Are the concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions novel to one field of research or novel in a broad sense? Is a refinement, improvement, or new application of theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions proposed?

Rating: [1 to 9]

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Approach: Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented? If the project is in the early stages of development, will the strategy establish feasibility and will particularly risky aspects be managed?

Rating: [1 to 9]

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Environment: Will the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success? Are the institutional support, equipment, and other physical resources available to the investigators adequate for the project proposed? Will the project benefit from unique features of the scientific environment, subject populations, or collaborative arrangements?

Rating: [1 to 9]

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Health Impact: Applicants must describe how the proposed project impacts the health of Floridians. Health impact means the ability of the research to reduce morbidity and mortality from tobacco-related diseases or cancer. Evaluate the researcher's proposed research plan and their description of how the results of the research can provide information and evidence for changes in policy, or improve health service delivery and quality of care, and improve disease prevention through improvements in health literacy and changes in behavior within a certain amount of time.

Consider possible immediate and long-range effects of applying knowledge gained in the research and the ability of the research to support future research grant applications, publications, or patents as a health impact that may result from the research.

How well does the proposed research project impact the health of Floridians?

Rating: [1 to 9]

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

OVERALL IMPACT

Please provide an overall impact score to reflect your assessment of the likelihood for the project to exert a sustained, powerful influence on the research field(s) involved, in consideration of the six core review criteria and the additional review criteria described below. Briefly summarize the most important points of your critique, indicating the relative importance of the major strengths and weaknesses of the application.

Rating: [1 to 9]

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

ADDITIONAL REVIEW CRITERIA

The following additional items will be factored into the determination of an overall impact score, as appropriate.

Protections for Human Subjects: For research that involves human subjects, evaluate the justification for involvement of human subjects and the proposed protections from research risk relating to their participation according to the following five review criteria: 1) risk to subjects, 2) adequacy of protection against risks, 3) potential benefits to the subjects and others, 4) importance of the knowledge to be gained, and 5) data and safety monitoring for clinical trials.

a) Acceptable Risks and/or Adequate Protections
b) Unacceptable Risks and/or Inadequate Protections
c) Not Applicable (No human subjects)

Description of any concerns and recommendations:

Vertebrate Animals: For research that involves live vertebrate animals, consider the following five points: 1) proposed use of the animals, and species, strains, ages, sex, and numbers to be used; 2) justifications for the use of animals and for the appropriateness of the species and numbers proposed; 3) adequacy of living conditions and veterinary care; 4) procedures for limiting discomfort, distress, pain and injury to that which is unavoidable in the conduct of scientifically sound research including the use of analgesic, anesthetic, and tranquilizing drugs and/or comfortable restraining devices; and 5) methods of euthanasia.

a) Acceptable Risks and/or Adequate Protections
b) Unacceptable Risks and/or Inadequate Protections
c) Not Applicable

Description of any concerns and recommendations:

Budget and Period of Support: Are the budget and the requested period of support fully justified and reasonable in relation to the proposed research?

a) Recommend as Requested

b) Budget Modification Requested (in amount or time)

Recommended modifications (if any):

Scientific or Budget Overlap: Overlap, whether scientific or financial, or commitment of an individual's effort greater than 100 percent is not permitted. The goals in identifying and eliminating overlap are to ensure that sufficient and appropriate levels of effort are committed to the project; that there is no duplication of funding for scientific aims, specific budgetary items, or an individual's level of effort; and that funds not otherwise necessary to conduct the approved project are not included in the award.

a) No Overlap Concerns Identified

b) Potential Overlap Identified (changes or investigation needed)

Description of any concerns and recommendations for follow-up and/or modifications:

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS OR OTHER COMMENTS

Beyond the items already addressed, is there any additional advice you are willing to offer the applicant?

ADDITIONAL REVIEW CONSIDERATIONS

Separately from the overall impact score, peer reviewers will rate the following items.

Tobacco Relatedness: All applicants must clearly demonstrate how the proposed project is relevant to cancer. Biomedical and biotechnological research must address the etiology, pathogenesis, prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and/or cure of cancer. Social scientific and behavioral proposals must address the development, implementation, and/or evaluation of existing or novel approaches to cancer prevention, diagnosis, or treatment. Proposed projects must demonstrate a close relationship with advancing progress toward cures for cancer or endeavor to dramatically improve cancer morbidity and mortality. Has the applicant made a compelling case for a strong cancer relationship?

Rating: [1 to 9]

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Infrastructure (if applicable): Applicants must describe how the proposed infrastructure improvements, where practical, will be made available to and used by researchers throughout the state. Priority will be given to projects that demonstrate institutional collaboration in the pursuit of a research question or development of infrastructure. The proposed project must describe:

• A plan for providing access to the funded infrastructure.

• A scientific advisory process involving researchers from at least two of the major cancer centers in the state, and at least two regional cancer centers.

• A community advisory process that represents the perspective of participants in research, with particular focus on the perspectives of underserved and minority populations and communities that historically lack trust in research.

Applications may include support to address ethical, legal, and social issues in the research.

How well does the proposed research project improve sustainable infrastructure/resources for Florida?

Rating: [1 to 9]

Strengths:

Weaknesses: