

## \*Foundation of the ASNR Boerger Research Fund Review Scoring Scale

Reviewers will critically assess the scientific quality of the proposed research plan, the applicant's track record and their trajectory towards independence, the applicant's environment, and the support from their mentor. The items below will be considered when reviewing proposals.

<b>SIGNIFICANCE (20 points maximum)</b>	
Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field? Is there a strong scientific premise for the project? 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?	Max (20) pts
<b>INNOVATION (20 points maximum)</b>	
Does the application challenge and seek to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilizing novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions? Are the concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions novel to one field of research or novel in a broad sense? Is a refinement, improvement, or new application of theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions proposed?	Max (20) pts
<b>INVESTIGATORS &amp; RESOURCES (25 points maximum)</b>	
Are the PD/PIs, collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project? If Early-Stage Investigators or New Investigators, or in the early stages of independent careers, do they have appropriate experience and training? If established, have they demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s)? If the project is collaborative or multi-PD/PI, do the investigators have complementary and integrated expertise; are their leadership approach, governance, and organizational structure appropriate for the project? Competence of the applicant and key personnel to conduct the research. Adequacy of the facility.	Max (25) pts
<b>APPROACH (25 points maximum)</b>	
Is the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Have the investigators presented strategies to ensure a robust and unbiased approach, as appropriate for the work proposed? Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented? If the project is in the early stages of development, will the strategy establish	Max (25) pts

<p>feasibility, and will particularly risky aspects be managed? Have the investigators presented adequate plans to address relevant biological variables, such as sex, for studies in vertebrate animals or human subjects? If the project involves human subjects and/or NIH-defined clinical research, are the plans to address 1) the protection of human subjects from research risks, and 2) the inclusion (or exclusion) of individuals based on sex/gender, race, and ethnicity, as well as the inclusion (exclusion) of children, justified in terms of the scientific goals and research strategy proposed?</p>	
<b>ENVIRONMENT (10 points maximum)</b>	
<p>Will the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success? Are the institutional support, equipment, and other physical resources available to the investigators adequate for the project proposed? Will the project benefit from unique features of the scientific environment, subject populations, or collaborative arrangements?</p>	Max (10) pts
<b>Total Possible Points per proposal (100 points maximum)</b>	