Before starting your review of SCH proposals, you should read the following:

Smart and Connected Health (SCH) Program Solicitation, NSF 16-601  
(http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2016/nsf16601/nsf16601.htm). This defines the requirements for proposals, and the review criteria to be applied to them.

NSF Proposal Review Introduction (go to http://fastlane.nsf.gov, follow the “More About FastLane ...” link near the top of the page, and then select the “Proposal Review” link from the menu on the left). This explains how to enter reviews in FastLane, as well as the general NSF review criteria.

NIH Scoring System  
(http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/guidelines_general/scoring_system_and_procedure.pdf)

Since SCH is a joint NSF-NIH program, you will need to evaluate and score each proposal according to two different sets of criteria, one for each agency.

For the NIH, you will need to write down a score for the NIH Overall Impact Score, on a scale of 1-9, on an NIH score sheet and bring it to the panel meeting. The NIH scores should be based solely on the NIH criteria, which are explained in a separate NIH instruction sheet that will be sent to you along with the score sheet. Given the missions of the two agencies, an application may be highly rated for one agency and not the other. Please consider the strengths of a proposal as it related to each agency separately when making your ratings.

For the NSF you will use the FastLane on-line system to enter your comments and an overall score for the proposal on the NSF scale of Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, or Poor. This rating should be based on your overall assessment of the proposed project in relation to responsiveness to the SCH solicitation and the strengths and weaknesses with respect to the NSF Merit Review Criteria of Intellectual Merit and Broader Impacts and solicitation-specific review criteria.

Please consider all of the five NSF review elements, interpreting them in the context of this solicitation:

1. How important is the proposed activity to advancing knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields?

2. How well qualified is the individual, team, or organization to conduct the proposed activities?

3. To what extent do the proposed activities suggest and explore creative, original, or potentially transformative concepts? (For this program, the proposed project must have potential to “make a fundamental contribution to engineering, computer and information sciences, or social, behavioral and economic sciences.”)

4. Is the plan for carrying out the proposed activities well-reasoned, well-organized, and based on a sound rationale? Does the plan incorporate a mechanism to assess success?

5. Are there adequate resources available to the PI (either at the home organization or through collaborations) to carry out the proposed activities?
Keep in mind that this program has adopted a triage rule: a proposal will not be discussed at the panel meeting unless either it has one reviewer score of Very Good or higher, or at least one panel member requests that it be discussed at the meeting.

We will provide you with an NSF review template form, as a text (.txt) file. The template contains section headings to remind you of the different components of the review. Please enter your comments into a copy of the template file and then copy and paste the relevant sections from that file into the appropriate text boxes in FastLane. This process reduces the likelihood of losing text in case of an Internet failure. The template has four major sections corresponding to the four text entry boxes provided by FastLane. Each major section is divided by subheadings, generally corresponding to categories of review criteria.

Please provide evaluative comments for each subheading. Structure your comments as separate lists of strengths and/or weaknesses of the proposal. It is helpful to use “+” as bullets for strengths and “-” for weaknesses. Use complete sentences. If a comment is relevant to more than one section you may make reference to it rather than repeating the full text.
INTELLECTUAL MERIT:  This is the first text box of the FastLane review form.

Proposal summary:

Provide a brief non-evaluative summary of what the proposal is about. Identify the "key health problem" addressed and the nature of the “fundamental contribution(s) to engineering, computer and information sciences, or social, behavioral and economic sciences”. Your comments must address all five of the NSF review elements described above.

Strengths:

+ A statement of a strength of the proposal
+ Another statement
+ etc.

Weaknesses:

- A statement of a weakness of the proposal.
- etc.

The following subheadings correspond to required proposal elements that relate to Intellectual Merit. For each, indicate whether you have noted any specific strengths or weaknesses. If an item is not applicable (e.g., if there are no human or vertebrate animal subjects) just enter “N/A”.

Evaluation Plan:

This program requires that every proposal include an Evaluation Plan, as part of the Project Description. Please check that there is one, and comment on the quality.

Human and Vertebrate Subjects (if applicable):

Proposals involving human subjects should include a Supplementary Document (at the end of the proposal) of no more than two pages in length summarizing potential risks to human subjects; plans for recruitment and informed consent; inclusion of women, minorities, and children; and planned procedures to protect against or minimize potential risks. There should also be a supplement covering any experimentation involving vertebrate animals.

Budget:

Are the budget and the requested period of support fully justified and reasonable in relation to the proposed research? This can be a simple “Budget: appropriate”, unless there are deficiencies.

Results from prior NSF and/or NIH support (if applicable):
Please comment on the quality of the prior work, if any. The comment may be terse, unless specific strengths or weaknesses are noted.

**Letters of Collaboration (if applicable):**

Any dependence on personnel and resources not included in the budget should be supported by letters of collaboration.

---

**BROADER IMPACTS:** This is the second text entry box in FastLane.

---

What is the potential to benefit society and contribute to the achievement of specific, desired societal outcomes? Your comments must address all five of the NSF review elements described above.

**Strengths:**

**Weaknesses:**

The following subheadings correspond to required proposal elements that relate to Broader Impacts. For each, indicate whether you have noted any specific strengths or weaknesses. If an item is not applicable (e.g., if there are no postdoctoral fellows in the budget) just enter “N/A”.

**Postdoctoral Mentoring plan (if applicable):**

If the budget includes any postdoctoral fellows, evaluate the mentoring plan here. Your comment may be terse unless the plan is missing or you have found deficiencies or notable strengths.

---

**SOLICITATION-SPECIFIC CRITERIA** This is the third text entry box in Fastlane.

---

You may have already provided some comments on strengths and weaknesses of the proposal with respect to the following criteria, under in the Intellectual Merit and Broader Impacts boxes. If so, you may make reference to those comments here rather than repeating the full text.

**Infrastructure Planning, Software Sharing, and Data Management:**

Assess the dissemination plan for using and sharing the technological products of this research, with appropriate timelines, for its potential effectiveness and impact. All proposals are required to include a Data Management Plan, as a supplemental document. Include that in your evaluation. Remember that “data” includes software, databases, etc. developed by the project.

**Survivability:**

Assess the credibility of the plan for continuing the development and transferring the artifacts and know-how after the expiration of research funding, including steps toward commercialization and translation to the bedside.
Impact:

Assess the potential for general impact of the proposed research on the development of techniques, environments or paradigms that will advance the provision of a system with patient-centered, evidence-based, prevention-focused and/or personalized care.

Collaboration, Management, and Coordination:

Assess the extent to which the group is integrated, has a common focus and the quality of management and collaboration plans. Include in your consideration information from the Coordination Plan, which is a required supplementary document for INT proposals and optional for EXP proposals. Supplementary documents appear at the end of the proposal.

Education and Training:

Assess the degree to which research and education are integrated and activities involve participation and training of students, and the potential for involvement of motivated populations of young researchers in advancing health through science, technology, and behavior.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

SUMMARY STATEMENT - This is the fourth and final text entry box in FastLane. Do not provide a summary of the proposal here (that goes as the first paragraph under Intellectual Merit). Here you provide a summary of your evaluation.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Responsiveness to the SCH Solicitation:

Does the project address a “key health problem” and make a case that it will produce “fundamental contribution(s) to engineering, computer and information sciences, or social, behavioral and economic sciences”?

Justification for NSF Rating:

Write a paragraph summarizing the factors that informed your NSF rating. This paragraph is not intended to be a summary and/or restatement of comments you made above. Rather, it should succinctly inform the reader (e.g., the applicant and NSF personnel) of the underlying rationale for the overall scores, given your preceding comments.