Principal Investigator(s):

BACKGROUND & INSTRUCTIONS

A "limited submission" refers to a grant program that places a limitation on the number of proposal applications a single eligible entity can submit each cycle. The University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA) has a process in place to allow for an internal competition among interested PIs to determine which application(s) will move forward. Once a limited submission opportunity is identified, an internal call for pre-proposals is sent out to potential PIs. Those interested in being considered for full submission are required to submit a pre-proposal by a specified date. If more applications are received than the institution is allowed to submit to the sponsor, the applications are moved forward to a peer review process in order to make final selection(s).

That peer review process is what you are taking part in now. While we do want you to be aware that the proposals you review here are *not* finalized and will be expanded before they are submitted to the sponsor, we ask that you be as critical in your review as you would be if these applications were moving forward to a sponsor now. We are especially interested in your feedback on weaknesses of the applications and where improvements can be made either before they move forward through submission to this program or others.

If you are reviewing more than one application for this same program, we ask that you use the applications as a reference for one another in your scoring, knowing that the pool will be ranked based on scores received to determine which move(s) forward to the sponsor.



SCORING

Selection of applications to be submitted to the **CPRIT High-Impact/High-Risk (HIHR) Research Awards** will be based on a 5-point scoring scale for criteria given below.

No. of applications allowed per institution this cycle: 5

- Ratings should be given in whole numbers (no decimals).
- Reviewers should consider not only the relative number of strengths and weaknesses, but also the importance of these strengths and weaknesses to the criteria or to the overall impact when determining a score.
 - For example, a major strength may outweigh many minor and correctable weaknesses

Minor weakness: easily addressable weakness, does not substantially

lessen impact

Moderate weakness: lessens impact **Major weakness**: Severely limits impact

SCORING RUBRIC

Score	Description
1	Inadequate – No evidence or information provided
2	Weak – Minimal evidence; limited potential; vague; weak concepts; limited likelihood of success; limited in innovative thinking; lacks sufficient information
3	Marginal – Some evidence; partially developed concepts; some potential for effectiveness and success; some inconsistencies; needs work; some innovation present; requires additional information/clarification
4	Good – Convincing concepts with enough examples of evidence to indicate a good chance for success; clear and complete; innovative
5	Exemplary – Excellent concepts; exceptional evidence; well-thought out with an extremely high likelihood of success; exemplary; highly innovative

SCORED REVIEW CRITERIA



Please consider each of the review criteria below in the determination of merit, and give a separate score for each, based on the rubric above.

Below, please summarize the factors that informed your individual criteria scores:

1. Significance and Impact

Is the application clearly responsive to the RFA and specifically to the HIHR Research Award mechanism? What is the innovative potential of the project? Does the applicant propose new paradigms or challenge existing ones? Does the project develop state-of-the-art technologies, methods, tools, or resources for cancer research or address important underexplored or unexplored areas? If the research project is successful, will it lead to truly substantial advances in the field rather than add modest increments of insight? Responsive applications will be highly speculative or exploratory; they need not be based on preliminary data but must have the potential for high scientific payoff because of exceptionally promising ideas.

Strengths: Click here to enter text.

Weaknesses: Click here to enter text.

2. Research Plan

Is the proposed work presented as a self-contained research project? Does the proposed research have a clearly defined hypothesis or goal that is supported by a sound scientific rationale? Are the methods appropriate, and are potential experimental obstacles and unexpected results discussed?

Strengths: Click here to enter text.

Weaknesses: Click here to enter text.

3. Applicant Investigator

Does the applicant investigator demonstrate the required creativity, expertise, experience, and accomplishments to make a significant contribution to the research? Applicants' credentials will be evaluated in a career stage—specific fashion. Have early-career-stage investigators received excellent training, and do their accomplishments to date offer great promise for a successful career? Has the applicant devoted a sufficient amount of his or her time (percent effort) to this project?

Strengths: Click here to enter text.



Weaknesses: Click here to enter text.		

4. Relevance

Does the proposed research have a high degree of relevance to cancer? This will be an important criterion for evaluation of projects for CPRIT support.

Strengths: Click here to enter text.

Weaknesses: Click here to enter text.

5. Research Environment

Does the research team have the needed expertise, facilities, and resources to accomplish all aspects of the proposed research? Are the levels of effort of the key personnel appropriate? Is there evidence of institutional support of the research team and the project?

Strengths: Click here to enter text.

Weaknesses: Click here to enter text.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO APPLICANT

Reviewers may provide guidance to the applicant or recommend against submission without fundamental revision.

Additional Comments to Applicants (Optional)

Click here to enter text.



Evaluation Scores

Criteria	Your Score
Significance and Impact	
2. Research Plan	
3. Applicant Investigator	
4. Relevance	
5. Research Environment	

