

***Mental Health Imaging Research Grant Scoring Criteria**

Reviewers will consider each of the review criteria below in the determination of scientific merit and give a separate score for each. Individual reviewers will use a 9-point scale, with a score of 1 indicating an exceptionally strong application with essentially no weaknesses. A score of 9 indicates an application with serious and substantive weaknesses with very few strengths; 5 is considered an average score. Ratings are in whole numbers only (no decimal ratings).

Significance (Score 1-9)
Is the project responsive to the goals of using neuroimaging to understand underlying factors and improve treatment and outcomes for mental and behavioral health? Does the proposal include a rigorous scientific background, and does it explain the knowledge gaps it intends to fill? If the aims are achieved, how will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved?
Reviewer Comments
Investigator(s) (Score 1-9)
Is the PI, collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project? If the project is collaborative, do the investigators have complementary expertise? Is it multi-disciplinary?
Reviewer Comments
Innovation (Score 1-9)
Does the application challenge and seek to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilizing novel concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions? Does it address social determinants of mental health which are less often addressed in neuroimaging research?
Reviewer Comments
Approach (Score 1-9)
Is the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Are there clearly stated, testable hypothesis, or hypotheses, and well-developed aims? Have the investigators included plans to address weaknesses in the rigor of prior research? If the project uses large clinical imaging datasets, how will it move the field forward? Have the investigators presented adequate plans to address diversity in subject recruitment, as appropriate?
Reviewer Comments
Environment (Score 1-9)
Are the institutional support, equipment, and other physical resources available to the investigators adequate for the project proposed?
Reviewer Comments

Overall impact score (1-9)

Reviewers will provide an overall impact score to reflect their assessment for the project to meet the goals of the Aldon Mark Berger Mental Health Imaging Research Grant and to exert a sustained influence on the research field. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major scientific impact. For example, a project that by its nature is not innovative may be essential to advance a field.

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.

Inclusion of Women, Minorities, and Individuals Across the Lifespan

Does the proposed project involve human subjects and/or NIH-defined clinical research? Do the plans provide for the inclusion (or exclusion) of individuals based on sex/gender, race, and ethnicity, as well as the inclusion (or exclusion) of individuals of all ages (including children and older adults) to determine if it is justified in terms of the scientific goals and research strategy proposed.

Vertebrate Animals

The committee will evaluate the involvement of live vertebrate animals as part of the scientific assessment according to the following criteria: (1) description of proposed procedures involving animals, including species, strains, ages, sex, and total number to be used; (2) justifications for the use of animals versus alternative models and for the appropriateness of the species proposed; (3) interventions to minimize discomfort, distress, pain and injury; and (4) justification for euthanasia method if NOT consistent with the AVMA Guidelines for the Euthanasia of Animals

Reviewer Comments

NIH SCORING RUBRIC

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 weaknesses
	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
<p>Minor Weakness: An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact.</p> <p>Moderate Weakness: A weakness that lessens impact.</p> <p>Major Weakness: A weakness that severely limits impact</p>			