

Review Criteria for K01 Proposals

Overall Impact

Reviewers should provide their assessment of the likelihood that the proposed career development and research plan will enhance the candidate's potential for a productive, independent scientific research career in a health-related field, taking into consideration the criteria below in determining the overall impact/priority score.

Candidate

- Does the candidate have the potential to develop as an independent and productive researcher?
- Are the candidate's prior training and research experience appropriate for this award?
- Is the candidate's academic, clinical (if relevant), and research record of high quality?
- Is there evidence of the candidate's commitment to meeting the program objectives to become an independent investigator in research?
- Do the letters of reference address the above review criteria, and do they provide evidence that the candidate has a high potential for becoming an independent investigator?

Career Development Plan/Career Goals & Objectives/Plan to Provide Mentoring

- What is the likelihood that the plan will contribute substantially to the scientific development of the candidate and lead to scientific independence?
- Are the content, scope, phasing, and duration of the career development plan appropriate when considered in the context of prior training/research experience and the stated training and research objectives for achieving research independence?
- Are there adequate plans for monitoring and evaluating the candidate's research and career development progress?

Research Plan

- Are the proposed research question, design, and methodology of significant scientific and technical merit?
- Is the research plan relevant to the candidate's research career objectives?
- Is the research plan appropriate to the candidate's stage of research development and as a vehicle for developing the research skills described in the career development plan?

Mentor(s), Co-mentor(s), Consultant(s), Collaborator(s)

- Are the qualifications of the mentor(s) in the area of the proposed research appropriate?

- Does the mentor(s) adequately address the candidate's potential and his/her strengths and areas needing improvement?
- Is there adequate description of the quality and extent of the mentor's proposed role in providing guidance and advice to the candidate?
- Is the mentor's description of the elements of the research career development activities, including formal course work adequate?
- Is there evidence of the mentor's, consultant's, and/or collaborator's previous experience in fostering the development of independent investigators?
- Is there evidence of the mentor's current research productivity and peer-reviewed support?
- Is active/pending support for the proposed research project appropriate and adequate?
- Are there adequate plans for monitoring and evaluating the career development awardee's progress toward independence?

Environment and Institutional Commitment to the Candidate

- Is there clear commitment of the sponsoring institution to ensure that a minimum of 9 person-months (75% of the candidate's full-time professional effort) will be devoted directly to the research and career development activities described in the application, with the remaining percent effort being devoted to an appropriate balance of research, teaching, administrative, and clinical responsibilities?
- Is the institutional commitment to the career development of the candidate appropriately strong?
- Are the research facilities, resources and training opportunities, including faculty capable of productive collaboration with the candidate adequate and appropriate?
- Is the environment for scientific and professional development of the candidate of high quality?
- Is there assurance that the institution intends the candidate to be an integral part of its research program as an independent investigator?

Additional Review Criteria

Resubmissions. For Resubmissions, the committee will evaluate the application as now presented, taking into consideration the responses to comments from the previous scientific review group and changes made to the project.

Renewals. For Renewals, the committee will consider the progress made in the last funding period.

Revisions. For Revisions, the committee will consider the appropriateness of the proposed expansion of the scope of the project. If the Revision application relates to a specific line of investigation presented in the original application that was not recommended for approval by the committee, then the committee will consider whether the responses to comments from the previous scientific review group are adequate and whether substantial changes are clearly evident.

Score Chart Used by Reviewers

Impact	Score	Descriptor	Strengths/Weaknesses
High Impact	1	Exceptional	
	2	Outstanding	
	3	Excellent	
Moderate Impact	4	Very Good	
	5	Good	
	6	Satisfactory	
Low Impact	7	Fair	
	8	Marginal	
	9	Poor	

Non-numeric score options: NR = Not Recommended for Further Consideration, DF = Deferred, AB = Abstention, CF = Conflict, NP = Not Present, ND=Not Discussed

Additional Guidance on Strengths and Weaknesses

The graphical representation of strengths and weaknesses (the far right column) is provided to illustrate the relative balance of strengths and weaknesses associated with each rating score. Reviewers should consider not only the relative number of strengths and weaknesses noted, but also the importance of them to the overall impact. For example, a major strength may outweigh many minor and correctable weaknesses. The table below provides additional guidance to assist reviewers in determining their ratings.

Score	Descriptor	Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses
1	Exceptional	Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses
2	Outstanding	Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
3	Excellent	Very strong with only some minor weaknesses
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
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

Minor Weakness: An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact **Moderate Weakness:** A weakness that lessens impact. **Major Weakness:** A weakness that severely limits impact

Reviewer Templates for K01 Review

Application #:

Principal Investigator(s):

OVERALL IMPACT

Reviewers will provide an overall impact score to reflect their assessment of the likelihood for the candidate to maintain a strong research program, in consideration of the following five scored review criteria, and additional review criteria. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to have a major impact.

Overall Impact 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. Candidate

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

2. Career Development Plan/Career Goals & Objectives/Plan to Provide Mentoring

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

3. Research Plan

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

4. Mentor(s), Co-Mentor(s), Consultant(s), Collaborator(s)

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

5. [Environment and Institutional Commitment to the Candidate](#)

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

ADDITIONAL REVIEW CRITERIA

- A response for Protections for Human Subjects, Vertebrate Animals, and Biohazards **is required for all applications**.
- A response for Inclusion of Women, Minorities and Children **is required** for Human Subjects Research Applications.

[Protections for Human Subjects](#)

Click Here to Select

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

-

Data and Safety Monitoring Plan (Applicable for Clinical Trials Only):

Click Here to Select

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

- o

[Inclusion of Women, Minorities and Children](#) Applicable Only for Human Subjects Research

Click Here to Select Gender Code

Click Here to Select Minority Code

Click Here to Select Children Code

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

-

[Vertebrate Animals](#)

Click Here to Select

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

-

[Biohazards](#)

Click Here to Select

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

-

[Resubmission](#)

Comments (if applicable):

-

[Renewal](#) (Applicable only for K02 and K24)

Comments (if applicable):

-

[Revision](#)

Comments (if applicable):

-

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 score.

[Training in the Responsible Conduct of Research](#)

Click Here to Select

Comments on Format (Required):

-

Comments on Subject Matter (Required):

-

Comments on Faculty Participation (Required; not applicable for mid- and senior-career awards):

-

Comments on Duration (Required):

-

Comments on Frequency (Required):

-

[Select Agents](#)

Click Here to Select

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

•

[Resource Sharing Plans](#)

Click Here to Select

Comments (Required if Unacceptable):

•

[Budget and Period of Support](#)

Click Here to Select

Recommended budget modifications or possible overlap identified:

•

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO APPLICANT

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

[Additional Comments to Applicant](#) (Optional)

•