

**Loma Linda University SPH Research Support Grant Committee  
Reviewer Report**

**PI:**

**Title:**

**Review Date:**

**Reviewer Name:**

**Brief summary of the principal goals**

**Significance**

How important is this work to basic science knowledge, potential clinical application (long term), or actual clinical application (more immediate) ? Does the study test a significant hypothesis? Is the rationale for the proposed hypotheses convincing? Are the specific aims clearly stated?

**Innovation**

Is the proposed work novel or innovative? Briefly describe. Is it a modest modification of previous research? This may be appropriate if the study involves a different way of testing an important hypothesis.

**Approach**

There are several points that can be considered to assess the rationale, logic and feasibility of the approach. Are the proposed procedures and analyses of the study clearly designed? Will the work adequately test the hypotheses? Is the proposal mostly descriptive? Have the investigators adequately explained what they are planning to do? Is the approach logical? Are appropriate statistical methods for analyzing the data adequately described? Are potential pitfalls discussed? Is the experimental plan or study design feasible? Are the investigators capable of doing the work? Are the facilities adequate?

**Other issues that should be considered in your score:**

- Is the proposal from a new investigator? This should improve the score but not necessarily if expertise is poor for important components of the proposal and collaborators or mentors are not involved.
- Does the proposal realistically involve a collaboration between teaching and research and clinical science investigators? The seed grant announcement suggested that this type of proposal is desirable. Is the collaboration convincing and significant to the aims?
- Does the PI have an active seed grant or did the PI have a seed grant in the last two years (BRSG or SMRSG)? If so, a two page progress report is required for each grant as described in the announcement. For grants that started just recently the PI just needs to say why the start was delayed.
- Are the previous related experience and productivity of the proposal's investigators adequate? If you can't tell from the proposal, determine whether, in your opinion, the investigators should be capable of doing the work. (Just a few sentences on this will be sufficient.)
- If the PI has an active seed grant from SOM or had seed grant funding awarded in 2003 or 2004, was significant progress made during the time the project was active? If the project from 2004 has not been activated yet, is there a valid reason? In your opinion, did progress on a previous seed grant provide data that is useful for developing an extramural grant proposal?

- Is the budget requested reasonable and justified? If you feel it is questionable, provide your reasons in your comments.
- Is a introduction in letter or in text provided that explains why this seed money application has potential for outside funding?

**Priority Score:**

Assign an overall score to the proposal based on your assessment of the proposal and all of the criteria presented here. Scores should be based on the NIH model 1.0 – 1.5 (outstanding), 1.5 – 2.0 (excellent), 2.0 – 2.5 (good), 2.5 – 3.0 (acceptable) and 3.0 – 5.0 (not competitive or unacceptable). Last year the mean and median score were 2.52 and 2.44.

**Other comments:**

Use this file as a template for making your review. More information about the reviewer committee meeting process is in the Reviewer Information document.

If you are an outside reviewer, not on the committee, thank you very much for your help. You do not need to review committee meeting. Just send you review by e-mail to

If you are a review committee member, please e-mail your reviews before the meeting if you can. Also, print your reviews and bring them to the meeting.