



## 2021 HOPA Research Fund Award

### Request for Proposal Details

A scientifically justified proposal with a clear, well-defined, measurable hypothesis consistent with the proposal's specific aims and a power analysis (if appropriate) with statistical plan must be included in your submission. Also of note, be sure it will be evident to the reviewers that you have access to the patients, laboratories, and other resources necessary to conduct your proposed research. Finally, don't forget to describe the relationship of your project to the HOPA [Strategic Goals](#). All applicants should submit their proposals to HOPA ([education@hoparx.org](mailto:education@hoparx.org)) by **11:59 PM CST on October 29<sup>th</sup>, 2021**, using the subject line "2021 HOPA Research Fund Award".

New this year, a letter of intent will **NOT** be required prior to submission of a full proposal. You are asked to prepare the proposal using the PHS 398 format. These forms can be downloaded from the NIH website at:

<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/funding/phs398/phs398.html>

The grant must use the following PHS 398 forms:

Page 1	Face Page
Page 2	Project Summary, Relevance and Project/Performance Sites
Page 2-cont	Senior/Key Personnel, Other Significant Contributors and Human Embryonic Stem cells
Page 3	Table of Contents
Page 4	Detailed Budget (1 year)

Biographical Sketch for PI and all key investigators (using the new NIH biosketch format)  
Resources

The proposal should contain the following sections, similar to NIH formatting;

- Abstract (placed on Summary page; max 30 lines)
- Research Plan: Topics 2-3 (Specific Aims and Research Strategy from the Table of Contents)
  - Contents have a **limit of 6 pages** combined. . Please attach the research protocol in the Appendix section (no page limit on the research protocol)
- Research Plan: Topics 4-14 from the Table of Contents (no page limit).
  - These topics should include Bibliography/References; Protection of Human Subjects; Vertebrate Animals (if applicable); Select Agent Research (if applicable); Multiple PD/PI Leadership Plan (if applicable); Consortium/Contractual Arrangements (if Applicable); and Letters of Support from Key Collaborators and Contributors (e.g. Consultants)

Please note that the reviewers will include in their review of the material the following considerations:

- Feasibility for completion **in one year**
- Feasibility for completion with available funding

- Clarity of the Hypothesis and Objectives/Aims
- Methodology and approach
- Outcome measures and statistical analysis
- Qualifications of the investigators to conduct the proposed research and role of PI
- Applicability to Hematology/Oncology Pharmacy Practice and the HOPA [Strategic Goals](#)

**Proposals that are not considered feasible due to their cost, completion in the one-year timeframe, or lacking a statistical plan will not be scored.** A summary of concerns and noted merits will be provided for all submitted applications. It is strongly recommended that junior investigators form mentoring or collaborative support that strengthens grant quality. The role of mentor(s) and collaborative support should be clearly stated in support letters and within their individual biosketches. IRB approval is required prior to the release of funds for the selected candidate.

### **Review Criteria**

The HOPA Research Fund Awards are intended to provide support for projects that are likely to facilitate the efforts of hematology/oncology pharmacists in order to optimize the care of individuals affected by cancer.

The HOPA Basic and Translational Sciences and Grant Reviewers Committee will be comprised of individuals with expertise and familiarity in practice and research.

All applications will be reviewed based on the following criteria:

1. Significance
  - Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field?
  - If the aims of the project are achieved, how will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved?
  - How will successful completion of the aims change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive practice?
2. Investigators
  - Are the PI(s), collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project?
  - Do they have appropriate experience and training for the proposed work?
  - Have they demonstrated an ongoing record of research accomplishments such as peer-reviewed publications, practice awards, etc?
3. 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?
4. Approach
  - Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project?
  - Have the investigators presented strategies to ensure a robust and unbiased approach, as appropriate for the work proposed?

- Are the study design, sample size, statistical analysis plan, outcomes, and time line reasonable and clearly justified?
  - Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented?
5. 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?
6. Timeline/feasibility
- This is a one year, non-renewable grant; therefore the proposed research plan must be feasible to be completed within a year
7. Budget justification
- Budget may be allocated towards the following- direct costs (costs to do the study), labor, travel to the HOPA Annual Conference to present findings (travel should cover the PI and may include up to one other individual who contributed a significant amount of effort towards the grant).
  - Budget may not be allocated towards the following- overhead, indirect fees/charges, capital equipment costs

Criteria 1 through 5 will be the scoring criteria. Budget justification, while not part of the scoring criteria, the reviewers will consider whether the timeline and budget is justified and reasonable in relation to the proposed research.