

## **ECD Global Alliance LOI Review Process**

The due date for ECD Global Alliance (ECDGA) Letters of Intent (LOIs) will be announced early each year via the ECDGA website and email. The organization will announce the number of grants and award amounts expected to be able provided at that time.

A Review Committee will evaluate submitted LOIs based on the criteria listed on the following page. The Review Committee's evaluation and comments will be provided to the the ECD-GA Board of Directors.

The ECDGA Board of Directors (BOD) will review the evaluation material to determine which investigators/studies will be invited to submit a complete proposal. Proposals are usually due in the summer. All submitted proposals will undergo a review prior to a funding decision being made by the ECDGA BOD.

# ECDGA LOI Review Criteria

## OVERALL IMPACT

Reviewers will provide an overall impact score to reflect their assessment of the likelihood for the project to exert a sustained, powerful influence in ECD knowledge, in consideration of the following six scored review criteria,. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major scientific impact.

## SCORED CRITERIA

### 1. Significance

Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to understanding ECD, including the etiology, pathophysiology, diagnosis or treatment? 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

Is the PI well suited to the project? If an investigator is new to ECD research, do they have appropriate experience and training? If established, have they demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced the field? If the project is collaborative, 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 ECD 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 clinical research, 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?

### 6. Collaboration

Will the study promote meaningful collaboration among scientists? Among institutions?

### 7. Appropriateness

Is it likely that this project will meet its intended objective? Is achieving the patient population target likely? Is the study design well thought out and adequate? Are the estimated time and budget reasonable given the scope of the research and its potential significance?

## ECD-GA 2015 Scoring Values

The following guidance has been given to reviewers to determine individual review criterion and overall impact/priority scores:

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 weakness
	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
<p><b>Non-numeric score options:</b> NR = Not Recommended for Further Consideration, DF = Deferred, AB = Abstention, CF = Conflict, NP = Not Present, ND = Not Discussed</p>			
<p><b>Minor Weakness:</b> An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact  <b>Moderate Weakness:</b> A weakness that lessens impact  <b>Major Weakness:</b> A weakness that severely limits impact</p>			