

Criteria for the Scientific Review include:

A. Scored Review Criteria (Scored individually and considered in overall impact/priority score)

1. Significance:

- Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field?
- If the aims of the project are achieved, how will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved?
- How will successful completion of the aims change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field?

2. Investigator(s):

- Are the PD/PIs, collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project?
- If Early Stage Investigators or Junior Investigators, or in the early stages of independent careers, do they have appropriate experience and training?
- If established, have they demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s)?
- If the project is collaborative or multi-PD/PI, do the investigators have complementary and integrated expertise; are their leadership approach, governance and organizational structure appropriate for the project?

3. Innovation:

- Does the application challenge and seek to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilizing novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions?
- Are the concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions novel to one field of research or novel in a broad sense?
- Is a refinement, improvement, or new application of theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions proposed?

4. Approach:

- Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project?
- Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented?
- If the project is in the early stages of development, will the strategy establish feasibility and will particularly risky aspects be managed?
- If the project involves research involving human subjects or a clinical investigation, are the plans for 1) protection of human subjects from research risks, and 2) inclusion of minorities and members of both sexes/genders, as well as the inclusion of children, justified in terms of the scientific goals and research strategy proposed?

5. Environment:

- Will the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success?
- Are the institutional support, equipment and other physical resources available to the investigators adequate for the project proposed?
- Will the project benefit from unique features of the scientific environment, subject populations, or collaborative arrangements?
- Reviewers will consider the following additional (items B and C) in the determination of scientific and technical merit, but will not give separate scores for these items.

B. Additional Review Criteria (Not scored individually, but considered in overall impact/priority score)

1. Human Subjects, Gender/Minority/Children, Vertebrate Animals and/or Biohazards Issues:

- Are the procedures of proposed adequate for the protection of human subjects and/or vertebrate animals, appropriately documented, and in compliance with applicable published regulations?
- If human subjects are involved, does the research plan include both genders, minorities and/or children? If the plan does not include such gender, minority and/or children representation, is there justification?
- Are proposed materials or procedures potentially hazardous to research personnel and/or the environment? Is adequate protection proposed?

C. Additional Review Considerations (Not scored individually and not considered in overall score)

1. Budget:

- Is the budget reasonable and appropriately justified?
- Are all costs (direct and indirect) included in the budget?

Criteria for the Programmatic Review include:

1. Relevance of the proposed project to occupational safety and health issues in PHR 6.
2. Severity of the injury or disease in the region.
3. Usefulness of the research to technical knowledge on the identification, evaluation, or control of occupational safety and health hazards on a regional and national basis.
4. Scientific merit of the proposal as determined by the Scientific Review.
5. Availability of funds.

Applications considered scientifically meritorious and programmaticaly relevant, will be invited to revise and resubmit their proposals in view of the received written critique. There is no guarantee that revised proposals will be funded. Revised proposals should satisfactorily address the reviewer's comments and will receive a second level of review by the Scientific Review Panel.