

## Exhibit 3: Sample Peer Review Form

Project Title:

CRIS Number:

Lead Scientist:

Name of the Review Session:

Date:

Reviewer ID Number:

### AD HOC REVIEW OF ARS RESEARCH PROJECT PLAN

---

*The purpose of this review is to judge the technical merit of the planned research and to make constructive comments for improvement. The principle focus of this research has been determined by ARS to be essential to its mission, and funding has been approved at the planned level. Please provide both qualitative ratings and comments on each review criteria. Please list and number each significant recommendation being made. Be sure to briefly state the rationale or basis for suggestions made or questions raised. Each recommendation can include specific questions you believe should be addressed by the lead scientist. Please select an action class at the end of this form to indicate the level of revision you believe the subject project requires.*

---

- 1. Merit and Significance:** Are the project objectives relevant to the stated research goals and directions of the corresponding National Program? Will the successful completion of the project enhance knowledge of a scientifically important problem? Will the project lead to the development of new knowledge and technology? Are you aware of any other data/studies relevant to this research effort? If applied research, comment on the value of the research to its customers.

Project Title:

CRIS Number:

Lead Scientist:

Name of the Review Session:

Date:

Reviewer ID Number:

---

**2. Adequacy of Approach and Procedures:** Are the hypotheses and/or plan of work well conceived? Are the experiments, analytical methods, and approaches and procedures appropriate and sufficient to accomplish the objectives? How could the approach or research procedures be improved?

Project Title:

CRIS Number:

Lead Scientist:

Name of the Review Session:

Date:

Reviewer ID Number:

---

**3. Probability of Successfully Accomplishing the Project's Objectives:** What is the probability of success in light of the investigator or project team's training, research experience, preliminary data, if available, and past accomplishments? Are the objectives both feasible and realistic within the stated timeframe and with the resources proposed? Do the investigators have an adequate knowledge of the literature as it relates to the proposed research?

Project Title:

CRIS Number:

Lead Scientist:

Name of the Review Session:

Date:

Reviewer ID Number:

**Additional Comments or Suggestions:**

---

**Action Class Judgement**

\_\_\_\_\_ **No Revision Required**

**No Revision Required** – Needs no revision, but minor revision might be made.

\_\_\_\_\_ **Minor Revision Required**

**Minor Revision Required** – Needs minor revisions, but objectives fit the National Program Action Plan; approaches to all objectives are sound. Project is Feasible.

\_\_\_\_\_ **Moderate Revision Required**

**Moderate Revision Required** – Moderate revision of an objective and/or one approach is needed. Project is feasible.

\_\_\_\_\_ **Major Revision Required**

**Major Revision Required** – Project should be sound and feasible after major revision.

\_\_\_\_\_ **Not Feasible**

**Not Feasible** – Project is not feasible because of deficiencies in expertise and/or facilities, or has other major flaws that require a complete redesign and rewrite.

---

**Comments**  
for Section 15  
Sample Peer Review Form