

## AOS Grant Review

Principal Investigator(s): James RG

Application Title: Development of Novel Surgical Instruments for Endoscopic Ear Surgery

Reviewer Assignment (check one): ☐ Primary Reviewer ☒ Secondary Reviewer

### OVERALL IMPACT

Reviewers will provide an overall impact 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. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major scientific impact.

Overall Impact Write a paragraph summarizing the factors that informed your Overall Impact score.

Score (1-9): 7

**NARRATIVE:** This grant proposes to identify areas of need for endoscopic ear surgery and then fabricate the necessary tools to meet these needs. The investigators form a good team and the environment is good. Enthusiasm is diminished by the lack of quantitative methodology for demonstrating successful outcomes stemming from the work. Although the engineering approach to this device development proposal is good, there is nothing particularly innovative about it.

### 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.

1. Significance Score (1-9): 6

#### Strengths

- Endoscopic ear surgery may provide better patient outcomes than conventional surgery

#### Weaknesses

- This proposal does not provide a scientific rationale, hypothesis, or means for testing whether the research products are beneficial.

2. Investigator(s) Score (1-9): 2

#### Strengths

- Well published
- Motivated, with a long history of work in this area
- Good team

#### Weaknesses

- 

3. Innovation Score (1-9): 8

**Strengths**

- 

**Weaknesses**

- This just seems like routine engineering work, and not hypothesis driven research.
- While this research approach could potentially work, there is nothing particularly innovative about the methodology.

4. [Approach](#) Score (1-9): 7**Strengths**

- 

**Weaknesses**

- How will the investigators show that the tools they build are safe, effective, and beneficial over existing tools?
- How will this seed funding lead to future large scale grant funding?

5. [Environment](#) Score (1-9): 2**Strengths**

- The combination of medical doctors and engineers is excellent.

**Weaknesses**

- 

## ADDITIONAL REVIEW CRITERIA

As applicable for the project proposed, reviewers will consider the following additional items in the determination of scientific and technical merit, but will not give separate scores for these items.

[Protections for Human Subjects](#)

Click Here to Select

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

- 

Data and Safety Monitoring Plan (Applicable for Clinical Trials Only):

Click Here to Select

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

- 

[Vertebrate Animals](#)

Click Here to Select

Comments (Required Unless Not Applicable):

- 

[Resubmission](#)

Comments (if applicable):

- 

[Renewal](#)

Comments (if applicable):

- 

[Revision](#)

Comments (if applicable):

- 

## ADDITIONAL REVIEW CONSIDERATIONS

**As applicable** for the project proposed, reviewers will address each of the following items, but will not give scores for these items and should not consider them in providing an overall impact/priority score.

[Budget and Period of Support](#)

Click Here to Select

Recommended budget modifications or possible overlap identified:

- 

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO APPLICANT

Reviewers may provide guidance to the applicant or recommend against resubmission without fundamental revision.

[Additional Comments to Applicant](#) (Optional)

-