EUROSPINE Grant Application Review

The EUROSPINE TFR funds three types of applications; development proposal (one year), pilot studies (one year), clinical research studies (maximum 3 years or less).

Application #:
Principal Investigator(s):
Score (overall impact and priority):

OVERALL IMPACT AND PRIORITY SCORE

Provide an overall impact score to reflect their assessment of the likelihood for the application to exert a sustained, powerful influence on the research field(s) involved: base this on the following five review criteria. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major scientific impact.

Overall Score: Write a paragraph summarizing the factors that informed your Overall Impact and Priority score (1 highest-9 lowest score)

REVIEW CRITERIA

Reviewers will consider each of five review criteria to estimate the scientific and technical merit. (The explanations of the review criteria are simply suggestions to help focus the review). The additional topics should be considered, but do not form part of the overall (scientific) score.

1. Significance
Does the project address an important problem? Will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved? Will successful completion make a difference to the field?
   • Strengths
   • Weaknesses

2. Investigator(s)
Can the team do the job? Do the Principal Investigator, collaborators, and other researchers match the project? Do they have an ongoing track record of advancing their field(s)? Is there appropriate experience/training/support?
   • Strengths
   • Weaknesses

3. Innovation
Does the application challenge and seek to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms? Are the concepts, approaches, or interventions novel? Does it seek to refine or improve existing clinical interventions, or is there a new application of theoretical concepts/methodologies?
   • Strengths
   • Weaknesses
4. Approach
Are overall strategy, methodology, and statistical analyses well-reasoned and appropriate for the project? Is the population suitable and are the numbers sufficient? Are potential problems noted, along with strategies to manage the risk?
- Strengths
- Weaknesses

5. Environment and budget
Are institutional support, equipment and other physical resources adequate for the project proposed? Are the features of the scientific environment or collaborative arrangements well suited to the topic? Are any other resources needed? Are the budget and timeframe appropriate and adequate to complete the project? Are any non-fundable items included? Is the project dependent on other funding?
- Strengths
- Weaknesses

Ethics
Is ethical approval required? Yes / No / N/A
Has approval been obtained Yes / No / N/A
Are there any outstanding ethical/inclusion concerns? Yes (please comment) / No
- Comments

Resubmission
Did the applicants give an acceptable response to the previous review? Yes / No

Additional Comments to Applicant (optional)
Reviewers may provide guidance to the applicant or recommend against resubmission without fundamental revision.

Scoring guidance table
This table gives a descriptive guide on how the strengths and weaknesses should be considered, and how they combine when assigning the overall rating score. It also defines the levels of weakness, and indicates an impact rating for the scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exceptional</td>
<td>Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Very strong with only some minor weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Strong but with at least one moderate weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Some strengths but with at least one major weakness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>A few strengths and a few major weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weakness guide**
- 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

**Impact guide:**
- Score 1 to 3 = high impact
- Score 4 to 6 = moderate impact
- Score 7 to 9 = low impact

These recommendations for reviewers are adapted from National Institute of Health (NIH USA 2010).