K99 Review Critique Template

Visit: <https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/rfa-files/RFA-CA-22-035.html>

Application #:

Applicant:

**For this particular announcement, note the following**: 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 score.

# Overall Impact

|  |
| --- |
|  **(IMPORTANT): Write a paragraph summarizing the factors that informed your Overall Impact score.** |
| **Overall Impact:** |

# Scored Review Criteria

Reviewers will consider each of the review criteria below in the determination of scientific merit, and give a separate score for each. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major scientific impact.

|  |
| --- |
| **1. Candidate:*** *Based on the candidate’s prior research and training experience, track record, referee’s evaluations, and the quality and originality of prior research and the current application, what is the candidate’s potential to become a highly successful, independent investigator who will contribute significantly to his/her chosen field of biomedical, behavioral, or clinical related research?*
* *Considering the years of postdoctoral research experience to date, what is the candidate’s record of research productivity, including the quality of peer-reviewed scientific publications?*
* *What is the quality of the candidate's pre- and postdoctoral research, with respect to development of appropriate scientific and technical expertise?*
* *Given the candidate’s prior training, proposed career development plan, and the referees’ evaluations, is it reasonable to expect that the candidate will be able to achieve an independent, tenure-track or equivalent faculty position within the time period requested for the K99 phase of this award?*
 |
| **Strengths****Weaknesses** |

|  |
| --- |
| **2. Career Development Plan/Career Goals and Objectives/Plan to Provide Mentoring:*** *Are the content and duration of the proposed components of the career development plan appropriate and well-justified for the candidate’s current stage of scientific and professional development and proposed research career goals?*
* *To what extent does the proposed career development plan enhance or augment the candidate’s research and skills acquisition to date?*
* *Is the proposed career development plan likely to contribute substantially to the scientific and professional development of the candidate, and facilitate his/her successful transition to independence?*
* *To what extent are the plans for evaluating progress adequate and appropriate for guiding the awardee towards a successful transition to the independent phase of the award?*
* *Is the timeline planned for transition to the independent phase of the award appropriate for the candidate’s current stage of scientific and professional development, anticipated productivity, and the career development proposed for the K99 phase of the award?*
* *If proposed, will the clinical trial experience contribute to the applicant’s research career development?*
 |
| **Strengths****Weaknesses** |

|  |
| --- |
| **3. Research Plan:*** *Is the prior research that serves as the key support for the proposed project rigorous?*
* *Has the candidate included plans to address weaknesses in the rigor of prior research that serves as the key support of the proposed project?*
* *Has the candidate presented strategies to ensure a robust and unbiased approach, as appropriate for the work proposed?*
* *Has the candidate presented adequate plans to address relevant biological variables, such as sex, for studies in vertebrate animals or human subjects?*
* *Is the proposed K99 phase research significant and scientifically sound?*
* *Are the scientific and technical merits of the K99 research appropriate for developing the research skills described in the career development plan, and appropriate for developing a highly successful R00 research program?*
* *Is the proposed R00 phase research significant, scientifically sound, and a logical extension of the K99 phase research? Is there evidence of long-term viability of the proposed R00 phase research plan?*
* *Does the R00 phase project address an innovative hypothesis or challenge existing paradigms? Does the project develop or employ novel concepts, approaches, methodologies, tools, or technologies?*
* *To what extent is the proposed R00 phase research likely to foster the career of the candidate as a successful, independent investigator in biomedical, behavioral, or clinical research?*
* *If proposed, will the clinical trial experience contribute to the research project?*
 |
| **Strengths****Weaknesses** |

|  |
| --- |
| **4. Mentor(s), Co-Mentor(s), Consultant(s), Collaborator(s):*** To what extent does the mentor(s) have a strong track record in career development of future independent researchers?
* To what extent are the mentor’s research qualifications and experience, scientific stature, and mentoring track record appropriate for the candidate’s career development needs?
* Is the supervision proposed for the mentored phase of support adequate, and is the commitment of the mentor(s) to the candidate’s career development appropriate and sufficient?
* Does the mentor provide an appropriate plan that addresses the candidate’s research needs, and that is likely to foster the candidate’s continued career development and transition to independence?
* Does the mentor describe an acceptable plan for clear separation of the candidate’s research and research career from the mentor’s research, including identifying the components of the research plan that the K99 candidate may take to an independent research position?
* If applicable are the consultants’/collaborators’ research qualifications appropriate for their roles in the proposed K99 phase of the award? Do they provide letters of support that affirm their commitment?
* If applicable, are the Advisory Committee members’ qualifications appropriate for their roles in the proposed K99 phase of the award? Do they provide letters of support that affirm their commitment?
* If the applicant is proposing to gain experience in a clinical trial as part of his or her research career development, is there evidence of the appropriate expertise, experience, and ability on the part of the mentor(s) to guide the applicant during participation in the clinical trial?
 |
| **Strengths****Weaknesses** |

|  |
| --- |
| **5. Environment & Institutional Commitment to the Candidate:*** To what extent does the institution provide a high quality environment appropriate for the candidate’s development during the K99 phase of the award?
* To what extent are the research facilities and educational opportunities, including collaborating faculty, adequate and appropriate for the candidate’s research and career development goals during the K99 phase of the award? Is adequate evidence provided that the K99 sponsoring institution is strongly committed to fostering the candidate’s development and preparation for transition to independence?
* Is there adequate assurance that the required minimum of 9 person-months (75% of the candidate’s full-time professional effort) will be devoted directly to the research and career development proposed for the K99 phase of the award?
 |
| **Strengths****Weaknesses** |

# Additional Review Criteria

As applicable for the project proposed, reviewers will evaluate the following additional items while determining scientific and technical merit, and in providing an overall impact score, but will not give separate scores for these items.

* A response forProtections for Human Subjects, Vertebrate Animals, and Biohazards ***is required from reviewers for all applications****.*
* A response for Inclusion Plans is required from reviewers for applications proposing Human Subjects Research, except those designated Exemption 4.

|  |
| --- |
| Study Timeline (*Specific to applications designated clinical trial on the electronic cover sheet*) |
| **Strengths***

**Weaknesses***
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Protections for Human Subjects |
| Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):*

Data and Safety Monitoring Plan (Applicable for Clinical Trials Only):Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):* +
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Inclusion Plans **Applicable Only for Human Subjects research and not IRB Exemption #4.** |
| * Sex/Gender:
* Race/Ethnicity:
* For NIH-Defined Phase III trials, Plans for valid design and analysis:
* Inclusion/Exclusion Based on Age:

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):*
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Vertebrate Animals  |
| Is the proposed research involving vertebrate animals scientifically appropriate, including the justifications for animal usage and protections for research animals described in the Vertebrate Animal section (and method of euthanasia described in the Cover Page Supplement or PHS Fellowship Supplemental Form, if applicable)?Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):*
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Biohazards  |
| Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):*
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Resubmission |
| 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  |
| 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):*
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Resource Sharing Plans  |
| Comments (Required if Unacceptable):*
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Authentication of Key Biological and/or Chemical Resources |
| Comments (Required if Unacceptable):*
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Budget and Period of Support  |
| Recommended budget modifications or possible overlap identified:*
 |