

ASNR Seed Grant Review Criteria:

“There is no grantsmanship that will turn a bad idea into a good one, but... There are many ways to disguise a good one.” - Dr. William Raub, Former Deputy Director, NIH

A. Is the research question/problem a significant one in the field? [Significance]

The question (purpose) is novel, clinically relevant, scientifically sound, and compelling w.r.t potential for advancing the field of neurorehabilitation. For example, a viable proposal could address a common assumption w.r.t clinical practice, but one where this is little to no empirical support for the practice.

B. Is the approach feasible and is the study design appropriate for the stage? [Approach]

The objectives are straight-forward and clearly stated. Has a relatively simple design w.r.t implementation across at least one other site and preferably multiple sites within ASNR structure (e.g., makes use of standard/acceptable clinical practices, can be measured using valid and reliable outcomes, standardization across sites), and the design would be one for which IRB approval should be relatively easy to obtain, if not already approved. For example, gather 30 patients with dysnomia to compare two home-based language interventions for 3 months, using a valid and reliable outcome measure.

C. How will the research funded under this seed fund mechanism provide the preliminary data/evidence for submission of a scaled-up, follow on research proposal? [Expected Outcomes]

For pilot projects: Has potential for further development and external funding. For example, using the Dobkin stages of clinical trial development (Dobkin, NNR, 2009), the scope would likely be at stage 2: development of concept pilots or stage 3: demonstration of concept pilots. In other words, successful completion of your seed grant project should make you more competitive for acquiring external funds for your scaled up multi-site project than you would have been before seed grant project completion. Make sure to include the future funding sponsor (e.g., NIH, PCORI), mechanism (e.g., R01, R21, SBIR) and target date (i.e., month and year) for submission of the scaled-up, follow-on application that is a logical extension of seed project preliminary findings.

For proposals where the goal is to develop a collaborative network (less emphasis on data acquisition), there is evidence that the team members have complementary expertise to meet the needs of the proposed future research, and there is a well stated goal and plan for developing a collaborative clinical research project.

For all proposals: there is evidence that the PI has thought beyond the current seed grant and has a viable plan for the next step in funding his/her research program.

D. How does your proposal leverage the ASNR and or its flagship Journal, *Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair*?

Could not be done without discussions with other ASNR members, research infrastructure, recent programming, or ideas you read about in NNR. For example, the idea came to you after reading a recent systematic review published in NNR (e.g., compelling argument for ASNR publicity).

E. Explain how the Principle investigator and collaborators are qualified to carry out the research outlined in your seed funding proposal and fulfill all post-award reporting requirements?

Consider the distribution of experience level of the team. Has a good mix of experienced and inexperienced investigators to promote beneficial mentoring in the early stage clinical research area. The PI is committed to demonstrating fiscal responsibility by reviewing all payments according to the established guidelines for allowable expenses, once the funds are transferred to the PI's institution. The PI is committed to all the reporting requirements required upon funding.

F. Proposes a compelling budget and budget justification that fits the research scope and stage.

Consider how you plan to use the 5K mainly for travel and the costs of starting a viable collaborative clinical research project. See Application for suggestions/criteria of allowable expense categories.

Each of the six criterion will be rated on a 5-point scale: Outstanding (5), Excellent (4), Good (3), Fair (2), or Poor (1). [Total possible score = 30 points]