

WESTERN CLINICAL TRIALS LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

Reviewer Scoring Form

Total Score

0.0

Scoring rules: For each criterion, rate 0.0 to 5.0 (half-points allowed). Provide 1 to 2 lines of evidence.

Base scores only on submitted materials.

5.0	Fully specified, internally consistent, clearly justified
4.0	Strong, minor gaps only
3.0	Adequate, important gaps or assumptions
2.0	Weak, multiple major gaps
0.0 to 1.0	Very weak or missing

SECTION 1 (50 points): Applicant Background, Support, and Readiness

Section 1 Total

0

Criterion	Description	Weight	Rating (0-5)	Weighted Score	Evidence from application
1.1	Trial-relevant experience and methods foundation (trial roles, ethics/GCP, methods)	5		0	
1.2	Productivity and trajectory (past 5 years research outputs)	15		0	
1.3	Leadership potential (ownership, follow-through, team roles)	15		0	
1.4	Fit with program goal (credible path to execution-ready protocol)	15		0	

SECTION 2 (50 points): Trial Concept Proposal

Section 2 total

0

Criterion	Description (proposal question mapping)	Weight	Rating (0-5)	Points	Evidence (1-2 lines)
2.1	Problem or evidence gap (Q1)	5		0	

2.2	Primary trial objective with PICOT elements (Q2)	5		0	
2.3	Primary design intent and design implications (Q3)	5		0	
2.4	Setting and implementation context aligned to objective (Q4)	5		0	
2.5	Eligibility criteria and justification (Q5)	5		0	
2.6	Intervention delivery: feasibility and standardization (Q6)	5		0	
2.7	Comparator selection and justification (Q7)	4		0	
2.8	Risk level and safety oversight (Q8)	4		0	
2.9	Participant burden and retention implications (Q9)	4		0	
2.10	Data sources and outcome measurement strategy (Q10)	4		0	
2.11	Scalability and implementation potential (Q11)	4		0	

SECTION 3: Potential Flaws (If any item below is YES, the total score is capped at 49.9 (not suitable), regardless of other scores.)

Instructions: Please only fill the cells below if:

- (1) The application is from the AMOSO-Match Stream; **OR**
- (2) the trial concept is intended to be pragmatic leaning from the Open-Match Stream.

Potential Flaw	Description
	Trial feasibility is likely implausible based on details provided in the application. Setting, population access, data access, or recruitment pathway is not credible.
	The application doesn't provide sufficient details to operationalize the intervention. Cannot describe who does what, when, or what training and workflow is required.
	More-than-minimal risk with minimal safety oversight provided in the application. Risk is high but monitoring and escalation are missing or vague.

Notes

If a potential critical flaw present, specify which and why (brief)

Overall comments (optional)

TOTAL SCORE AND CATEGORY

Section 1	Section 2	Raw total	Capped total	Suitability	Category
0	0	0	0	Not suitable: total < 50.0	Not Suitable

Ranking notes: If total < 50.0, the applicant is not suitable for the program.

If three or more reviewers score < 50.0 overall, designate not suitable regardless of mean.

Tie-breaks within a small margin may use program diversity considerations, documented by Program Leads.