

Scoring Criteria

<p>Consistency with Center Goals (1-3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Development of sound scientific evidence on the nature, causes, and consequences of the opioid overdose epidemic</i> • <i>Prediction of emerging trends and future directions of the epidemic as it changes over time</i> • <i>Evaluation of evidence-based policies and programs to prevent opioid misuse, disorder and overdose</i> 	<p>1: not aligned with Center goals 2: moderately aligned with one Center goal 3: directly aligned with one or more Center goals</p>
<p>Significance (1-3)</p> <p><i>Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field? 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?</i></p>	<p>1: problem is already being adequately addressed; unlikely to move the field forward 2: problem has been insufficiently addressed to date; incremental contribution to the field 3: problem is not being addressed adequately; research will provide a major advancement to the field</p>
<p>Innovation (1-3)</p> <p><i>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 one field of research or novel in a broad sense? Is a refinement, improvement, or new application of theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions proposed?</i></p>	<p>1: lacking novelty or originality 2: moderately novel approach 3: novel or innovative approach</p>

<p>Rigor (1-3) <i>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?</i></p>	<p>1: proposal lacks well-reasoned, rigorous strategy, methodology, and analyses; unlikely to adequately accomplish the specific aims of the project 2. strategy, methodology, and analyses are moderately rigorous with some concerns 3. strategy, methodology, and analyses are rigorous; high likelihood specific aims of the project will be accomplished</p>
<p>Potential for Outside Funding (1-3)</p>	<p>1: unlikely to generate outside funding; not a priority area for outside funding sources 2: potential to generate outside funding, but lacks a clear plan 3: highly likely to generate outside funding; priority area for outside funding sources; clear plan for future funding</p>
<p>Budget (1-3)</p>	<p>1: unlikely to complete project with budget provided 2: likely to complete project with budget provided 3: very likely to complete project with budget provided</p>