Limited Submission Scoring Matrix
CPRIT Collaborative Action Program to Reduce Liver Cancer Mortality in Texas: Collaborative Action Center

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.
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SCORING

Selection of applications to be submitted to the CPRIT Collaborative Action Program to Reduce Liver Cancer Mortality in Texas: Collaborative Action Center will be based on a 5-point scoring scale for criteria given below.

No. of applications allowed per institution this cycle: 1

- 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

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

CPRIT Collaborative Action Program to Reduce Liver Cancer Mortality in Texas: Collaborative Action Center

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**
   How well does the proposed Center address the responsibilities described in the RFA? Will the Center effectively engage the CAP Research Awardees and create new opportunities for collaboration? Will the Center bring unique advantages or capabilities to the CAP? Will the Center provide statewide leadership and engage appropriate stakeholders in advancing policies and practices that will impact HCC in Texas? Does the Center include plans for developing outreach to health care providers, policymakers, and others whose participation will increase the likelihood of success? Will the overall impact of the Center lead to a program whose whole is greater than the sum of the individual components?

   **Strengths:** Click here to enter text.

   **Weaknesses:** Click here to enter text.

2. **Technical Expertise**
   Is there sufficient technical expertise to carry out the duties of the Center?

   **Strengths:** Click here to enter text.

   **Weaknesses:** Click here to enter text.

3. **Institutional Commitment**
   Is there clear institutional commitment for support of the Center? This could include mention of space allocated and infrastructure support.

   **Strengths:** Click here to enter text.

   **Weaknesses:** Click here to enter text.
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### 4. Center Personnel

Are the PI and other key personnel well suited to their roles in the Center? Do they have appropriate experience and training, and have they demonstrated significant experience with coordinating collaborative clinical research and implementation science? Is the leadership approach, governance, plan for conflict resolution, and organizational structure appropriate for the Center?

**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? 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Your Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Significance and Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Technical Expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Institutional Commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Center Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Research Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>