

Conquer Cancer Grants & Awards Program Grant Review Process and Selection Criteria

**Kavita Bhalla, PhD
Scientific Review Officer
Conquer Cancer, the ASCO Foundation**

Research Grants & Awards



Mission

Conquering cancer through **research**, education, and promotion of the highest quality, equitable patient care.



Mission

Accelerate breakthroughs in lifesaving **research** and empower people everywhere to conquer cancer.



Building a Diverse Pipeline of Cancer Researchers

Awards to provide mentoring opportunities for medical school students and residents
underrepresented in medicine
(domestic only)

Mentored Grants for **Early-Career Scientists** to develop into independent investigators
(domestic and international)

Grants for **Independent and Senior Investigators** to devote to patient-oriented research, and to serve as mentors for beginning clinical investigators
(domestic and international)



- Medical Student Rotation
- Annual Meeting Research Award
- Oncology Summer Internship
- Merit Award

Young Investigator Award

Global Oncology Young Investigator Award

Long-term International Fellowship

- International Development and Education Award
- Merit Award

Career Development Award

Advanced Clinical Research Award

***International Innovation Grant (all career stages)**

Research Professorship

Scoring and Review Criteria

Scoring: NIH 1-9-point scale to represent the overall impact of an application

Scientific Reviewers:

- Hypothesis-driven proposal, significance, feasibility and approach (~35%)
- Mentor and mentoring plan (~30%)
- Career development (~25%)
- Availability of institutional resources (~10%)



Young
Investigator
Award

Biostatistical Reviewers: Biostatistical rigor, Biostatistical plan and Letter of support

Patient Advocate Reviewers: Layperson Abstract, Patient Advocate Form, and the patient advocate letter of support (**required for clinical proposals only**)

Feedback: Comments must be constructive and reflect the score (identify strengths and weaknesses)

Grant Review Process

Internal review



Phase I



Phase II



Final Review Stage
Grant Selection Committee
Meeting

- Staff checks the applications for program eligibility and completeness
- Scientific Reviewers (Primary and Secondary) review and score

Cutoff derived at this stage

- Biostatistician and Patient Advocates review and score
- An average score is determined from the Scientific Review Stage and Biostatistician and Patient Advocate Review Stage

Cutoff derived at this stage

- Applications that make the cutoff advance to Final Review and are discussed and scored by all the committee members

Final Review - Grant Selection Meeting



- The assigned reviewers present a summary of their critique and justify their initial scores.
- The Chair summarizes the discussion, and each member of the committee provides their final score.
- A cutoff score is derived after the Final Review Meeting to determine the fundable slate.

Program Evaluation and Metrics of Success

- Still in research
- Career advancement
- Publishing in high profile research journals
- Research led to advancement of the field
- Subsequent research funding
- Leadership positions
- Review of annual progress reports
- Collect data on patient success stories
- Collect information on status of Clinical trial
- Communicate Impact of funded research with Donors