

Beyond Batten Disease Foundation Reviewer Instructions

Excerpted and adapted from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Enhancing Peer Review for the National Institutes of Health (NIH) at <http://enhancing-peer-review.nih.gov/>

Please place emphasis on merit and impact (potential for translation) and less emphasis on technical details. The summary of the proposal is a chance to gather your thoughts and to show the applicant what you, the reviewer, see. For the remainder, we encourage succinct, well-focused critiques that evaluate, rather than describe applications. We encourage reviewers to make use of the entire rating scale.

Scores

The final score for each application represents the overall impact of the application and is in a 2-digit format. It is calculated as the average (to one decimal point) of the overall impact/priority scores (1-9 in whole numbers only) given by all review panel members, multiplied by ten (so the new scores range from 10-90 in whole numbers). Some reviewers find it helpful to score individual criteria to come up with their final score. Please keep in mind that some criteria are more important to the success of the proposal than others so averaging individual criteria may not be the best option.

1	Exceptional	Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses
2	Outstanding	Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
3	Excellent	Very strong with only some minor weaknesses
4	Very Good	Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses
5	Good	Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
6	Satisfactory	Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses
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