



*Improving Cancer Care
Through Research and Education*

Criteria for Evaluating Potential ROI Research Initiatives

Purpose

These criteria are to be applied when evaluating whether ROI should conduct a proposed research project as part of the overall ROI research agenda. Separate criteria will be developed for evaluating individual researcher proposals for specific RFPs.

Overall Impact

Reviewers will provide an overall impact/priority score to reflect their assessment of the likelihood for the project to exert a sustained, powerful influence on the research field(s) involved, in consideration of the following five scored review criteria and additional review criteria (as applicable for the project proposed).

Scored Review Criteria

Reviewers will consider each of the five review criteria below in the determination of scientific and technical merit, and give a separate score for each. An application does not need to be equally strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major scientific impact. For example, a project that by its nature may not be innovative but may be essential to advance a field.

1. **Significance.** Does this study address an important problem to radiation oncology? If the aims of the project were achieved, how would scientific knowledge or clinical practice be advanced? What would be the effect of these studies on the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that positively impact radiation oncology?
2. **Approach.** Are there enough feasible conceptual or clinical frameworks, design, methods, and analyses adequately developed, well integrated, well reasoned, and appropriate to the aims of the project?
3. **Cost Effectiveness.** Evaluate scale and scope of potential research initiative against resources and/or potential sources for funding.
4. **Gap in Needed Research.** Would project address an area of radiation oncology that was deemed a priority in the ROI Research Needs Assessment that heretofore had no or minimal research devoted to it?
5. **Timing.** Would project be of short or long duration and would it coincide well with any identified needs for results by a certain date(s)?
6. **Research Environment.** Would the scientific environment in which the work would be done contribute to the probability of success? Would there likely be institutional support for this project? Would the project benefit from unique features of the scientific environment, or subject populations, or require useful collaborative arrangements?

SCORING WILL BE ON A GLOBAL, TOTAL SCORE BASED ON A 5-POINT SCALE.