



Pilot Research Project Funding

Funding decisions:

The proposals will be reviewed by a pilot research grant review committee, consisting of at least three people including two faculty members with substantial research experience and a clinician. The criteria contained in Appendix 2 will be used to review the projects.

Administrative considerations:

Upon approval the Principal Investigator will receive a letter of approval. A project that has been funded will need to meet the administrative requirements of Health Research Services at McMaster University (or the relevant home institution of the grant award recipient) which will include the submission of a completed and signed HRS checklist (obtained at http://fhs.mcmaster.ca/healthresearch/administration_forms.html), a copy of the award letter, a copy of proposal, a budget, a budget justification and any applicable ethics approvals. The Department of Family Medicine Research Administration will provide financial administration of the funds. To cover the associate costs, please include 3% (\$150) to the budget for this purpose.

Reporting requirements:

The successful applicants will be asked to complete a brief progress report after six months and a brief final report by February 28, 2019.

It will be necessary to return the funds to the Department of Family Medicine if:

- the funds have not been used by January 31, 2019,
- the project account has not been opened by April 30, 2018,
- progress reports have not been submitted, or
- the progress of the project is deemed unsatisfactory based on the proposal submitted.

Pilot Research Project Funding

Appendix 2: Review Criteria for DFM Pilot Research Project Proposals

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE (10 points): Are the specific aims/hypothesis for the research project clearly stated? Does the proposal explain why this project should be undertaken? Does it reflect an adequate review of the literature?

SIGNIFICANCE (10 points): Is the project relevant to primary care practice? Is the proposed project original or unique in any respect (new problem or question, new or unique study method or evaluation technique, etc.)? Will the outcome of the project likely help to advance primary care?

METHODS (40 points): Do the proposed methods appropriately address the specific aims/hypotheses? Are the methods well described? Are methodological problems anticipated and alternative approaches proposed?

INVESTIGATORS (10 points): Are the professional (including clinical, educational or research) competencies and previous research experiences of the principal investigator and co-investigators appropriate to carry out the project? Do the previous research experiences, availability of pilot data, or the clarity in presentation of the research methods indicate that the investigators are familiar with the research methods being employed?

FEASIBILITY (10 points): Will sufficient subjects be available for completion of the project within the proposed timetable? Is the project's proposed timetable reasonable?

BUDGET (10 points): Does the budget match the staffing resources required (i.e. staff, students) to complete the project? Is the probable outcome worth the time and money involved? Will the grant serve as the total sum for the project or supplement an existing research effort? If the grant will provide only partial support for the project's total budget or any personnel, has the investigator stated specifically how the balance will be funded and provided evidence of its guaranteed availability? Does the budget allocate 3% (\$150) for financial administration of the account?

LIKELIHOOD TO CONTRIBUTE TO FUTURE RESEARCH ENDEAVOURS (5 points): Will the project most likely generate findings that can support a future full scale grant application?

PRIORITY AREA (5 points): Does the project focus on the priority area of the call for proposals (i.e. research related to primary health care)?