



Application Review Criteria

Please Note: Attachments of any kind (letters of support, appendices, supplemental materials, etc.) are not allowed.

Prior to sending the application for review, the Alzheimer's Association has confirmed these investigators are eligible.

If you have questions regarding the eligibility of one of your applications, please do not hesitate to contact us at grantsapp@alz.org

Applications will be reviews with special attention to:

A. The Significance of the Question Being Studied

Examples of questions and issues, which the reviewer might consider include, but are not limited to:

- a. What is the significance of the problem area, the question of hypothesis being tested?
- b. Does the proposed project address agency research priorities?
- c. How important is the problem for the overall scientific field?
- d. What is the likelihood that the solution of this problem will lead to fundamental advances?

B. Application Information – including the training of the PI insofar as it enables them to perform the work proposed and qualifications of the collaborators and the expertise they bring to the project.

Examples of questions and issues, which the reviewer might consider include, but are not limited to:

- a. Does the applicant, and if appropriate his/her co-workers, have the required experience and scientific or technical training to carry out this research project?
- b. Does the applicant have experience, which suggests that he/she can successfully lead a research team? If not, are there adequate backup scientific and management personnel?
- c. If the applicant is new to the field, what are the chances of his/her success?
- d. Is there a milieu of senior investigators and technical expertise that can help foster this research effort?
- e. How does the development of this application reflect on the competence of the applicant to execute this line of investigation?
- f. Does this proposed project introduce or recruit any new investigators to this line of research?

C. The Quality of the Work Plan, including novelty and innovation of the proposed project.

Examples of questions and issues, which the reviewer might consider include, but are not limited to:

- a. Is the overall plan of work appropriately paced in relationship to the requested budget and stated duration of the project?
- b. Is the design of the project well considered?
- c. Do the preliminary data support the research plan and procedures?
- d. Are the methods, procedures, instruments, subjects and/or models being used adequate to answer the question or solve the problem?
- e. Are the plans for data analysis appropriate?
- f. Has the applicant demonstrated awareness of the limitations of the methods of data acquisition and analysis?

D. The Quality and Adequacy of Resources and Budget.

Examples of questions and issues, which the reviewer might consider, but are not limited to:

- a. Will the available institutional resources and facilities support the completion of the project?
- b. Is there a supportive research milieu of experienced investigators and technical expertise?
- c. Does the applicant have the necessary equipment, instruments, populations, animals, samples, reagents, assays analytical methods or other technical supports available for the conduct of this project?
- d. What additional resources are required to complete this project satisfactorily?
- e. Does the applicant present a reasonable strategy to acquire the necessary resources?
- f. Is the budget well justified and are the requested funds appropriate?

E. Risk/Impact.

The Alzheimer's Association is interested in funding investigations that will have a major impact on the field of Alzheimer's and related diseases, including projects that may have an element of risk. However, such projects MUST contain the potential to fuel significant gains and/or insights. Based on this assertion, if this project were successful, could it have a major impact on advancing the field of dementia research?

Critique Summary/Overall Review of the Project

Please provide an index of the composite impression of the project as a whole. Remember that the overall evaluation of the scientific merit of a project may reflect more than or less than the sum of the individual domains you evaluated separately.