



## CNSF Awards FAQ Sheet

**The applicant should follow the directions and suggested format.**

**Abstract:** Include a brief background with preliminary data (published and unpublished), hypotheses, goal, aims, and anticipated outcomes.

**Specific Aims.** Include a succinct background. Include the hypotheses, methods, and anticipated outcome(s) for each Aim.

### **Which Award / Grant should I apply for?**

The Dodge Young Investigator Award is for clinical or basic science research and is generally awarded to someone with an outstanding track record of publications in their area of interest and have been out of training for 3 to 5 years. The Child Neurology Shields Research Grant supports translational or clinical research while the Pediatric Epilepsy Research Foundation (PERF) Scientific Research Grant supports clinical or basic science research.

The applicant should carefully review criteria for each Award/Grant and then select their preference on the face page. If they are not selected for the preferred Grant/Award, the applicant will be considered for the other Award/ Grants. Be sure to complete and submit the Appendix if you would like to apply or be considered for the PERF or Shields grants.

**Is there a difference in relevant scientific agenda for the PERF vs the Shields award?** No.

However, the Shields grant needs to have a clinical component, whereas the PERF does not. The PERF grant does not necessarily need to be related to epilepsy, but that is the foundation's main interest. <http://pediatricpilepsyresearchfoundation.org/grants>

**Can CNS members who received a prior CNSF grant or award apply for a different Grant or Award?** Yes, the committee will consider every application. However, when considering two or more outstanding proposals, the committee may give preference to the applicant without prior CNSF funding.

**Work by Others** includes background of the disease and data that applies to your question/hypothesis.

**Work by Investigator** includes any preliminary scientific data and/or data that shows the feasibility of the proposed experiments.

**Project Scope:** The proposed research should be feasible and experiments should be completed by the time funding ends.

**Indirect Costs** including facilities or administrative costs are not covered. A letter from the Investigator's Sponsored Projects office is not required. However, at least one reference letter should include a highlighted statement of the applicant's eligibility for the Award and should document the willingness of the institution to accept the award without indirect costs. These highlighted statements are often included in a letter from the applicant's Program Director.

**Funding cycle** for Shields and PERF grants are generally January - December. For PERF, the first disbursement of \$50,000 is in mid-January with remaining disbursements occurring every 6 months in July and January. Note that funding may be delayed pending formal approval from the Awardee's IRB or IACUC.

**Simultaneous abstract submission** to the Scientific Selection Committee: Unpublished data *on the same project* can be submitted to the Scientific Selection Committee for consideration as a poster or platform presentation. The Abstract for the poster/platform should be appropriately modified per CNS guidelines and contain Objective, Methods, Results, Conclusions. If accepted as a Poster or Platform presentation, the Dodge Awardee may present *some of the same data* as they do in their Award presentation.

**Appendix:** Applicants who would like to be considered for the Shields and PERF Grants are required to complete the appendix. Applicants primarily seeking the Dodge Award may also complete the Appendix if they would like to be considered for the Shields and PERF grants. Page limitations are indicated in the Award Announcement. The NIH Biosketch for any Key Personnel should not exceed 5 pages. There are no page limitations for letters of recommendation, or for appendix materials such as Human Subjects, Budget and justification, etc. However, these sections should be succinct and must not contain unrelated information (Research plan, figures, data, etc.).

**Human Subjects:** The IRB approval for this study and any IRB-approved informed consent form will be required before funds are released. This section should provide a description of the proposed involvement of human subjects and may contain as applicable the following information: **Protections for Human Subjects.** For research that involves human subjects but does not involve one of the six categories of research that are exempt under 45 CFR Part 46, the committee will evaluate the justification for involvement of human subjects and the proposed protections from research risk relating to their participation according to the following five review criteria: 1) risk to subjects, 2) adequacy of protection against risks, 3) potential benefits to the subjects and others, 4) importance of the knowledge to be gained, and 5) data and safety monitoring for clinical trials. For research that involves human subjects and meets the criteria for one or more of the six categories of research that are exempt under 45 CFR Part 46, the committee will evaluate: 1) the justification for the exemption, 2) human subjects involvement and characteristics, and 3) sources of materials.

**Inclusion of Women, Minorities, and Children.** When the proposed project involves human subjects and/or NIH-defined clinical research, the committee will evaluate the proposed plans

for the inclusion (or exclusion) of individuals on the basis of sex/gender, race, and ethnicity, as well as the inclusion (or exclusion) of children to determine if it is justified in terms of the scientific goals and research strategy proposed.

**Vertebrate animals:** The Awardee's institutional IACUC approval for this study will be required before funds are released. This section should provide a description of the proposed involvement of vertebrate animals and may contain as applicable the following information: The committee will evaluate the involvement of live vertebrate animals as part of the scientific assessment according to the following five points: 1) proposed use of the animals, and species, strains, ages, sex, and numbers to be used; 2) justifications for the use of animals and for the appropriateness of the species and numbers proposed; 3) adequacy of veterinary care; 4) procedures for limiting discomfort, distress, pain and injury to that which is unavoidable in the conduct of scientifically sound research including the use of analgesic, anesthetic, and tranquilizing drugs and/or comfortable restraining devices; and 5) methods of euthanasia and reason for selection if not consistent with the AVMA Guidelines on Euthanasia.

**Revision:** For revisions, the applicant should indicate such in the abstract and *italicize* any revised text. The committee will consider the appropriateness of any proposed expansion of the project scope. If the Revised application relates to a specific line of investigation presented in the original application that was not recommended for approval by the committee, then the committee will consider whether the responses to comments from the previous scientific review group are adequate and whether substantial changes are clearly evident.

**Review:** The reviewers will consider the following and provide constructive feedback to the applicant where indicated. Subsections are graded on a 1-10 scale (1 best, 10 worst). For the overall impact score (1 best, 10 worst): Consider the 5 criteria: significance, investigator, innovation, approach, environment (weighted based on reviewer's judgment) and other score influences, e.g. human subjects, animal welfare, inclusion plans, and biohazards. Use the entire range of scores (1-9), keeping in mind that a score of 5 is a good medium-impact application. Decimal points (i.e. 3.3) are not allowed.

**Significance.** Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field? If the aims of the project are achieved, how will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved? How will successful completion of the aims change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field?

**Investigator.** Is the investigator well suited to the project? Do they have appropriate experience and training? For the Dodge Award, have they demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field? If the project is collaborative, do the investigators have complementary and integrated expertise; are their leadership approach, governance and organizational structure appropriate for the project?

**Innovation.** Does the application challenge and seek to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilizing novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions? Is a refinement, improvement, or new application of theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions proposed?

**Approach:** Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented? If the project is in the early stages of development, will the strategy establish feasibility and will particularly risky aspects be managed?

If the project involves human subjects and/or NIH-defined clinical research, are the plans to address 1) the protection of human subjects from research risks, and 2) the inclusion (or exclusion) of individuals on the basis of sex/gender, race, and ethnicity, as well as the inclusion (exclusion) of children, justified in terms of the scientific goals and research strategy proposed?

**Environment.** Will the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success? Are the institutional support, equipment and other physical resources available to the investigators adequate for the project proposed? Will the project benefit from unique features of the scientific environment, subject populations, or collaborative arrangements?

**Protections for Human Subjects.** For research that involves human subjects, the committee will evaluate the justification for involvement of human subjects and the proposed protections from research risk relating to their participation according to the following five review criteria: 1) risk to subjects, 2) adequacy of protection against risks, 3) potential benefits to the subjects and others, 4) importance of the knowledge to be gained, and 5) data and safety monitoring for clinical trials. For research that involves human subjects and meets the criteria for one or more of the six categories of research that are exempt under 45 CFR Part 46, the committee will evaluate: 1) the justification for the exemption, 2) human subjects involvement and characteristics, and 3) sources of materials.

**Inclusion of Women, Minorities, and Children.** When the proposed project involves human subjects and/or NIH-defined clinical research, the committee will evaluate the proposed plans for the inclusion (or exclusion) of individuals on the basis of sex/gender, race, and ethnicity, as well as the inclusion (or exclusion) of children to determine if it is justified in terms of the scientific goals and research strategy proposed.

**Vertebrate Animals.** The committee will evaluate the involvement of live vertebrate animals as part of the scientific assessment according to the following five points: 1) proposed use of the animals, and species, strains, ages, sex, and numbers to be used; 2) justifications for the use of animals and for the appropriateness of the species and numbers proposed; 3) adequacy of veterinary care; 4) procedures for limiting discomfort, distress, pain and injury to that which is unavoidable in the conduct of scientifically sound research including the use of analgesic,

anesthetic, and tranquilizing drugs and/or comfortable restraining devices; and 5) methods of euthanasia and reason for selection if not consistent with the AVMA Guidelines on Euthanasia.

**Biohazards.** Reviewers will assess whether materials or procedures proposed are potentially hazardous to research personnel and/or the environment, and if needed, determine whether adequate protection is proposed.

**Resubmission.** For Resubmissions, the committee will evaluate the application as now presented, taking into consideration the responses to comments from the previous scientific review group and changes made to the project.

**Select Agent Research.** Reviewers will assess the information provided in this section of the application, including 1) the Select Agent(s) to be used in the proposed research, 2) the registration status of all entities where Select Agent(s) will be used, 3) the procedures that will be used to monitor possession use and transfer of Select Agent(s), and 4) plans for appropriate biosafety, biocontainment, and security of the Select Agent(s).

**Resource Sharing Plans.** Reviewers will comment on whether the following Resource Sharing Plans, or the rationale for not sharing the following types of resources, are reasonable: 1) Data Sharing Plan; 2) Sharing Model Organisms; and 3) Genome Wide Association Studies (GWAS)/Genomic Data Sharing Plan.

**Budget and Period of Support.** Reviewers will consider whether the budget and the requested period of support are fully justified and reasonable in relation to the proposed research.

**Additional Comments to the Applicant.** Reviewers may provide additional guidance to the applicant.