JOHNS HOPKINS
GUPTA-KLINSKY
INDIA INSTITUTE

GKII Research Award Reviewer Guide

Applicant Review Criteria

Rating Criteria

- Are the candidate's academic record and research experience of high quality?
- Does the candidate have the potential to develop into an independent and productive researcher?
- Does the candidate demonstrate commitment to a research career in the future?
- Does the research project reflect a significant contribution of the candidate to the originality of the project idea, approach and/or hypotheses relative to the career stage of the applicant?
- Is the research project highly relevant to India, addressing critical issues or gaps in the field to advance knowledge and outcomes related to India?

Rating Scoring

1-5 Rating Scale

Contribution to the Research Project

PLEASE RATE USING 1-5 SCALE, and PROVIDE COMMENTS BELOW –

5: Outstanding - The research project reflects an exceptional contribution from the candidate, with clear evidence of original ideas, innovative approaches, and hypotheses directly attributable to the candidate. The project is of high scientific quality, well integrated with the proposed research training plan, and addresses the rigor of prior research with robust and unbiased strategies.

4: Excellent - The research project shows a strong contribution from the candidate, with significant original ideas, approaches, and hypotheses. The project is scientifically sound, well integrated with the research training plan, and includes plans to address prior research rigor and ensure a robust and unbiased approach.

3: Good - The research project reflects a good contribution from the candidate, with some original ideas, approaches, and hypotheses. The project is generally of good scientific quality, integrated with the research training plan, and includes some plans to address prior research rigor and unbiased strategies.

2: Fair - The research project shows limited contribution from the candidate, with few original ideas or approaches. The project lacks strong scientific quality, is poorly integrated with the research training plan, and has minimal plans to address prior research rigor or ensure unbiased strategies.

1: Needs Improvement - The research project does not reflect a significant contribution from the candidate, lacking original ideas, approaches, or hypotheses. The project is of poor scientific quality, not integrated with the research training plan, and fails to address prior research rigor or ensure a robust and unbiased approach.

Relevance to India Research and Scientific Potential

PLEASE RATE USING 1-5 SCALE, and PROVIDE COMMENTS BELOW –

5: Outstanding - The proposed research is highly relevant to India, addressing critical issues or gaps in the field. The scientific potential is exceptional, with innovative methodologies and significant implications for advancing knowledge related to India.

4: Excellent - The proposed research is very relevant to India, tackling important issues or gaps. The scientific potential is high, with strong methodologies and meaningful implications for the field.

3: Good - The proposed research is relevant to India, addressing notable issues or gaps. The scientific potential is good, with sound methodologies and relevant implications for the field.

2: Fair - The proposed research has limited relevance to India, addressing minor issues or gaps. The scientific potential is fair, with some methodological weaknesses and limited implications for the field.

1: Needs Improvement - The proposed research lacks relevance to India, addressing inconsequential issues or gaps. The scientific potential is poor, with significant methodological weaknesses and negligible implications for the field.

Proposal Review Criteria

1-5 Rating Scale

Scientific Approach: Rigor and Technical Merit

PLEASE RATE USING 1-5 SCALE, and PROVIDE COMMENTS BELOW –

5: Outstanding - The scientific approach is exceptionally rigorous, technically excellent, and based on state-of-the-art methods.

4: Excellent - The scientific approach is robust and technically sound, meeting high standards.

3: Good - The scientific approach is generally sound but may have minor issues in rigor or technical execution.

2: Fair - The scientific approach lacks rigor and has significant technical weaknesses.

1: Needs Improvement - The scientific approach is fundamentally flawed, lacking any rigor or technical merit.

Innovation: Novelty and Impact

PLEASE RATE USING 1-5 SCALE, and PROVIDE COMMENTS BELOW –

5: Outstanding - The research project is exceptionally innovative, introducing groundbreaking concepts or methods that have the potential to significantly advance the field. It demonstrates an original and transformative approach.

4: Excellent - The research project is highly innovative, presenting new ideas or methods that are likely to have a substantial impact on the field. It shows a strong potential to advance knowledge and practices.

3: Good - The research project is moderately innovative, offering new ideas or methods that contribute to the field but may not have a transformative impact. It shows potential for advancement but lacks groundbreaking novelty.

2: Fair - The research project has limited innovation, presenting ideas or methods that are not significantly different from existing approaches. It shows minimal potential for advancement in the field.

1: Needs Improvement - The research project lacks innovation, presenting no new ideas or methods. It does not demonstrate potential for advancement and fails to address the need for novel approaches.

Collaboration: Strength of Multidisciplinary Collaboration

PLEASE RATE USING 1-5 SCALE, and PROVIDE COMMENTS BELOW –

5: Outstanding - The project demonstrates exceptional strength in fostering diverse multidisciplinary collaboration, creating innovative new partnerships.

4: Excellent - The project exhibits strong collaboration across disciplines, with some new and existing valuable partnerships.

3: Good - Collaboration is evident, but there may be some limitations in diversity or innovation in partnerships.

2: Fair - Collaboration is limited and may lack diversity or novel partnerships.

1: Needs Improvement - The project lacks any meaningful multidisciplinary collaboration or new partnerships.

Significance: Impact on Knowledge, Practice, Outcomes, or Policy

PLEASE RATE USING 1-5 SCALE, and PROVIDE COMMENTS BELOW –

5: Outstanding - The project's potential impact on knowledge, practice, outcomes, or policy is highly significant and transformative.

4: Excellent - The project has a strong potential to significantly create impact with clear relevance and importance.

3: Good - The project is likely to have a moderate impact addressing important issues but with some limitations.

2: Fair - The project's impact is limited, with significant shortcomings in addressing critical aspects.

1: Needs Improvement - The project lacks any substantial potential to create impact through knowledge, practice, outcomes, or policy.

Viability: Feasibility of Project Completion Within a 12-Month Period

PLEASE RATE USING 1-5 SCALE, and PROVIDE COMMENTS BELOW –

5: Outstanding - The project's completion within 12 months is highly feasible, with excellent project management and resource allocation.

4: Excellent - The project is likely to be completed within the timeframe 12-month period, with sound project management.

3: Good - The project has moderate feasibility for completion within 12 months, with some challenges in project management.

2: Fair - Completion within 12 months is doubtful, with significant issues in project management and resource allocation.

1: Needs Improvement - The project is highly unlikely to be completed within the stipulated 12-month period.

Sustainability: Likelihood the Project will Promote Continued Collaboration

PLEASE RATE USING 1-5 SCALE, and PROVIDE COMMENTS BELOW –

5: Outstanding - The project is highly likely to secure future funding and promote continued collaboration, with a strong foundation for sustainability.

4: Excellent - The project has good potential for future funding and collaboration, with a clear path to sustainability.

3: Good - The project may attract some future funding and collaboration, although sustainability may have limitations.

2: Fair - The project's potential for future funding and collaboration is limited, with significant challenges in sustainability.

1: Needs Improvement - The project is unlikely to attract future funding or promote sustained collaboration.

Budget: Assessment of Budget Aligned to Project Activities and Award Funds

PLEASE RATE USING 1-5 SCALE, and PROVIDE COMMENTS BELOW –

5: Outstanding - The budget is exceptionally well-aligned with the project's activities and maximizes award funding judiciously.

4: Excellent - The budget is well-structured and appropriate for the project, with sound utilization of award funding.

3: Good - The budget is generally suitable for project activities, but funding may be limited.

2: Fair - The budget is inadequate or misaligned with the project's scope, and funding is inadequate.

1: Needs Improvement- The budget is entirely inappropriate for the project, and there is a lack of justification for award funds.

Additional Reviewer Guidance:

Research Training Plan

- Is the proposed research project of high scientific quality, and is it well integrated with the proposed research training plan?
- Is the prior research that serves as the key support for the proposed project rigorous?
- Has the applicant included plans to address weaknesses in the rigor of prior research that serve as the key support for the proposed project?
- Has the applicant presented strategies to ensure a robust and unbiased approach, as appropriate for the work proposed?
- Has the applicant presented adequately plans to address human subject research, international collaboration protocols, and other research and travel contingencies?
- Is the research project consistent with the candidate's stage of research development?
- Is the proposed time frame feasible to accomplish the proposed training and research?
- Does the training and project plan provide adequate opportunities to present and publish research findings and to collaborate with scientists and professionals in India as the work progresses?
- Will the project plan provide the professional skills needed for the candidate to transition to the next stage of his/her research career?
- Will the fellowship experience contribute to the proposed project and/or the candidate's international research training?