

*Foundation of the ASNR Grant 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.

Scientific quality (50% of Overall Score)
- Are the hypotheses or aims designed to address an important question and is strong justification provided for the proposal (e.g., literature review, preliminary data)? - Is the proposal innovative? - Are the experimental design and statistical plan appropriate for the research proposed? - Can the work reasonably be done in a year? - Are pitfalls and alternative approaches adequately considered? - Is the proposal well written and clearly organized? - Does the proposed project involve human subjects and/or NIH-defined clinical research? Do the plans provide for the inclusion (or exclusion) of individuals from populations experiencing health disparities in the project as well as the inclusion (or exclusion) of individuals of all ages (including children and older adults) to determine if such inclusion (or exclusion) is justified in terms of the scientific goals and research strategy proposed. - Is the scope of proposed research appropriate for a 1-year project? (too ambitious or too little)
Reviewer Comments
Applicant & Trajectory (25% of Overall Score)
- Do the applicant's publications, proposal, and the mentors' letter indicate that they are formulating their own research ideas? - Is there an indication that the applicant is on a pathway to a successful academic career? - Does the applicant have an appropriate number of publications for the stage of his/her career? Are the publications relevant to the proposed research topic?
Reviewer Comments
Mentor and Environment (25% of Overall Score)
- Does the applicant have strong support from their mentor? Does the mentor have a track record relevant to the proposed research? - Does the mentor provide a comprehensive training plan for the applicant, including opportunities to learn new techniques, present their research data, and interact with other researchers? Does the training plan fit with the applicant's career goals? - Has the mentor successfully trained other mentees? - Are there sufficient facility, resources, and collaborators to ensure success for the applicant and the proposed study? - Is the applicant given sufficient time to perform the proposed research?
Reviewer Comments
Overall impact score (1-9):
The overall impact score should be between 1 and 9, with 1 as the best possible score and 9 as the lowest possible score. Please use the scoring rubric below, and weight your score approximately 50% for scientific quality, 25% for the applicant and trajectory, and 25% for the mentor and environment.
Reviewer Comments

ASNR 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
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			