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Title of Proposal:

Application reviews should be conducted without conflict of interest or the appearance of conflict of interest. Conflict of interest occurs when the reviewer or the reviewer’s family has a financial interest in the outcome of the grant process, or is negotiating prospective employment with the applicant. In addition, reviewers should decline to review if their objectivity in reviewing the proposal might be compromised for any reason (e.g., if the reviewer is a recent student, teacher, or mentor of the applicant, a close professional collaborator, a close personal friend, or an individual with longstanding personal, scientific, or clinical differences with the applicant.

I have no conflict of interest in reviewing this proposal as defined above.

(Signature of reviewer)

If, after looking over the application, you believe that you do have a conflict of interest, or your objectivity in reviewing this proposal might be compromised, please contact Aaron Wong, Director-Scientific of the Klein Family Parkinson’s Rehabilitation Center, at (215) 663-6747 or [aaron.wong2@jefferson.edu](mailto:aaron.wong2@jefferson.edu) as soon as possible so that an alternate reviewer can be selected.

Scoring should be based on the following criteria:

20 points Significance (i.e., the potential impact at addressing a clear need)

10 points Innovation (i.e., originality of the idea, approach, etc.)

10 points Degree of clinical-research integration

40 points Adequacy of proposed plan/methodology

10 points Capacity of the Principal Investigator/Project Team to carry out the project

10 points Resources to conduct the project (is the budget appropriate for the stated objectives)

*(See specific items for consideration guidance in each section below, in italics.)*

Please refer to the scale below when calculating the final score:

90 – 100 No weaknesses identified; strongly recommend funding

80 – 89 One or two minor weaknesses identified; recommend funding

70 – 79 Significant weakness that could be addressed; recommend revise and resubmit

60 – 69 Multiple significant weaknesses identified; do not recommend funding

< 60 Does not address all required sections of proposal; do not recommend funding

The reviewer will be anonymous to the Principal Investigator (PI)/Team, so please omit any identifying marks or comments on the following pages.

* **Significance**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| *The proposal addresses a clear need with regard to Parkinson’s Disease.* | 10 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| *There is sufficient background or a clear rationale to justify the proposal.* | 10 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 2 |

Score: (Max, 20 points)

Please provide justification for your score.

* + Strengths:
  + Weaknesses:
* **Innovation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| *The project is novel and/or sufficiently different from existing research or clinical programs. Consider novelty of theory, methodology, and/or technology.* | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| *The scope of the innovation is reasonable, given the significance and available resources.* | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

Score: (Max, 10 points)

Please provide justification for your score.

* + Strengths:
  + Weaknesses:
* **Degree of clinical-research integration**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| *This project will promote clinical-research integration, by considering current clinical needs and good research practices.* | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| *The proposal includes contributions from staff in clinical and research roles.* | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

Score: (Max, 10 points)

Please provide justification for your score.

* + Strengths:
  + Weaknesses:
* **Adequacy of proposed plan/methodology**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| *The overall strategy/methodology is feasible and is likely to accomplish the objectives of the project.* | 10 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| *Appropriate consideration and justification is given to eligibility, sample size, available resources, etc.* | 10 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| *There is an appropriate plan to evaluate the progress and success of the project (e.g., data collection/analysis or program evaluation).* | 10 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 2 |
| *There is a reasonable plan if progress or outcomes are not occurring as expected.* | 10 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 2 |

Score: (Max, 40 points)

Please provide justification for your score.

* + Strengths:
  + Weaknesses:
* **Capacity of the PI/Project Team to carry out the project**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| *The PI/Team is appropriate given the objective of the proposed project.* | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| *The Team will have access to adequate resources (participants, equipment, etc.) to complete the project.* | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

Score: (Max, 10 points)

Please provide justification for your score.

* + Strengths:
  + Weaknesses:
* **Resources to conduct the project**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| *The budget is appropriate for the stated project objectives. Consider personnel, time those individuals will dedicate to the project, and other fiscal needs.* | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| *The timeline is appropriate to accomplish the proposed activities.* | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

Score: (Max, 10 points)

Please provide justification for your score.

* + Strengths:
  + Weaknesses:

**Overall Score: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Sum of the individual section scores above, out of 100 points)**

**Overall comments:**