

Resident/Clinical Fellow Trainee Research Grant (RCFTRG) Reviewer Scoring Template

Date (dd/mm/yy):
Reviewer Name:
Applicant Name:

All applications to the RCFTRG are reviewed by academic faculty in the Department of Pediatrics at the University of Alberta. In some circumstance, external reviews may be solicited from faculty members beyond the Department of Pediatrics. Effort is made to secure reviewers with expertise in the area of the proposed research; however, because some reviewers may not have expertise in the proposed research, applicants are encouraged to write their applications for a general audience. Applications are reviewed based on the following criteria (Note for Reviewers: Please **bold** the assigned score win each section).

Applicant's Academic Background/Experience (including awards, presentations, publications):

	Score
Adequate	1
Good	2
Very Good	3
Outstanding	4

Comments:

Role of Resident/Fellow in Proposed Research (including intellectual, methodological, and practical contributions):

	Score
The role of the resident/fellow is described adequately and should enable the resident/fellow to gain some new research experience and skill.	1
The role of the resident/fellow is described well. He/She will make key intellectual and methodological contributions that will enhance the learning experience.	2
The role of the resident/fellow is described very well. The proposed research builds on his/her previous expertise and experience. The resident/fellow has the skills required to drive the research project to successful completion.	3

Comments:

Role of the Mentor(s) in Proposed Research:

The resident/fellow will have a mentor that is engaged in the project and is committed to facilitating the research project to completion. If a mentor has limited experience in research mentorship, a co-mentor with an established track record may be required. Reviewers should consider the mentor's academic track record with reference to academic output (e.g., presentations, publications) with their trainees.

	Score
The applicant would benefit from the inclusion of a co-mentor to ensure adequate resources and expertise are available to support the proposed research.	0
The mentor (and co-mentor, if applicable) has a track record of mentoring trainees. Requisite resources and expertise are available to support the proposed research.	1
The mentor (and co-mentor, if applicable) has an established and successful track record of mentoring trainees. There is a high likelihood that the proposed research will be completed successfully, leading to academic output (e.g., presentations, manuscript).	2

Comments:

Quality and Clarity of Proposed Research:

	Score
The quality of the proposed research is poor and not clearly described. Revisions are required.	0
The quality of the proposed research is adequate, and the project is described clearly. Some revisions are recommended to improve quality and clarity.	1
The quality of the proposed research is very good, and the project is described very clearly and concisely. Only minor revisions (if any) are suggested.	2

Comments:

Feasibility and Overall Impression of the Proposed Research:

	Score
The proposed research is not feasible, and revisions are recommended.	0
The proposed research appears feasible. Overall impression of project is positive.	1
The project is clearly feasible. Overall impression of project is very positive.	2

Comments: