

The O&P Foundation Screening and Review Form

Mentored Pilot, Pilot, and Early Career Grants

Administrative screening

Program managers will check each proposal for the following criteria:

- The study team meets eligibility requirements as listed in the program manual (specific to each program).
- The proposal is complete, including all sections listed in the program manual (specific to each program).
- The proposal adheres to all word and page limits (specific to each program).
- The budget is under the maximum amount listed in the program manual (specific to each program).
- If human subjects research, the proposal lists the institutional review board (IRB) that will review, approve, and oversee the proposed research.
- If animal research, the proposal lists the institutional animal care and use committee (IACUC) that will review, approve, and oversee the proposed research.

Review form

Score	Description
10	Excellent, no apparent weaknesses
8	Good, only minor weaknesses
6	Average, some moderate weaknesses
4	Fair, some major weaknesses
2	Poor, many major weaknesses
0	Absent, no information

Section 1. Relevance to orthotics and prosthetics

- 1.1. The applicant(s) have identified a clinically relevant issue or problem.
- 1.2. The applicant(s) have proposed a novel, unique, or original study to address a knowledge gap.

Section 2. Scientific merit

- 2.1. The specific aims/objectives are logical and appropriate for addressing the identified knowledge gap. If applicable, hypotheses are stated in a testable manner. If hypotheses are not applicable (e.g., the proposed research is qualitative or exploratory in nature), the expected outcomes are explained with appropriate detail.

- 2.2. The proposed study design (e.g., experimental, observational, qualitative, cross-sectional, longitudinal, etc.) is justified and appropriate for the stated specific aims, objectives, and/or hypotheses (if applicable). If the study design is experimental, all intervention(s) and control(s) are clearly described. If the study design is longitudinal, the follow-up duration for participants is appropriate.
- 2.3. The eligibility criteria and sampling approach are appropriate for the proposed study. The proposed sample size is justified and appropriate to the aims and scope of the study.
- 2.4. The outcome measures are clearly described and justified.
- 2.5. The data analysis plan is clearly described, justified, and address the study aims. If applicable, confounding variables and/or effect modifiers are described and accounted for in the design or analysis.
- 2.6. The proposed timeline, including milestones and deliverables, is feasible.
- 2.7. Expected results and potential problems are described. For each potential problem, appropriate alternative strategies are proposed that demonstrate the investigators' ability to successfully complete the project.
- 2.8. Future plans demonstrate the investigators' commitment to continuation of this line of research (for pilot research) or dissemination of findings (for stand-alone projects).

Section 3. Investigators and environment

- 3.1. The budget and budget justification are reasonable for the proposed project.
- 3.2. The facilities and resources available to the investigators are adequate and will facilitate successful completion of the project.
- 3.3. The investigator team has the experience, expertise, and time to successfully complete the project. If the principal investigator is a trainee (e.g., student, resident), the mentor(s) identified for the project have the experience and expertise to help the trainee successfully complete the project.
- 3.4. Letters of support demonstrate institutional and collaborator commitment to the project.

Summary of strengths and weaknesses

- Please describe the major strengths of this application.
- Please describe any major concerns you have with the proposed research.
- Please describe any minor concerns you have with the proposed research. Note that applicants selected for funding may be required to address reviewer concerns.