

Applicant Name:

Project Title:

Mentor:

Reviewer:

Please score proposals using the NIH review criteria outlined at the end of the document.

Comments	
Consistency with Center Goals (1-9)	
<i>Comments</i>	
Significance (1-9):	
<i>Comments</i>	
Innovation (1-9)	
<i>Comments</i>	
Rigor (1-9)	
<i>Comments</i>	
Potential for Outside Funding (1-9)	

Comments	
<i>Comments</i>	
Budget (1-9)	
<i>Comments</i>	
Project Strengths	
Project Weaknesses	
Overall Project Comments & Feedback	
Overall Impact Score for Proposal (1-9)	

Scoring criteria available on the following pages.

Scoring Criteria

<p>Consistency with Center Goals (1-9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Development of sound scientific evidence on the nature, causes, and consequences of the opioid overdose epidemic</i> • <i>Prediction of emerging trends and future directions of the epidemic as it changes over time</i> • <i>Evaluation of evidence-based policies and programs to prevent opioid misuse, disorder and overdose</i> 	<p>1-3: directly aligned with one or more Center goals 4-6: moderately aligned with at least one Center goal 7-9: not aligned with Center goals</p>
<p>Significance (1-9)</p> <p><i>Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field? If the aims of the project are achieved, how will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved? How will successful completion of the aims change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field?</i></p>	<p>1-3: research will provide a major advancement to the field; problem is not being addressed adequately 4-6: incremental contribution to the field; problem has been insufficiently addressed to date 7-9: unlikely to move the field forward; problem is already being adequately addressed</p>
<p>Innovation (1-9)</p> <p><i>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?</i></p>	<p>1-3: novel or innovative approach 4-6: moderately novel approach 7-9: lacking novelty or originality</p>

<p>Rigor (1-9) <i>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?</i></p>	<p>1-3: strategy, methodology, and analyses are rigorous; high likelihood specific aims of the project will be accomplished 4-6: strategy, methodology, and analyses are moderately rigorous with some concerns 7-9: proposal lacks well-reasoned, rigorous strategy, methodology, and analyses; unlikely to adequately accomplish the specific aims of the project</p>
<p>Potential for Outside Funding (1-9)</p>	<p>1-3: highly likely to generate outside funding; priority area for outside funding sources; clear plan for future funding 4-6: potential to generate outside funding, but lacks a clear plan 7-9: unlikely to generate outside funding; not a priority area for outside funding sources</p>
<p>Budget (1-9)</p>	<p>1-3: very likely to complete project with budget provided 4-6: likely to complete project with budget provided 7-9: unlikely to complete project with budget provided</p>
<p>Overall Impact Score for Proposal (1-9)</p> <p>1 – Exceptional: Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses</p> <p>2 – Outstanding: Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses</p> <p>3 – Excellent: Very strong with only some minor weaknesses</p> <p>4 – Very Good: Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses</p>	

5 – Good: Strong but with at least one moderate weakness

6 – Satisfactory: Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses

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

Definitions

- Minor: easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen the impact of the project.
- Moderate: weakness that lessens the impact of the project.
- Major: weakness that severely limits the impact of the project.