



DEVELOPMENTAL GRANT PROGRAM GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

The guidelines approximate those of an NIH study section. All proceedings and information of this review will remain confidential.

GENERAL

- Review the program description/announcement for criteria as stated to the investigators.
- The emphasis of the program is on pilot projects – it is not expected that investigators have a great deal of preliminary data or publications in the proposed area.
- Your comments are crucial to the investigator and to the Lifespan Research Advisory Committee in making final award determinations. Be descriptive in your comments so they are valuable to the investigator in changing his/her application in the future.

REVIEW PROCEDURE

Overview

Written critiques will be solicited from at least two reviewers, one primary and one secondary. Guidelines are provided below and a template for your remarks is provided in a separate MS Word doc (DevGrantCritqueTemplate.doc). All reviewers will be asked to attend a single study section. At that study section, scores from both reviewers will be reported. The primary reviewer will then present a brief description of the project and their evaluation. The secondary reviewer will then offer their further evaluation. After completion of the study section, consideration for funding will be addressed by the Lifespan Research Advisory Committee. Consideration will be based upon your scores and the available funds.

Conflicts of Interest

During the study section meeting, any reviewer who is involved with the proposal should inform the Chair just prior to review and excuse themselves from the room during the discussions.

Written Critique (DevGrantCritqueTemplate.doc)

Your critiques should follow the format suggested in the accompanying document, which is modeled after an NIH form. Since this is an intramural program, any and all constructive comments are greatly appreciated. Blinded copies of all reviews will be furnished to the applicant.

The following scale for scoring should be employed:

1.0 – 1.5	Outstanding
1.6 – 2.0	Excellent
2.1 – 2.5	Very good
2.6 – 3.0	Good
3.1 – 3.9	Fair- not fundable
4.0 – 5.0	Poor- not fundable