



CNSF Awards FAQ Sheet

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 scientific work in their area of interest and have been out of training for 3 to 5 years. The Pediatric Epilepsy Research Foundation (PERF) Shields Research Grant supports translational or clinical research while the Pediatric Epilepsy Research Foundation (PERF) Elterman Research Grant supports clinical or basic science research. The applicant should carefully review criteria for each Award/Grant and then select one preference on the face page. All applicants are now required to complete the Appendix.

Is there a difference in relevant scientific agenda for the PERF Elterman vs the PERF Shields award? No. However, the Shields grant needs to have a clinical component, whereas the Elterman grant does not. The PERF grants do not need to be related to epilepsy, but that is the foundation's main interest. <http://pediatricpilepsyresearchfoundation.org/grants> Currently funded research is disqualified for the PERF Elterman and Shields Grants with the exception of an NIH K12 grant. Candidates are eligible for the PERF Elterman and Shields Grants if they have received an NIH K12 grant.

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.

Indirect Costs including facilities or administrative costs are not funded. A letter from the Investigator's Sponsored Projects office is not required. However, at least one reference letter should include a yellow 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 and provision of sufficient protected time to perform the research described in the application. These highlighted statements are often included in a letter from the applicant's Section Chief or Program Director.

Simultaneous CNS Meeting abstract submission: Unpublished data *on the same project* can be submitted to the Scientific Selection Committee for consideration as a poster or platform presentation.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 to conform with the CNS Meeting Guidelines (Objective, Methods, Results, Conclusions). If accepted as a Poster or Platform presentation, the Dodge Awardee may present *some of the same data* in their Award presentation.

APPLICATION

The applicant should follow the directions and suggested format indicated under Procedure for All Award and Grants.

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.

Work by Others includes background of the disease and data that applies to your question/hypothesis. This includes work done outside of the applicant's laboratory or clinical research program.

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

Research plan: The proposed research should be feasible, and experiments should be completed by the time funding ends.

NIH Biosketch – Investigator: Use the standard NIH Biosketch template (<https://grants.nih.gov/grants/forms/biosketch.htm>). Not to exceed 5 pages.

APPENDIX

All applicants are now required to complete the appendix. Page limitations are indicated in the Award Announcement. 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 such as Research plan, figures, data, etc. The NIH Biosketch for any Key Personnel should not exceed 5 pages.

Human Subjects: If applicable, IRB approval and IRB-approved informed consent forms 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. Type N/A if no human subjects are used in the proposed experiments.

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: If applicable, the Awardee's institutional IACUC approval 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. Type N/A if no vertebrate animals are used in the proposed experiments.

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.

Resources. Specify the facilities to be used for the conduct of the proposed research. Indicate the performance sites and describe capacities, pertinent capabilities, relative proximity and extent of availability to the project. List the most important equipment items already available for this project noting the location and pertinent capabilities of each.

Performance sites and Key Personnel: Detail where the experiments will be performed. List the names and institutions of any study investigators and collaborators and their role in the project.

REVIEW

The CNSF Awards Committee consists of both clinicians and physician-scientists with a wide variety of backgrounds. Applicants should therefore write succinctly and clearly describe all scientific terms and experiments. Abbreviations should be identified in their first instance and can then be used throughout the proposal. The Applicant should consider that multiple abbreviations can become confusing.

The reviewers will consider the following and provide constructive feedback to the applicant, when indicated: significance, investigator, innovation, approach, environment, and other score influences, including references, human subjects, animal welfare, etc.

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: Is the overall strategy, methodology, and analysis 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? Will particularly risky aspects be managed effectively? 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, protected time for research endeavors, 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?