**Grant Proposal Review Guidelines**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Impact** | **Score** | **Descriptor** | **Additional Guidance** |
| High | 1 | Exceptional | Essentially no weaknesses |
| 2 | Outstanding | Negligible weaknesses |
| 3 | Excellent | At least a few minor weaknesses |
| Medium | 4 | Very Good | Numerous minor weaknesses |
| 5 | Good | At least one moderate weakness |
| 6 | Satisfactory | At least a few moderate weaknesses |
| Low | 7 | Fair | At least one major weakness |
| 8 | Marginal | At least a few major weaknesses |
| 9 | Poor | Numerous major weaknesses |

Definitions:

1. Minor weakness: easily addressable and does not lessen impact or validity

2. Moderate weakness: lessens impact or validity

3. Major weakness: severely limits impact or validity

Scoring:

The lower the score the stronger the proposal. The sum of the 5 categories minus the bonus points (≤5 points) will be the total score. Total scores can be 0 – 45 points.

Categories:

**A. Overall Impact**

1. Is it scientifically compelling?

2. Is it likely to change clinical practice- diagnosis, treatment, treatment monitoring, or prevention?

3. Are there clear plans to disseminate data?

4. Could it lead to a marketable product?

**B. Clinical Significance**

1. Does it address an important clinical problem or challenge?

2. Will it improve outcomes or clinical practice efficiency?

3. Could it lead to further research or external funding?

**C. Investigators & Environment**

1. Have the investigators collaborated with, or served on SAB of, MVD?

2. Will it provide useful experience/training for a young investigator   
 (junior faculty, house-officer, student)

3. Do the investigators have appropriate training and experience to successfully   
 complete the project?

4. Have the investigators demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments?

5. Are there institutional support, facilities, and equipment to successfully complete the project?

**D. Innovation**

1. Could it lead to a paradigm shift in the current understanding pathophysiology   
 or clinical practice?

2. Are the concepts, methodologies, technologies, or interventions novel?

3. Could the findings be applicable to other fields?

4. Could the findings lead to a new or improved MVD test/service?

**E. Study Design**

1. Is the study internally and externally valid?

2. Are the inclusion/exclusion criteria appropriate?

3. Is there a control group and blinding?

4. Are the statistical analyses including power analysis appropriate?

5. Are the descriptions for challenges and plans for mitigation adequate?

6. Did the client consent form adequately describe risks of study inclusion?

**F. Bonus** (optional)

1. Are there factors not captured in the above 5 categories that make it an exceptionally   
 strong proposal? (up to 5 points)