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| **Standard Deviation** | <<[d.Critiques.FirstOrDefault(x => x.OverallFlag).StandardDeviation]:"0.0">> |

**ABSTRACT AND SIGNIFICANCE (verbatim):**

**<<if [d.OtherData1.Count(x => x.Field2 == "19") > 0]>>**<<[d.OtherData1.FirstOrDefault(x => x.Field2 == "19").Field1]>><</if>>

**REVIEWER SUMMARY**

**OVERALL IMPRESSION**

<<foreach [element in d.Critiques.Where(x => x.ScoreFlag && x.OverallFlag).GroupBy( p => new { ElementDesc = p.ElementDesc, AvgScore = p.AvgScore, ElementOrder = p.ElementOrder, ClientElementId = p.ClientElementId}).OrderBy(o=> o.Key.ElementOrder)]>>**<<foreach [in d.Critiques.Where(x => x.ClientElementId == element.Key.ClientElementId &&** !x.DiscussionNoteFlag**).OrderBy(o => o.ReviewerOrder)]>><<[ReviewerDisplayName]>>**

Tag||<<[ApplicationTemplateElementId]>>||<<[ContentText] -html>>

<</foreach>><</foreach>>**Evaluation Criteria Rating Scale 1.0 (Highest Merit) To 9.0 (Lowest Merit)**

Comments and scores are those of assigned reviewers.

**Average of Criteria Scores of Assigned Reviewers**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria Description** | **Score** |
| <<foreach [element in d.Critiques.Where(x => x.ScoreFlag && !x.OverallFlag).GroupBy( p => new { ElementDesc = p.ElementDesc, AvgScore = p.AvgScore, ElementOrder = p.ElementOrder}).OrderBy(o=> o.Key.ElementOrder)]>>**<<[element.Key.ElementDesc]>>** | <<[element.Key.AvgScore]:"#0.0">><</foreach>> |

**PRIMARY CRITERIA**

<<foreach [element in d.Critiques.Where(x => x.ScoreFlag && !x.OverallFlag).GroupBy( p => new { ElementDesc = p.ElementDesc, AvgScore = p.AvgScore, ElementOrder = p.ElementOrder, ClientElementId = p.ClientElementId}).OrderBy(o=> o.Key.ElementOrder)]>>**<<[element.Key.ElementDesc]** :upper **>>**

**<<foreach [in d.Critiques.Where(x => x.ClientElementId == element.Key.ClientElementId &&** !x.DiscussionNoteFlag**).OrderBy(o => o.ReviewerOrder)]>><<[ReviewerDisplayName]>>**

Tag||<<[ApplicationTemplateElementId]>>||<<[ContentText] -html>>

<</foreach>><</foreach>>**SECONDARY CRITERIA**

<<foreach [element in d.Critiques.Where(x => !x.ScoreFlag && !x.OverallFlag **&& x.ElementTypeId** !=  **2**).GroupBy( p => new { ElementDesc = p.ElementDesc, AvgScore = p.AvgScore, ElementOrder = p.ElementOrder, ClientElementId = p.ClientElementId }).OrderBy(o=> o.Key.ElementOrder)]>>**<<[element.Key.ElementDesc]>>**

**<<foreach [in d.Critiques.Where(x => x.ClientElementId == element.Key.ClientElementId &&** !x.DiscussionNoteFlag**).OrderBy(o => o.ReviewerOrder)]>><<[ReviewerDisplayName]>>**

Tag||<<[ApplicationTemplateElementId]>>||<<[ContentText] - html>>

<</foreach>><</foreach>>\*Advocate reviewers are required to provide comments only for the Impact or Impact and Innovation criterion but may provide comments for other criteria as well.

**REVIEW PROCESS OVERVIEW**

All eligible applications are reviewed using a two-stage process: (1) Peer Review and (2) Programmatic Review. In the first stage, applications are evaluated by an independent review panel using the criteria described in the RFA. In the second stage, applications judged to be most meritorious by review panels are evaluated by the Prevention Review Council (PRC).

**PEER REVIEW SUMMARY STATEMENT AND SCORING**

This application was evaluated by a review panel of highly qualified experts from outside the State of Texas. The purpose of the Peer Review Summary Statement is to provide meaningful feedback on the submitted application and guidance for implementation of the proposed project.

Two types of scores are stated in the Peer Review Summary Statement: (i) An overall evaluation score and (ii) evaluation criteria scores. Review panel members assigned to evaluate an application provide an overall score and criteria scores prior to the peer review meeting and also at the peer review meeting. Review panel members not assigned to evaluate an application provide an overall score at the peer review meeting only.

Applications with the highest premeeting overall scores from reviewers assigned to evaluate the application and, therefore, the highest potential for funding are discussed at the peer review meeting. Applications with lower overall scores are not discussed in detail at this time. The Peer Review Summary Statement states if the application was discussed at the peer review meeting.

During discussion of an application at the peer review meeting, every review panel member provides an overall score for the application. Thus, for applications discussed at the peer review meeting, the overall evaluation score stated in the Peer Review Summary Statement represents an average of the overall scores provided by the entire panel. For applications not discussed at the peer review meeting, the overall evaluation score represents an average of the overall scores provided only by the reviewers assigned to evaluate the application. In either case, evaluation criteria scores are an average of the criteria scores provided only by the reviewers assigned to evaluate the application. Please note that the overall score is not an average of the criteria scores; rather, it reflects the panel’s or assigned reviewers’ overall impression of the application based on the scored and unscored evaluation criteria.

**PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW PROCESS AND PRIORITIES**

The goals of the Programmatic Review are to meet budget guidelines and to balance the CPRIT portfolio by selecting the best projects based on the programmatic priorities (listed below). Applications must be within the score range determined by the PRC to be considered during programmatic review. At this level of review, recommendations for funding are based on comparisons with applications from all of the merit review panels and programmatic priorities. The order of scores may be disregarded in favor of programmatic considerations.

Programmatic Priorities

1. Potential for Impact and Return on Investment (ROI)

* + Based on the project’s potential to reduce risk, prevent cancer, and demonstration of a strong evidence base
  + ROI—good investment for cost of program and ability to defend cost per person as reasonable

2. Geographic distribution

* + High incidence, mortality areas for Texas
  + Areas not well served in current portfolio

3. Cancer type

* + CPRIT may support all cancers that have evidence-based prevention interventions but may prioritize based on high incidence, mortality, prevalence of risk factors
  + Geographic distribution of cancer type in portfolio

4. Type of program

* + Primary, secondary, tertiary prevention
  + Education, clinical service delivery

**PROGRAM INTEGRATION COMMITTEE AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

The Program Integration Committee (PIC) is composed of the Chief Executive Officer, the Chief Scientific Officer, the Chief Product Development Officer, the Chief Prevention and Communications Officer, and the Commissioner of State Health Services. The PIC considers the prioritized list of grant applications submitted by the respective PRC. The PIC approves by a majority vote a final list of grant applications to be [recommended to the Oversight Committee](http://www.cprit.state.tx.us/grants-process).

In composing the final list of Grant applications recommended for funding, the PIC must do the following:

* Consider the priorities outlined in statute;
* Document the factors considered in making the grant award recommendations;
* Explain in writing the reasons for not recommending a grant application that was recommended for a grant award by a Review Council;
* Specify the amount of funding for each grant application;
* Specify changes, if any, to the grant applications’ goals and objectives, timeline, or budget recommended for a grant award and provide an explanation for the changes made; and
* Address how the funding recommendations meet the annual priorities for the Prevention, Research, and Product Development programs and affect the Institute’s overall grant award portfolio established by the Oversight Committee.

The PIC’s decision to not include a grant application on the prioritized list of grant applications submitted to the Oversight Committee is final.

Two-thirds of the Oversight Committee Members present and voting must approve each grant award recommendation submitted by the PIC. The total amount of money approved to fund a multiyear project must be specified, and the CEO’s recommendation, if any, regarding an advance of grant award funds must be approved by a majority vote of the Oversight Committee.

If the Oversight Committee does not approve a grant award recommendation made by the PIC, the explanation must be recorded in the minutes of the meeting. The Oversight Committee may not award more than $300 million in Grant Awards in a fiscal year.