

Survivorship Outcomes Research Young Investigator Award The purpose of this award is to promote and support early investigators involved in cancer survivorship research at CHOP. Early investigators from all CHOP departments and divisions are encouraged to apply. Specifically, this award is open to investigators in any of CHOP 6 departments including Pediatrics, Surgery, Anesthesia, Critical Care, Pathology, and DCAPBS **with a research focus on outcomes in survivors of childhood cancer.** Fellows, instructors, PhD post docs and early investigators (including Assistant Professors or PhD faculty on CE or Tenure tracks) are eligible to apply. Selected proposals will be supported for **\$50,000** for one year. Projects should be able to be completed within one year.

Key Dates

Application Deadline: January 12, 2026

Anticipated Project Period: July 1, 2026 – June 30, 2027

Eligibility

Early career investigators (fellows, instructors, Assistant Professors or PhD faculty) with research focus on survivorship outcomes in childhood cancer will be eligible for this award. **Investigators with established research independence (e.g. NIH funding such as R01, U01, DoD, or Foundation equivalent) or investigators with concurrent career development awards from any funding agency will not be eligible.** Studies already in progress or partially funded will not be supported. Early investigators from all CHOP departments and divisions are encouraged to apply.

Application

Please submit the application as a single PDF document via email to Kat Cambareri at cambarerik@chop.edu no later than **5:00 p.m. on the deadline date January 12, 2026.** Application components:

- 1) Cover page, listing: Project Title, Project Director/Principal Investigator (PD/PI), Co-Investigator(s)/Mentor(s), Department/Division, Date
- 2) Proposal Description (5-page maximum) including: Summary/Abstract, Specific Aims, Background, Research Strategy (Significance, Innovation, and Approach).
- 3) References/Works Cited. Maximum 2-page (not included in Proposal Description page limit).
- 4) Budget
- 5) Budget Justification
- 6) Applicant Biosketch in NIH format (5-page maximum)
- 7) Biosketch for Mentor and relevant Co-Investigators for the research proposal in NIH format (5-page maximum).
- 8) Mentor Letter of Support (should outline mentoring plan for proposal success, 2-page maximum).
- 9) Proposal Timeline
- 10) IRB approval if applicable

*Resubmissions are by invitation only. Clinical Futures will notify applicants if their submission qualifies to be resubmitted for a future funding cycle.

Budget

Budgets must be reviewed and approved by your business manager prior to submission. Allowable costs include: (1) Personnel costs (including salary and fringe benefit), (2) supplies, (3) travel (restricted to nominal travel costs), and (4) other expenses. Budget may include full PI salary support. No indirect costs will be funded. Subawards are not encouraged. This grant funding mechanism will not fund equipment costs. Provide a breakdown of costs by category (e.g. personnel, travel, supplies, etc.) and describe in the Budget Justification with sufficient detail how the funds will be used and how the costs were calculated. Priority will be given to projects that include a prudent spending plan for the \$50,000 over the duration of award's one-year period. **Additional cost extension will not be allowed.**

Review Process and Selection Criteria

The review process consists of 2 rounds. In Round 1, investigators will submit an application, which will be judged by the Clinical Futures Grant Steering Committee. If judged to be of sufficient quality for review, the application will be assigned to a reviewer, critiqued and scored. For Round 2, reviewers meet in a study section to discuss the merits and limitations of the competing proposals and determine the awardee. Only proposals that qualify for the second round are

critiqued and scored. All applicants whose proposals qualify for Round 2 will receive a copy of reviewers' anonymized comments and scores. The review criteria, adapted from the NIH scoring system, used to score proposals follow:

Simplified Peer Review Framework:

Factor	Criteria	Scoring method
Factor 1: Importance of the Research	Significance, Innovation	Scored 1-9 (1 = exceptional, 9 = poor)
Factor 2: Rigor and Feasibility	Approach	Scored 1-9 (1 = exceptional, 9 = poor)
Factor 3: Expertise and Resources	Investigators, Environment	Considered in overall impact, no individual score (evaluated as "sufficient" or "not sufficient")

- **Significance of Study:** Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field?
- **Approach:** Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? What is the novelty of the concept and strategy? Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented?
- **Likelihood of Impact on Effectiveness of Clinical Care and Survivorship Outcomes:** If the aims of the project are achieved, how will scientific knowledge, technical capability, clinical practice, policies, and/or programs in Survivorship improve? How will successful completion of the aims change the: concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive the Survivorship field? Or, how will the proposed work improve access, quality, cost, or experience of clinical care or programs?
- **Experience, background, and qualifications of the investigators.** Does the investigative team have the expertise to complete the proposed study?
- **Appropriateness of Budget:** Is the proposed budget and period of support appropriate in relation to the research?
- **Likelihood of Future Research:** If the aims are achieved, will the results lend themselves to future research?
- **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? Are the concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions novel to one field of research or novel in a broad sense? Is a refinement, improvement, or new application of theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions proposed?
- **Overall Impact:** Reviewers will provide an overall impact score to reflect their assessment of the likelihood for the project to lead to future funding (such as career development award) and the candidate to maintain a strong research program, in consideration of the previous scored review criteria. Does the proposal set forth a comprehensive plan to bring the research findings to clinical application?

Awards

Successful applicants must show documentation of IRB approval. If a project is IRB exempt, this must clearly be indicated in the application. Project Directors/Principal Investigators must submit a report at the end of the one-year grant period for review by Survivorship Outcomes Research Young Investigator Award committee and include: project progress, expenditures and plans for disseminating results. Subsequent annual reports will be requested to include publications and extramural funding resulting from the research. **Funds unspent at the end of the one-year grant period will be returned to Clinical Futures. Additional cost extension will not be allowed.**

Additional Information

For more information about the **Survivorship Outcomes Research Young Investigator Award** please see: <https://clinicalfutures.research.chop.edu/research-practice/pilot-grant-program>. Contact Katherine Cambareri cambarerik@chop.edu with any questions about eligibility or the application and submission process.