

Submit the application to: Technical Information Management—PA 03027, Procurement and Grants Office, Centers for Disease Control Prevention, 2920 Brandywine Rd, Room 3000, Atlanta, GA 30341-4146.

Applications may not be submitted electronically.

CDC Acknowledgement 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. 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 or natural 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 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

Application

Upon receipt, applications will be reviewed by CDC staff for completeness, responsiveness, and eligibility as outlined under the "Eligible Applicants" section. 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.

All awards will be determined by the Director of the NCIPC based on priority scores assigned to applications by the IRGRC, recommendations by the secondary review committee, *e.g.*, NCIPC's 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. A committee consisting of no less than three reviewers with appropriate expertise using current NIH criteria (a scoring system of 100–500 points) will 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 and the resources available? 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? Is the name and role of a scientific mentor or collaborator described?

e. *Environment*—Does the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success? 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? Where relevant, 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 research? How will the applicant deal with recruitment and retention of subjects?

h. *Dissemination*. What plans have been articulated for disseminating findings?

i. *Measures of Effectiveness*. The Peer Review Panel shall assure that measures set forth in the application are in accordance with CDC's performance plans. How adequately has the applicant addressed these measures?

The IRGRC will also examine the appropriateness of the proposed project budget and duration in relation to the proposed research and the availability of data required for the project.

2. The secondary review will be conducted by the Science and Program Review Subcommittee (SPRS) of the ACIPC. The ACIPC Federal agency experts will be invited to attend the