

**Department of Surgery Bridge Funding
2025-2026**

Applicant: _____

Reviewer: _____

SCORE: /20

1. Addressing Prior Critiques — 5 points

- ☐ **5** – Thorough, clear, and convincing responses to all prior reviewer critiques; substantial improvements demonstrated.
- ☐ **4** – Most critiques addressed well; minor areas lack detail.
- ☐ **3** – Adequate response to critiques; some issues remain.
- ☐ **2** – Only partially addresses critiques; several unresolved issues.
- ☐ **1** – Minimal improvements; inadequate responses.
- ☐ **0** – Does not address prior critiques.

Reviewer Comments:

2. Feasible Budget — 5 points

Score (check one):

- ☐ **5** – Budget is realistic, well-justified, and aligned with aims.
- ☐ **4** – Budget mostly feasible; minor inconsistencies.
- ☐ **3** – Generally reasonable; justification somewhat weak.
- ☐ **2** – Notable issues (unclear, inflated, missing rationale).
- ☐ **1** – Significant flaws; poorly justified.
- ☐ **0** – Unrealistic or disconnected from project needs.

Reviewer Comments:

3. Likelihood of Successful Resubmission — 5 points

Score (check one):

- ☐ **5** – Highly competitive for resubmission; strong likelihood of funding.
- ☐ **4** – Good likelihood; minor weaknesses remain.
- ☐ **3** – Moderate likelihood; several key improvements still needed.
- ☐ **2** – Low likelihood; major gaps persist.
- ☐ **1** – Very low likelihood.
- ☐ **0** – Unlikely to succeed without major overhaul.

Reviewer Comments:

4. Quality of Research — 5 points

Score (check one):

- ☐ **5** – High-quality, innovative, rigorous research plan; strong impact.
- ☐ **4** – Solid plan with minor weaknesses.
- ☐ **3** – Adequate quality; some issues in design or data.
- ☐ **2** – Weak or unclear plan; limited impact.
- ☐ **1** – Poorly designed research.
- ☐ **0** – Fatally flawed or not viable.

Reviewer Comments:

Total Score (0–20):

_____ / 20