

## Instructions to Scientific Reviewers

**Each reviewer will provide a single score for their respective proposal on a scale of 1.0 (best possible) to 5.0 (worst possible).**

The score is based on the reviewer's interpretation of the scientific merit of the proposal. Merit assessment may include the following: (1) how the recommended research would advance knowledge in the FA field, (2) technical and scientific competence of the investigators, (3) degree of institutional support, (4) facilities and resources, (5) and the internal support structures of the organization.

### **Questions for consideration during scientific review:**

*Approach of Proposed Work:* Are the conceptual or clinical framework, design, methods, and analyses adequately developed, well integrated, well-reasoned, and appropriate to the aims of the project? Does the applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative tactics?

*Innovation:* Is the project original and innovative? For example, does the project challenge existing paradigms or clinical practice, and address an innovative hypothesis or critical barrier to progress in the field? Does the project develop or employ novel concepts, approaches, methodologies, tools, or technologies for this area?

*Significance:* Does this study address an important problem? If the aims of the application are achieved, how will scientific knowledge or clinical practice be advanced? What will the effect of these studies be on the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field?

*Qualifications of Investigators:* Are the investigators appropriately trained and well-suited to carry out this work? Is the proposed work appropriate to the experience level of the principal investigator and other researchers? Does the investigative team bring complementary and integrated expertise to the project (if applicable)?

*Budget:* Is the proposed budget reasonable? Is the requested period of support in relation to the proposed research reasonable? *Note:* The priority score should not be affected by the evaluation of the budget.

*Protection of Human & Animal Subjects from Research Risk (if applicable):* What is the involvement of human/animal subjects? Do the proposed studies protect human/animal subjects from research risk relating to their participation in the proposed research?

*Environment:* Does the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success? Do the proposed studies benefit from unique features of the scientific environment, or subject populations, or employ useful collaborative arrangements? Is there evidence of institutional support?

*Therapeutic Value:* Please describe the projects therapeutic value as it relates to the FA population and their needs. Is there a level of risk involved?