

G. Submission and Deadline

Letter of Intent (LOI) Submission

On or before June 3, 2003, submit the LOI to appropriate recipient. The LOI should be on the applicant's letterhead and sent to the Grants Management Specialist identified in the "Where to Obtain Additional Information" section of this announcement.

Application Forms

Submit the signed original and two copies of PHS 398 (OMB Number 0925-0001). Adhere to the instructions on the Errata Instruction Sheet (as posted on the CDC website for PHS 398) to the CDC Procurement and Grants Office. Forms are available at the following Internet address: <http://www.cdc.gov/od/pgo/forminfo.htm>.

If you do not have access to the Internet, or if you have difficulty accessing the forms on-line, you may contact the CDC Procurement and Grants Office Technical Information Management Section (PGO-TIM) at: 770-488-2700. Application forms can be mailed to you.

Submission Date, Time, and Address

The application must be received by 4 p.m. eastern time July 3, 2003. Submit the application to: Technical Information Management—PA 03100, CDC Procurement and Grants Office, 2920 Brandywine Road, Atlanta, GA 30341-4146.

Applications may not be submitted electronically.

CDC Acknowledgment of Application Receipt

A postcard will be mailed by PGO-TIM, notifying you that CDC has received your application.

Deadline

Letters of intent and applications shall be considered as meeting the deadline if they are received before 4 eastern time on the deadline date. Any applicant who sends their application by the United States Postal Service or commercial delivery services must ensure that the carrier will be able to guarantee delivery of the application by the closing date and time. If an application is received after closing due to (1) carrier error, when the carrier accepted the package with a guarantee for delivery by the closing date and time, or (2) significant weather delays, natural or manmade disasters, CDC will upon receipt of proper documentation, consider the application as having been received by the deadline.

Any application that does not meet the above requirements will not be

eligible for competition, and will be discarded. The applicant will be notified of their failure to meet the submission requirements.

H. Evaluation Process and Criteria

Application

Applications which are complete and responsive may be subjected to a preliminary evaluation (streamline review) by a peer review committee, the Special Emphasis Panel (SEP), to determine if the application is of sufficient and scientific merit to warrant further review by the SEP. CDC will withdraw from further consideration applications judged to be noncompetitive and promptly notify the principal investigator/program director and the official signing for the applicant organization. A dual review process will evaluate applications that are complete and responsive.

All awards will be determined by the Director of the NCIPC based on priority scores assigned to applications by the primary review committee SEP, recommendations by the secondary review committee of the Science and Program Review Subcommittee of the Advisory Committee for Injury Prevention and Control (ACIPC), consultation with NCIPC senior staff, and the availability of funds.

1. The primary review will be a peer review conducted by the SEP. A committee of reviewers with appropriate expertise will review all applications for scientific merit using current National Institutes of Health (NIH) criteria (a scoring system of 100–500 points) to evaluate the methods and scientific quality of the application. All categories are of equal importance, however, the application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have a major scientific impact.

Factors to be considered will include:

a. *Significance.* Does this study address an important problem? Does the applicant justify the present proposal using existing scientific knowledge? If the aims of the application are achieved, how will scientific knowledge be advanced? What will be the effect of these studies on the concepts or methods that drive this field?

b. *Approach.* Are the conceptual framework, design, methods, and analyses adequately developed, well integrated, and appropriate to the aims of the project? Does the applicant describe the specific questions this research is intended to address? Does the applicant describe how relevant behavioral theories will be applied to encourage the proposed activities? Does

the applicant describe the hypotheses to be tested, the specific study goals, measurable objectives, and outcomes? Does the applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative tactics?

Does the project include plans to measure progress toward achieving the stated objectives? Is there an appropriate work plan included? Does the applicant provide a detailed time-line for the first year of the study as well as a projected time-line for the subsequent four years?

Has the applicant clearly described how intervention and comparison households will be selected; the process by which households will be randomized; and how households will be accessed, recruited and retained? Does the applicant describe a proposed intervention strategy that will use behavioral strategies to improve smoke alarm maintenance and function over time?

Is there a statement as to whether the plans for recruitment and outreach for study participants include the process of establishing partnerships with community or communities and recognition of mutual benefits. Is there evidence of effective working relationships between the applicant and community organizations? Does the applicant describe experience in developing community partnerships and the community's current and anticipated capacity to carry out the proposed activities?

Are there adequate plans for data collection and data management including security of data, assurance of participant confidentiality, data entry, editing, and quality assurance procedures? Is there a statistical analysis plan appropriate for the study design?

c. *Innovation.* Does the project employ novel concepts, approaches or methods? Are the aims original and innovative? Does the project challenge or advance existing paradigms, or develop new methodologies or technologies?

d. *Investigator.* Is the principal investigator appropriately trained and well suited to carry out this work? Is the proposed work appropriate to the experience level of the principal investigator and other significant investigator participants? Is there a prior history of conducting injury-related research? Does the applicant document capacity to accomplish the proposed study as demonstrated by relevant past or current injury prevention studies and smoke alarm program activities?

e. *Environment.* Does the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success? Does the proposed research