

What makes a proposal a 'winner' in the eyes of a reviewer?

Great idea
Paradigm shifter



Grantsmanship

Makes a good first impression
Well prepared and clear message
Credible
Good supporting document

Why, What and How???

“Why”

A strong and testable hypothesis

- Based on current scientific literature and preliminary data, and has a measurable, reproducible outcome.
- Increases understanding of biologic processes, diseases, treatments and/or preventions.

Hypothesis-assumption made to test specific ideas which may or may not be true.

“What”

Specific Aims

- The tightest and most structured part.
- Goals: Basic gist of the proposed research and get the reviewer excited.
- Logical sequence, and not dependent on one another, but related.
- May be the only section an unassigned reviewer might read.

Aims- the intentions directing the effort towards the
 *overall goal.* 

“How”

Research Plan

- Good model system to test the hypothesis.
- Coherent direction with well coordinated plan that is clearly related to the central focus.
- Feasible, not overambitious-a ‘fishing expedition’.
- Novel approaches, or advantage of using a nonstandard approach.
- Potential problems and good alternate approaches.

Crystal clear, understood by reviewers not directly related to the field.

Abstract

- The first impression of the PI and the work.
- Roadmap of the proposal.
- Must be understood by both experts in your field and generalists.
- Content should include: – Brief Background – Hypothesis – Objectives/Specific aims – Methods/research plan – Significance-human significance important.

“Complete Picture”

Good story that conveys the excitement and enthusiasm, and states what impact that will have on a field.

