

CPRN Scientific Review Subcommittee Objectives

The Scientific Review Subcommittee (SRS) of CPRN performs two functions:

- 1) Review of proposed CPRN multi-center studies that seek the support of the network to submit and conduct the study. In this capacity, the objective of an SRS review is to provide critical feedback to the investigator(s) in order to strengthen the likelihood that the study will achieve its objectives and granting agencies will view the application favorably. The study concept has been approved by the CPRN investigator committee to be developed into a protocol. The protocol will not include complete budget information at this stage of review.
- 2) Review of applications developed in response to CPRN and partner requests for applications. In this capacity, the SRS, at least initially, will be reviewing significantly smaller grants that may be proposing analyses of existing registry data or conducting smaller pilot oriented studies that do not require the full weight of the network to accomplish the research. For these reviews, the SRS will function much like an NIH study section reviewing a batch of grant proposals.

SRS committee members should be familiar with [NIH's Center for Scientific Review guidelines](#) for reviewing scientific proposals. Applications will also be evaluated based on patient-centeredness using the related [PCORI engagement rubric](#). A template for scoring the applications strengths and weaknesses along these criteria is located below. For applications in response to an RFA, in the case that applicants are not members of CPRN, SRS members will need to sign a conflict of interest statement and recuse themselves from any review in which they are in conflict.

Under the direction of the SRS chair and/or vice chair, a primary, secondary and tertiary reviewer will be selected prior to the review meeting. For single application reviews, all SRS members are expected to review and score the application according to the template below and submit those scores to the SRS chair. For batch reviews, the chair and vice chair will assign specific reviews to take leadership in the review of the grants. The primary, secondary and tertiary reviewers will both score and comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the protocol. The primary reviewer will present the protocol in the SRS review meeting. The chair and vice chair will lead a discussion on the divergent scores from the reviewers. A final set of criterion scores and impact score will be established by the subcommittee. Final scores and individual comments (anonymized) will be provided to the investigator(s). A summary of the comments and the final scores will be provided to the Executive Committee.

In the case of single application reviews, CPRN investigators will take the feedback under advisement and revise the protocol accordingly. There will be a subsequent review of the revised protocol with the Executive Committee within two months of the SRS feedback. The SRS chair will provide feedback to the Executive Committee as to how well the investigator responded to the critique in the updated protocol. Only after an Executive Committee review and affirmative vote will the investigator proceed to a full application with the prospective funding agency.

For batch reviews conducted as part of an RFA, the SRS will establish a recommended payline for scores that are meritorious. The SRS chair will represent the SRS scoring recommendations in a meeting of the Executive Committee to determine final awards for grant applications.

1. Overall Impact

OVERALL IMPACT

Reviewers will provide an overall impact score to reflect their assessment of the likelihood for the project to exert a sustained, powerful influence on the research field(s) involved, 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 be judged likely to have major scientific impact.

Overall Impact Write a paragraph summarizing the factors that informed your Overall Impact score.

Score (1-9) ____ (1 is the highest score, 9 is lowest)

--

--

1-3 = High impact
 4-6 = Moderate Impact
 7-9 = Low Impact

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. Information about scoring criteria can be found [here](#). K award scoring criteria can be found [here](#).

1. Significance Score (1-9) ____ (1 is the highest score, 9 is lowest)
Strengths <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Weaknesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

2. Investigator(s) Score (1-9) ____ (1 is the highest score, 9 is lowest)
Strengths <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Weaknesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

3. Innovation Score (1-9) ____ (1 is the highest score, 9 is lowest)
Strengths <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •
Weaknesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

4. Approach Score (1-9) ____ (1 is the highest score, 9 is lowest)
Strengths <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Weaknesses

-

5. [Environment](#) Score (1-9) ____ (1 is the highest score, 9 is lowest)

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

6. [Patient-centeredness – Comment on the fit with Research CP agenda](#)

Score (1-9) ____ (1 is the highest score, 9 is lowest)

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

7. [Patient Engagement – Has the investigator engaged the patient community in the research planning, design or dissemination plan](#)

Score (1-9) ____ (1 is the highest score, 9 is lowest)

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-
-