

## Guidelines for Response to Previous Critiques

### 1. Overview/ Benchmarking

Since reviewers do not have access to any of the review materials from your previous application, it is worthwhile to begin with an overview of **selective** strengths identified by reviewers, as well as mentioning the **rank** to set a **benchmark**. Reviewers may be inclined to provide a higher score to applications that have been appropriately revised, so providing an overview of previous comments, rank or other indicator can serve as a useful prompt. We suggest opening with a **¼-page overview** on the strengths of your proposal including **specific quotes** and if appropriate, **key benchmark indicators**.

### 2. Summary of Progress

Strategically **describe key progress achieved** since the application was last submitted. Take advantage of the space to describe how the project is founded on the success of previously funded grants and logically builds on your research results.

Our suggested approach is to present a **¼-page summary of progress** to provide reviewers with an update on your productivity and work accomplished in the field, for example:

- Productivity: recently accepted/ published articles, relevant awards, leadership roles
- Advances in your field of research: significant/ conceptual shifts in research direction
- Expertise: addition of co-applicants/ collaborators/ trainees to the team
- Environment: new resources acquired by the lab/ centralized core facilities/ research capacity

### 3. Selective Responses

OPTIONAL: The Response should focus on and address a maximum of **two to three** major points of criticism. Concentrate your **½-page** response on a limited number of specific improvements, selecting the most constructive feedback that led to practical, value-added revisions.

As a note of caution, carefully select revisions that are **not likely to be controversial** since reviewers may not necessarily agree with the revised approach. Also, be careful not to introduce any new 'risks/ concerns' based on your revisions.

### Sample Text

We would like to thank the reviewers for their thoughtful and thorough review of our grant. We also appreciate that the reviewers found our study to be [*“exciting”*, that it addresses *“an important societal problem”*, that our methodology is *“justified”*, that our team is *“well-qualified”*, and that it is *“clear that the PI has the necessary expertise to perform the proposed study”*]. Additionally, the reviewers noted that a [*“strength of this proposal is the knowledge mobilization plan”* and that the PI is *“well-positioned to translate their results and to influence practice”*]. My proposal received a ranking of x out of x for my committee in the 2016 Insight Grant competition, where x proposals were funded, and received only Very Good - Excellent ratings.

Since the previous submission, [key progress updates on productivity/ applicable advancements in the field/ new expertise/ stronger environment] is now in place to better support the [feasibility/ urgency/ novelty] of the proposal.

OPTIONAL: Having had the opportunity to reflect on the reviewer comments regarding [*“salient concerns”*], we have [revised/ changed/ updated our approach] to address/ improve...