SCIENTIFIC MERIT & IMPACT SCORE

CRITIQUE: Discuss and evaluate the **scientific merit** of the research design, approaches and methodology. Areas and questions to address include:

- How logical are the hypotheses/aims?
- The validity and adequacy of the approach;
- The feasibility of the procedures;
- How adequately are potential difficulties and/or limitations addressed?
- The sufficiency and appropriateness of controls;
- How well are potential confounds to the study accounted for?
- The adequacy of the sample size;
- What is the significance of the proposed study relative to the state of the science?
- If applicable, how will the proposed study provide information required to develop a larger study?
- How can the study be improved?

RELEVANCE TO CF RESEARCH: How does this application address an important question that is relevant to CF clinical research or clinical management? Comment on the impact this project will have on CF research.

QUALIFICATIONS OF THE APPLICANT(S): Discuss and evaluate the background, experience and qualifications of the applicant and key investigators, with particular reference to the applicant's competency and depth as an independent investigator, leadership qualities, and evidence of his/her intention and ability to carry out clinical research that is related to CF for several years.

ADEQUACY OF EFFORT: Discuss and evaluate the time commitments of the investigator(s) and other collaborative personnel relative to conducting and/or supervising the study.

RESOURCES AND EQUIPMENT: Discuss and evaluate the facilities, resources, and patient sample at the disposal of the investigator.

ETHICAL ISSUES AND INSTITUTIONAL COMMITMENT: Discuss the inclusion of letters of support, human subject approval, release forms and other institutional needs for this project. If the proposal places human subjects at risk, are the risks reasonable relative to the expected benefits?

BUDGET: Evaluate the budget relative to the research plan. Identify any items in each of the budget years that should be deleted or adjusted and provide the basis for this recommendation.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS. Comment on any additional issues that may require further information.

RECOMMENDATION: Summarize the overall strengths and weaknesses of this application and present reasons for approval or disapproval. If recommending revisions, please provide specific suggestions for improvement and/or note what additional information may be required.

SCIENTIFIC MERIT & IMPACT

Study Proposal: _____

Reviewer Name: _____   **Reviewer Institution:** _____

SCORE the application on its **SCIENTIFIC MERIT and IMPACT** based on the following scale:
Use the guidelines for scoring on the following pages. Consider whether the applicant has outside funding for the proposed project or if they require C3 funding.

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 weakness
	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
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			

SCIENTIFIC MERIT: _____   **IMPACT:** _____

☐ **Vote to Approve**

☐ **Vote to Approve with Condition**

☐ **Vote to Disapprove for Reasons Cited:**
  ☐ Poor rationale
  ☐ Marginal addition to knowledge base
  ☐ Design poorly specified
  ☐ Methodology insufficient, not likely to succeed
  ☐ Data can be obtained from other sources
  ☐ Samples can be obtained from other sources
  ☐ Other (specify):

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____