



820 JORIE BLVD, SUITE 300
 OAK BROOK, IL 60523-4216
 630-574-0220

TRAINEE RESEARCH GRANT in NEURORADIOLOGY

Funding amount: \$20,000

Foundation of the ASNR Trainee Grant Review Scoring

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

| |
|--|
| Applicant & Trajectory (30% of Overall Score) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Do the applicant's career plan, proposal, and the mentors' letter indicate that they are progressing towards an independent researcher status?</i> • <i>Does the applicant propose to learn important skills during the grant?</i> • <i>Does the applicant propose to participate to relevant courses/classes during the grant?</i> • <i>Does the applicant have an appropriate number of abstracts/publications for the stage of his/her career?</i> |
| Reviewer Comments |
| Mentor and Environment (50% of Overall Score) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Does the applicant have strong support from their mentor? Does the mentor have a track record relevant to the proposed research?</i> • <i>Does the mentor provide a comprehensive training plan for the applicant, including opportunities to gain experience new techniques, present their research data, and interact with other researchers? Does the training plan fit with the applicant's career goals?</i> • <i>Has the mentor successfully trained other mentees?</i> • <i>Is there sufficient facility, resources, and collaborators to ensure success for the applicant and the proposed study?</i> • <i>Is the applicant given sufficient time to perform the proposed research?</i> |
| Reviewer Comments |
| Scientific quality (20% of Overall Score) |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>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)?</i> |

| |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Is the proposal innovative?</i> • <i>Is the experimental design and statistical plan appropriate for the research proposed?</i> • <i>Can the work reasonably be done with in a year?</i> • <i>Are pitfalls and alternative approaches adequately considered?</i> • <i>Is the proposal professionally written and clearly organized?</i> |
| Reviewer Comments |
| Overall impact score (1-9): |
| <i>The overall impact score should be between 1 and 9, with one as the best possible score and nine as the lowest possible score. Please use the scoring rubric below and weight your score approximately 30% for the applicant and trajectory, 50% for the mentor and environment, and 20% for scientific quality.</i> |
| Reviewer Comments |

FOUNDATION 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