

SINF FY19 Program Application Guidelines

- Call for applications opens on November 1, 2018; closes 11:59 pm CST on **February 18, 2019**.
- Supporting **new** research with MD Anderson faculty and network and/or sister institution members not already engaged in collaborative research.
- Funding will be provided for up to 20 projects.
- Application submission available online at mdanderson.org/sinf.

NEW: Global Academic Program's mission-based projects

For the FY19 funding cycle, we invite the submission of projects focused on GAP's following mission areas:

- Population-based screening and prevention in low-resourced environments
- Government\Ministries of Health impact on public health policy
- Collaborative translational research with near term clinical impact

Preparing the Application

Applications should be completed online via Submittable in accordance with the instructions available [online](#). Applicants will be required to create a Submittable account. The deadline for submission is 11:59 pm Central Standard Time on February 18, 2019.

Paper applications that are emailed, dropped off, or mailed to the Office of Research Administration will not be accepted. Exceptions may be made on a case by case basis.

Additional submission details:

- The Error Correction Window for the SINF FY19 application is 48 hours from the 02/18/2019 deadline.
- Should the due date fall on a weekend or holiday, the deadline is automatically extended to next business day.
- In case of emergency situation or extreme weather, documentation of institutional closing should be sent along with application, which must be received by 5pm local time on the first business day that the institution is open.
- **Late submissions will not be accepted and will be referred to the next award cycle. There will be no exceptions.**

Application Review

Proposals will be reviewed at MD Anderson by the SINF Committee. Members of this committee will read the proposals and evaluate them much as proposals sent to an agency of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) are reviewed. After discussion, each committee member will score the proposals. The scores are then

averaged and sent for final selection to the SINP Committee Chair and Co-Chair in the Cancer Network gauging feasibility and pertinence to SINP's mission.

Scoring is based on **relevance and feasibility**, as well as the following NIH review criteria:

- Significance
- Investigator(s)
- Innovation
- Approach
- Environment

For more detail on these criteria, please visit: <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm>. The review will result in an overall impact score and a brief written critique that will be communicated to each investigator.

The Research Plan

The Research Plan consists of multiple sections that allow the applicant to describe their research proposal. The page limit for this document is 6 pages maximum). The Research Plan will be reviewed according to the NIH criteria (See: Application Review above). The guidance below is provided to assist the applicant in understanding the sections and criteria.

Significance: Briefly sketch the background to the proposal and critically evaluate existing knowledge to provide context. Focus on the importance of the proposed work, and how it will impact the field, for example by changing how cancer is diagnosed, treated, monitored or prevented. Identify key outcomes that would be achieved if the work proposed is successful completed. (Recommended: ½ page)

Investigator(s): Are the PD/PIs, collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project? Have they demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s)? 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? Are the concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions novel to one field of research or novel in a broad sense? 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 clinical research, are the plans for 1) protection of human subjects from research risks, and 2) inclusion of minorities and members of both sexes/genders, as well as the inclusion 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?

Feasibility: Is the project feasible within Cancer Network's framework? Does the project directly support the strategies and goals of Cancer Network/Global Academic Programs? Will this project be concluded within projected timeframe?

Relevance to Sister Institution Network: Explain how this proposal makes use of one or more Sister Institution or network relationships to further the proposed research. If appropriate, identify possible future stages in the proposed work that could include additional members of the network. For example, in the first phase a SINF-supported project might identify a biomarker or agent which in a second phase could be used in clinical investigations in several Sister Institutions. (Recommended: ½ page)

Preliminary Studies: Applicants may provide an account of the principal investigators' studies pertinent to the application and/or any other information, which will help to establish the experience and competence of the investigator to pursue the proposed project.

Design and Procedure: Describe the experimental design and the procedures to be used to accomplish the specific aims of the work described in the application. Focus on experimental design and not on methodological detail. Describe how data will be analyzed and interpreted, including statistical methods where appropriate. Describe new methodology and its advantage over any existing methodology. Discuss the potential difficulties and limitations of the proposed procedures and alternative approaches to achieve the aims. Include a brief description of any specialized, non-typical physical resources that may be necessary. (Recommended length: no more than 3 pages)

References: Cite key published literature to substantiate contentions, with either citation numbers in parentheses or as superscripts, and provide the complete references in a list at the end of the Research Plan. Do not provide the reference in the text. Each reference must include the names of all authors, the name of the book or journal, volume number, page numbers and year of publication. There is no need to cite extensive literature – confine the list to the key papers that provide the background to your proposal.

Notice of Awards, Committee Decisions, Evaluations

During the Committee deliberations on grant applications, members, members with joint appointments and collaborators from the same department, as the applicant will be absent during discussions and scoring. All reviews are confidential and anonymous outside of the committee. Communications concerning reviews are done through the committee chair. The reviewers will be selected from outside of the applicant's department.

Committee actions, which may be reported, include: approved-funded or disapproved. Committee and reviewers' individual ratings and their evaluations will be available in the Office of Research Administration. Applicants disapproved will be formally advised along with application feedback. With the Chair's approval, a full review of the votes pertinent to the application may also be possible.

The SINF Committee recommendations are presented to the Senior Vice President, Clinical and Academic Network Development who, with the approval of the President, will make a final decision on awardees and amounts of funding. Following the final decision, successful applicants will be advised by the Office of Research Administration of the award amount and the source of funding. Research Finance will also be notified of the award and a company center will be established.

SINF Application Process

