

# Review Criteria

Reviewers score applications in terms of

- **Significance**

- Does the study address an important problem?
- How will it advance scientific knowledge?
- Reviewers need to be able to convey this to others less familiar with your research area.
- Write a specific sentence or two on this that the reviewer can lift for his/her review (This study is significant because.....)

# Review Criteria

## Approach

- Are the conceptual framework, design, methods, and analyses fully developed, well integrated, and appropriate to project goals?
- Does the application note potential problem areas and offer alternative tactics?

## Investigator

- Is the investigator appropriately trained and suited to carry out the project?
- Is the work appropriate to researchers' level of experience?
- Section C: Qualifications of PI and team: Write a summary paragraph for reviewer to lift. (The team is well-qualified to do this research based on.....)

# Review Criteria

## **Environment**

- Is the scientific environment where the project will take place conducive to success?
- Do proposed activities take advantage of the environment's unique features or employ

**Some Commonly Made  
Mistakes in a Grant Application**

# Methodology

- Underdeveloped application (lacks sufficient information/detail)
- Lack of pilot data –Does not apply to R03s
- State of the art methodology for survey data collection
  - Validated survey questions; alternatives to self-reported data; survey development/pilot testing (psychometrics); data collection, management, storage,
- Too many variables
- Unclear analytical plan

# Sampling & Participant Issues

- Exclusion of appropriate comparison or control groups
- Weak justification for inclusion of a study population
- Weaknesses in proposed sampling method (i.e. unclear if a sufficient sample size can be obtained given proposed sampling methods)
- Minority/women recruitment techniques not well explained
- Unclear sample characteristics
- Consent forms may not be appropriate for audiences (i.e. literacy level, language)
- High burden on subjects

# Qualitative Methods

- Doing better in reviews; check in with project officer about review panels
- Requires same level of detail in methodology (research aims, study design, data collection methods, analyses)
- <http://obssr.od.nih.gov/Documents/Publications/Qualitative.PDF> “Qualitative Methods in Health Research: Opportunities and Considerations in Application and Review”

# Theoretical Foundation

Theoretical assumptions that are not supported by current literature

Incorrect understanding or explanation of theories

Lack of clear theoretical framework

Outcome measures not clearly linked to theoretical framework

# PI/Investigator Qualifications

- Lack of demonstrated expertise in research area
- No staff members/co-investigators who can compensate for PI's lack of subject-area expertise
- Junior PI not properly supported by senior researchers
- No letters of recommendation from key partners or university officials

# Sloppiness

- Incomplete application
- Faulty citation procedures
- Poor overall presentation (i.e. irregular fonts, incomplete sentences)