



Evaluation Rubric for PHTS Proposals

Evaluation of upcoming proposals will be performed by both a primary and secondary reviewer from the scientific committee of the PHTS. Reviewers are blinded to proposal investigators to ensure an unbiased assessment of the project. The three assessment domains are:

- 1) **Importance of topic.** Please review attached file detailing previously presented PHTS abstracts for your reference. We are looking for projects that are relevant, timely, perhaps address a currently controversial issue in pediatric cardiac transplantation and have not recently been done through the PHTS. Remember, projects that may have been done in the past but were isolated single center projects with small “n’s” may still be acceptable given that the PHTS is a more robust and inclusive database that captures nearly 80-85% of pediatric all transplants worldwide.
- 2) **Proposal quality.** Quality of proposals is very important in that it sets the stage for the analysis. Reviewers will favor proposals that are succinct and clearly written. Proposals organized by hypotheses and specific aims supported by appropriate background information will also be more favorably reviewed as this approach makes the investigator’s goals clear to reviewers. Projects that require supplemental data collection from participating centers will receive lower scores regardless of their intrinsic merit, since ancillary data collection has historically been difficult to obtain and is time-consuming for coordinators to collect. Please review attached sample project proposals that received high scores in the past as reference templates.
- 3) **Feasibility.** Many proposals are relevant and well written but cannot be feasibly performed using the PHTS dataset. Since fields in the PHTS database are event-driven, project analyses must conform to the available data. Several projects over the years had merit but could not be done simply because the data required for the analysis was not collected through PHTS. Please verify that your project is feasible and list individual form question numbers from which data is to be abstracted to assure reviewers and the scientific committee that the project can be done within the constraints of the dataset.

Each of these three assessment domains will receive a score from 1-5 (1=significant gaps, 5=excellent) to make the process as objective as possible. Scores from each reviewer for each project will be added, and after review and discussion by the Scientific Committee, the highest scoring projects will be prioritized for completion during this year’s analysis cycle. Each project investigator will then receive feedback from the PHTS leadership regarding acceptability of their proposal for analysis this year along with relevant comments meant to strengthen the current or future proposals. For accepted projects, writing groups will be composed of member investigators from centers in good standing (up-to-date regulatory documents, dues paid and no more than small number of outstanding forms) on a rotating basis with an effort to include junior faculty and ensure that all centers have equal chances to participate over time. In addition, efforts will be made to include investigators whose projects were not accepted for the current cycle but were similar to those that were accepted.