**CIHR Project Grant Reviewer Report Form**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer Name:** |  |
| **Applicant(s):** |  |
| **Title of Study:** |  |
| **Date of Review:** |  |

***The purpose of this form is to provide the internal reviewers with CIHR Project Grant adjudication criteria. You can directly append your detailed comments to the draft proposal (using tracked changes) or summarize your comments (strengths, weaknesses of the proposal) at the end of this form. Please send your comments directly to*** ***the*** ***Principal Applicant****.*

* The proposal should stand alone, containing all the essential information required to support the proposed project.
* The proposal should have a maximum of 10 pages (including essential figures/tables but excluding references and supplementary figures/tables) and must adhere to the CIHR [formatting requirements](http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/29300.html). Unlimited references are allowed. Supplementary figures and tables are allowed as an attachment (in Other Application Materials).
* CIHR reviewers will rate each of the three criteria on a 0-4.9 scale (see [Project Grant Peer Review Manual](http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/49564.html)). Then each application will receive a total score based on criteria weighting. Reviewers are expected to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the entire application.

* ***Important Notes***
* Applications submitted to the **randomized controlled trial (RCT) committee** must follow the [specific RCT evaluation criteria and headings](http://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/39187.html).
* Commercialization projects submitted to the **Commercialization committee** must include both Research and Technical plan and Commercialization plan and follow [specific criteria](http://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/50439.html).
* Applications submitted to the **Indigenous Health Research (IHR)** committee should consider [specific guidelines](https://www.researchnet-recherchenet.ca/rnr16/vwOpprtntyDtls.do?prog=2719&view=currentOpps&org=CIHR&type=EXACT&resultCount=25&sort=program&all=1&masterList=true#evaluation) as shown below.

|  |
| --- |
| **Sub-criterion 1.1: Significance & Impact of the Research (25%)** |
| This criterion is intended to assess the quality of what is being proposed, the value of the anticipated project contributions, and any advances in health-related knowledge, health care, health systems, and/or health outcomes.* **Is the project idea creative?**
	+ The project idea is among the best formulated ideas in its field, stemming from new, incremental, innovative, and/or high-risk lines of inquiry; new or adapted research and knowledge translation/commercialization approaches/methodologies and opportunities to apply research findings nationally and internationally.
* **Is the rationale of the project idea sound?**
	+ The project rationale is based on a logical integration of concepts.
* **Are the overall goals and objectives of the project well-defined?**
	+ The goal states the purpose of the project, and what the project is ultimately expected to achieve.
	+ The objectives clearly define the proposed lines of inquiry and/or activities required to meet the goal.
	+ The proposed project outputs (i.e., the anticipated results of the project) are clearly described and aligned to the objectives.
* **Are the anticipated project contributions likely to advance health-related knowledge, health care, health systems and/or health outcomes?**
	+ The context and needs (issues and/or gaps) of the project are clearly described.
	+ The anticipated contribution(s) are clearly described, and should be substantive and relevant in relation to the context of the issues or gaps.
	+ The anticipated contribution(s) are realistic, i.e., directly stemming from the project outputs, as opposed to marginally related.

**IHR committee considerations:** The proposed research must be relevant to First Nations, Inuit and/or Métis priorities and have the potential to produce valued outcomes from the perspective of First Nations, Inuit and/or Métis participants and Indigenous peoples more broadly. |
| **Sub-criterion 2.1: Approaches and Methods (50%)** |
| This sub-criterion is intended to assess the quality of the project's design and plan; including how and when the project will be completed.* **Are the approaches and methods appropriate to deliver the proposed output(s) and achieve the proposed contribution(s) to advancing health-related knowledge, health care, health systems, and/or health outcomes?**
	+ The **research and/or knowledge translation/commercialization** approaches, methods, and/or strategies should be well-defined and justified in terms of being appropriate to accomplish the objectives of the project.
	+ Opportunities to maximize project contributions to advance health-related knowledge, health care, health systems and/or health outcomes should be proactively sought and planned for, but may also arise unexpectedly.
* **Are the timelines and related deliverables of the project realistic?**
	+ Timelines for the project should be appropriate in relation to the proposed project activities. Key milestones and deliverables should be aligned with the objectives of the project, and be feasible given the duration of the project.
* **Does the proposal identify potential challenges and appropriate mitigation strategies?**
	+ Critical scientific, technical, or organizational challenges should be identified, and a realistic plan to tackle these potential risks should be described. An exhaustive list is not expected.

**IHR committee considerations:** In addition to demonstrating scientific excellence (Western, Indigenous, or both), the proposed research approaches and methods must respect Indigenous values and ways of knowing and sharing, and abide by [*Tri-Council Policy Statement Chapter 9: Research Involving the First Nations, Inuit and Métis Peoples of Canada*](http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique/initiatives/tcps2-eptc2/chapter9-chapitre9/) and/or Indigenous partnering community/organizational ethical guidelines or clearly explain why other guidelines have been developed and agreed upon with the study governance body. |
| **Sub-criterion 2.2: Expertise, Experience and Resources (25%)** |
| An estimate of the **number of hours per week (contribution) for each applicant** working on the project should be provided. This sub-criterion is intended to assess the appropriateness of the complement of expertise, experience, and resources among the applicants (Nominated Principal Applicant, Principal Applicant(s) and Co-Applicant(s)), and their institutions/organizations, as it relates to the ability to collectively deliver on the objectives of the project.* **Does the applicant(s) bring the appropriate expertise and experience to lead and deliver the proposed outputs and achieve the proposed contribution(s)?**
	+ The applicant(s) should demonstrate the combined expertise and experience needed to execute the project (i.e., deliver the proposed outputs as well as achieve the proposed contribution(s)). The roles and responsibilities of each applicant should be clearly described, and linked to the objectives of the project.
* **Is there an appropriate level of engagement and/or commitment from the applicant(s)?**
	+ The level of engagement (e.g., time and other commitments) of each applicant should be appropriate for the roles and responsibilities described.
* **Is the environment (academic institution and/or other organization) appropriate to enable the conduct and success of the project?**
	+ Project applicants should have access to the appropriate infrastructure, facilities, support personnel, equipment, and/or supplies to:
		- Carry out their respective roles; and
		- As a collective, manage and deliver the proposed output(s), and achieve the proposed contribution(s).

**IHR Committee considerations:** Appropriateness of the team based on their overall scientific experience (Western, Indigenous, or both) and skills as well as their Indigenous community-based research experience, track record, relevance of past experience, including expertise related to Indigenous lived experience(s).  |
| **Other components of the application** |
| * 1 page summary (3500 characters including spaces)
* CVs & Most Significant Contributions: *as part of the assessment (sub-criterion 2.2)*
* Response to Previous Reviews (2 pages)
* Budget
 |