

Example of Research Project Grant (RPG) Review Critique

The following pages illustrate the recommended format for using the RPG (R01/R03/R15/R21) review critique template with enhanced review criteria. *Please note that part of the review critique is protected within Microsoft Word to enable functions such as drop-down boxes.*

The document contains hyperlinks that provide the full guidance for each criterion and consideration. Please note that Microsoft Word 2003 users will be unable to access some of the criterion hyperlinks within the document, but will always be able to access the all-encompassing hyperlink posted at the top of the critique template. Further instructions on using the review critique templates are at http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/critique_template_instructions.pdf.

As a reviewer, the goal is to be concise and clear in your comments and opinions. The template provides space to list strengths and weaknesses for each of the core review criteria and the overall impact. The preferred method is to use bullets, but exception is allowed when a short narrative is warranted. If appropriate for the application, you may list strengths for some criteria and no weaknesses, or vice versa. If you need more than one bullet, you may simply press enter at the end of the line with the bullet and another bullet will appear.

Although occasionally there will be the need for longer explanations of particular strengths or weaknesses, reviewers are strongly encouraged to limit the length of their comments to no more than ¼ page per core criterion and overall impact.

RPG/R01/R03/R15/R21 Review

If you cannot access the hyperlinks below,
visit <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm>.

Application #: 1R01HL123456-01

Principal Investigator(s): Doe, Jane

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

Strengths

- High potential impact in clinically important area of safe blood transfusion.
- Highly qualified investigators with complementary expertise ensure likely success.
- Novel application of incident reporting methods now in use in other fields could lead to improved public confidence in blood supply.
- The study will bring a rigorous, systematic approach to the current error reporting process, which is empiric and lacking in evaluation.

Weaknesses

- Lack of representation of non-academic transfusion medicine practitioners may make incident reporting less effective in non-academic hospital setting.
- Not enough time is allotted for aim one work and aims two and three too dependent on success of aim one work lessens confidence that work can be successfully completed.

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. Significance

Strengths

- An effective incident reporting system should greatly increase confidence of the public in safety of the blood supply.
- Models developed for other error-critical fields have been effectively adapted in the development of an incident-reporting system for transfusion medicine.
- Identifies and incorporates limited and appropriate range of human error patterns—will be easily transferable to practice.
- Could be generally applicable to understanding influence of incentives/disincentives on behavior.

Weaknesses

- Premise that human error follows limited range of patterns in diverse situations may not hold true.
- Unclear how incident reporting system would be utilized to reduce human error.
- Unclear whether public perception or clinical need is target of model application.

2. [Investigator\(s\)](#)**Strengths**

- Investigators are well recognized for their expertise in blood banking.
- The PI has a strong publication record in field of HIV analysis in the context of blood transfusions.
- Collaborators have expertise in error-critical fields and are complementary in expertise to PI.

Weaknesses

- Levels of effort proposed by investigators are unlikely to be sufficient for scope of project, raising doubts that goals will be accomplished.
- There is not sufficient expertise in the area of transfusion medicine. Research plan would benefit from input from someone with expertise in collection & transfusion in non-academic hospital setting.

3. [Innovation](#)**Strengths**

- Adaptation of incident reporting systems used in other error-critical fields (aviation, nuclear power, anesthesiology) to transfusion medicine is highly innovative.
- Use of positive reinforcement to address disincentives associated with self reporting of errors.

Weaknesses

-

4. [Approach](#)**Strengths**

- The experiments are well designed with appropriate controls proposed.
- Potential problems are anticipated and alternative approaches are presented.
- Conceptual framework for the entire project is well developed and supported.
- Use of ubiquitous computer platform to manage information is sound and generates confidence in the potential expandability of the system across the country.

Weaknesses

- Time allotted for aim one work is likely to be insufficient.
- Aims two and three are less well developed because they are dependent on outcome of aim one.
- It is unclear which test site will provide gold standard against which results from other sites are compared.
- Test sites are all academic institutions and thus lack real world diversity; hospitals/community health centers should be included so that results are more generalizable.

5. [Environment](#)

Strengths

- Outstanding scientific environment in each participating institution.
- Strong commitment of support from each institution.
- Opinion leaders in transfusion medicine field will participate.

Weaknesses

- Notable omission is the absence of non-academic hospital settings.
- Better plan to ensure uniformity across sites is needed.

ADDITIONAL REVIEW CRITERIA

As applicable for the project proposed, reviewers will consider the following additional items in the determination of scientific and technical merit, but will not give separate scores for these items.

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

[Protections for Human Subjects](#)

Acceptable Risks and/or Adequate Protections

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

- Plans for sample anonymity are inadequate

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

Not Applicable (No Clinical Trials)

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

o

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

G1A - Both Genders, Acceptable

M1A - Minority and Non-minority, Acceptable

C3A - No Children Included, Acceptable

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

- There is no need to include children in this study.

[Vertebrate Animals](#)

Not Applicable (No Vertebrate Animals)

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

-

[Biohazards](#)

Acceptable

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

- The use of biohazards is acceptable.

[Resubmission](#)

Comments (if applicable):

-

[Renewal](#)

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/priority score.

[Budget and Period of Support](#)

Recommend as Requested

Recommended budget modifications or possible overlap identified:

-

[Select Agents](#)

Not Applicable (No Select Agents)
Comments (Required if Unacceptable):

-

[Applications from Foreign Organizations](#)

Not Applicable (No Foreign Organizations)
Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

-

[Resource Sharing Plans](#)

Not Applicable (No Relevant Resources)
Comments (Required if Unacceptable):

-

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO APPLICANT

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

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

- It is likely that more time will be required between the two workshops planned for the second year.