

MAGGIE E NEUMANN FUND

Review

Principal Investigator(s):

OVERALL IMPACT

Reviewers will provide an overall impact score to reflect their assessment of the likelihood for the project to exert a clear proof-of-concept for novel and potentially scalable approaches to improve the health and well-being of those with chronic disabilities, in consideration of the following five scored review criteria, and additional review criteria. Scoring will be on a 9-point scale where 1= Exceptional and 9= Poor. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major scientific impact.

Overall Impact Score [1-9]:

Write a paragraph summarizing the factors that informed your Overall Impact score.

SCORED REVIEW CRITERIA

Reviewers will consider each of the five review criteria below in the determination of scientific and technical merit, and give a separate score for each.

1. Significance score [1-9]:

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 the scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practices improve the health and/or quality of life for adults or children in Delaware with chronic disabilities? How will successful completion of the aims change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field?

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

2. [Investigator\(s\) and Environment \[1-9\]:](#)

Are the PD/PIs, collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project? If Post-Doc is the named PI, is a suitable mentor listed and mentoring plan briefly described? Do investigators have a demonstrated track-record working with the targeted community and relevant community/commercial partners? Is there an inclusive communication and governance plan? If the project is collaborative or multi-PD/PI, do the investigators have complementary and integrated expertise; are their leadership approach, governance, and organizational structure appropriate for the project, and sufficiently inclusive? Does the application have sufficient access to facilities and resources to carry out the proposal?

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

3. [Innovation \[1-9\]:](#)

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? Will the results of this study directly inform and support a larger subsequent grant application that will improve the health and/or quality of life for adults and/or children with disabilities in Delaware?

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

4. [Approach \[1-9\]:](#)

Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Are community partners sufficiently engaged? Is the study design justified and feasible? Is the sample size sufficient? Are the targeted population and study setting appropriate for the proposed research question(s)? Are the assessments validated and appropriate for the study population?

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

5. [Target Population-centeredness and stakeholder engagement \[1-9\]:](#)

Does the application include a description of how the outcomes are important to the target population? Is the engagement of relevant target groups and other stakeholders described? Are the strategies to include targeted communities appropriate to the study?

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

ADDITIONAL REVIEW CONSIDERATIONS

As applicable for the project proposed, reviewers will address each of the following items, but will not give scores for these items and should not consider them in providing an overall impact/priority score.

[Principal Investigator or Co-Investigator is a current faculty member of the College of Health Sciences](#)

Comments (if applicable):

-

[Letters of support are provided.](#)

Comments (if applicable):

-

[Budget is for 12-months, falls between \\$25,000 - \\$50,000, and meets requirements](#)

Comments (if applicable):

-

[Timeline](#)

Comments (if applicable):

-

Explanation of Scoring

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
<p>Non-numeric score options: NR = Not Recommended for Further Consideration, DF = Deferred, AB = Abstention, CF = Conflict, NP = Not Present, ND = Not Discussed</p>			
<p>Minor Weakness: An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact</p>			
<p>Moderate Weakness: A weakness that lessens impact</p>			
<p>Major Weakness: A weakness that severely limits impact</p>			

