**Oak Grant Critique Sheet**

Grant number:

Title:

Principal Investigator:

Institution:

Collaborators/Industry Partners:

Hypothesis:

Specific Aims/Research Objectives:

**Scoring Guidelines**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Impact** | **Score** | **Descriptor** | **Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses** |
| High | 1 | Exceptional | Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses |
| 2 | Outstanding | Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses |
| 3 | Excellent | Very strong with only some minor weaknesses |
| Medium | 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 |
| Low | 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 |
| **Non-numeric score options:** NR = Not Recommended for Further Consideration,  DF = Deferred, AB = Abstention, CF = Conflict, NP = Not Present, ND = Not Discussed | | | |
| **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 | | | |

**Overall Impact**

Score:

Reviewers will provide an overall impact/priority score to reflect their assessment of the likelihood for the grant to exert a sustained, powerful influence on the research field(s) involved, in consideration of the following review criteria:

Is the overall research project as a whole scientifically compelling?

If the proposed research is successful, is the outcome likely to change a current treatment or procedure?

If the proposed research is successful, is the outcome likely to advance our understanding in this field or discipline?

Does the PI have the leadership and scientific ability to conduct a focused research program?

Is institutional support evident?

Are data sharing and publication plans evident?

Is this a pilot project?

Is the timeline reasonable and feasible?

If applicable, is progression to a marketable product evident?

Is progression to a larger funding mechanism (federal grants, industry collaborations) evident?

Has a One Health approach been taken and is there evidence of potential impact on human health?

Is there clear synergy with collaborators and/or industry partners?

Overall Strengths:

Overall Weaknesses:

**1. Significance**

Score:

Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field?

If the aims of the project are achieved, how will scientific knowledge, technical capability and/or clinical practice be improved?

How will successful completion of the aims change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field?

Will this research broadly impact canine health (through transfer to General Practice or dog owners) or is impact limited (to tertiary care centers or specific breeds)?

If limited to specific breeds, is the significance of the problem within the breed of high or low priority? Is this grant supported by DAF funds?

Will this research enhance the evidence-based practice of veterinary or human medicine?

Is this a **pilot project** that could lead to 1) Federal funding (One Health) 2) intellectual property and royalties?

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

**2. Investigators**

Early Stage/New Investigator: Yes No

Score:

Are the PIs, collaborators and other research partners well suited to the project?

If Early stage or New Investigators, do they have the appropriate experience and training?

If established investigators, have they demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field?

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

**3. Innovation**

Score:

Is the proposal highly innovative? Will it lead to a paradigm shift in current scientific understanding or patient care? Is it high risk but high gain?

Are the concepts, approaches, methodologies, instrumentation or interventions unique to one field of research or do they have broad application across disciplines?

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

**4. Research Approach/Methods**

Score:

Are the overall strategy, methodology and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project?

Are potential problems and alternative strategies presented clearly?

Are benchmarks for success presented?

If the project is in the early stages of development will the strategy establish feasibility and will risky aspects be managed?

If the project involves clinical research, are plans in place for protection of patients?

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

**5. Environment**

Score:

Will the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success?

Are institutional support, equipment and other physical resources available adequate for the proposed project?

Will the project benefit from unique features of the environment?

Will the project benefit from a unique collaboration?

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

**6. Grantsmanship**

**\*No score necessary\***

**For the benefit of the researcher, please provide feedback on the clarity of the proposal**

Was sufficient background provided?

Was the hypothesis clearly stated?

Do the specific aims/research objective support proving or disproving the hypothesis?

Is the proposal clearly written?