Instructions for Completing MRC Peer Review Evaluation

Below are instructions for assessing proposals in each of the categories listed on the Merit Review Committee Peer Review Evaluation form. Instructions have been italicized. The format here is the same as that on the form. Please use narrative form throughout your review.

PROPOSAL NUMBER:
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:
TITLE OF PROPOSAL:
REVIEW DATE:
PRIMARY/SECONDARY REVIEWER

ABSTRACT  The abstract from the proposal can be inserted by VPR from the application, or you may type in a modified version if you wish.

EVALUATION
Scientific and technical merit:  First assess the strengths and then the weaknesses of the proposal for each of the following factors. In each case, address originality as well as scientific and technical merit.

• Clarity and completeness of presentation
• Adequacy of background information
• Adequacy and appropriateness of approach
• Feasibility of approach
• Clarity of hypotheses
• Clarity of specific aims
• Research design and methodology
• Relevance of work to state of the art in its field

Qualifications, expertise and research experience of the principal investigator and staff:  You must include specific evaluation of each investigator who plays a key role in the proposed research. Please include information relevant to the ability of the team to conduct the research as proposed: training, experience and background; familiarity with the literature, relevant research, and research methodologies; publication record and productivity; and overall ability to conduct the research effectively.
Availability of institutional resources: Assess the suitability of the facilities available to conduct the proposed research, including but not exclusively equipment, space, computers and library resources.

Relevance to human health problems: Address both strengths and weaknesses.

Reasonableness of the proposed budget and duration of the project relative to the proposed research: Please be specific in recommending modifications and include justifications for your recommendations.

SUMMARY

Synopsis: In your own words, present a brief overview of the work proposed.

Strengths and weaknesses: In bullet format, list first the proposal's strengths and then its weaknesses. List as many as you think are appropriate.

Strengths
•
•

Weaknesses
•
•

Conclusions: Summarize your conclusions from your review of this protocol.

RECOMMENDATION: Indicate whether you think the proposal should be approved for funding, approved with minor modifications, resubmitted after major modification, deferred, or disapproved. If you recommend approval, indicate your level of enthusiasm for the proposal, using one of the following terms:

Outstanding (1.0-1.4)
Excellent (1.5-1.9)
Very good (2.0-2.4)
Good (2.5-3.4)
Acceptable (3.5-5.0)