

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 April 8, 2003. Submit the application to: Technical Information Management-PA03024, 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 p.m. Eastern Time on the deadline date. Applicants sending applications 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 or natural disasters, CDC will upon receipt of proper documentation, consider the application as having been received by the deadline.

Applications, which do not meet the above criteria, will not be eligible for competition and will be discarded. Applicants will be notified of their failure to meet the submission requirements.

H. Evaluation Criteria

Upon receipt, applications will be reviewed by CDC staff for completeness and responsiveness as outlined under the "Eligible Applicants" Section (Items one through five). Incomplete applications and applications that are not responsive will be returned to the applicant without further consideration. It is especially important that the applicant's abstract reflects the project's focus, because the abstract will be used to help determine the responsiveness of the application.

Applications which are complete and responsive may be subjected to a preliminary evaluation (streamline review) by a peer review committee, the Injury Research Grant Review Committee (IRGRC), to determine if the

application is of sufficient technical and scientific merit to warrant further review by the IRGRC; 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. Those applications judged to be competitive will be further evaluated by a dual review process.

Competing supplemental grant awards may be made, when funds are available, to support research work or activities not previously approved by the IRGRC. Applications should be clearly labeled to denote their status as requesting supplemental funding support. These applications will be reviewed by the IRGRC and the secondary review group.

All awards will be determined by the Director of the NCIPC based on priority scores assigned to applications by the primary review committee IRGRC, 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 IRGRC. All applications will be reviewed 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? 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 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?

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 violence-related research?

e. Environment. Does the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success? Does the proposed research take advantage of unique features of the scientific environment or employ useful collaborative arrangements? Is there evidence of institutional support? Is there an appropriate degree of commitment and cooperation of other interested parties as evidenced by letters detailing the nature and extent of the involvement?

f. Ethical Issues. What provisions have been made for the protection of human subjects and the safety of the research environments? How does the applicant plan to handle issues of confidentiality and compliance with mandated reporting requirements, *e.g.*, suspected child abuse? Does the application adequately address the requirements of 45 CFR Part 46 for the protection of human subjects? (An application can be disapproved if the research risks are sufficiently serious and protection against risks is so inadequate as to make the entire application unacceptable.) The degree to which the applicant has met the CDC Policy requirements regarding the inclusion of women, ethnic, and racial groups in the proposed research (See Attachment 1, AR-2). This includes:

(1) The proposed plan for the inclusion of both sexes and racial and ethnic minority populations for appropriate representation.

(2) The proposed justification when representation is limited or absent.

(3) A statement as to whether the design of the study is adequate to measure differences when warranted.

(4) A statement as to whether the plans for recruitment and outreach for study participants include the process of establishing partnerships with community(ies) and recognition of mutual benefits.

g. Study Samples. Are the samples sufficiently rigorously defined to permit complete independent replication at another site? Have the referral sources been described, including the definitions and criteria? What plans have been made to include women and minorities and their subgroups as appropriate for the scientific goals of the