

**Title:**

**Keywords:**

**How did you learn of this funding opportunity?**

Application Section	Review Guidance
<p><b>1) Abstract:</b> A summary of the unmet need being addressed, the proposed solution, its advantages over existing solutions, ways the health of players and former players would benefit, and the proposed work. (&lt;500 words)</p>	
<p><b>2) Unmet Need:</b> An overview of the health need motivating the work and the gaps in the current standard of care or prevention(&lt;1000 words)</p>	<p>Did the applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Articulate why the problem they seek to solve is significant and accurately explain the current standard of care or prevention and the current gap that their solution would address?</li> <li>• Provide associated morbidity, mortality and costs of the unmet need if known?</li> </ul>
<p><b>3) Proposed Solution:</b> A description of the proposed solution, why it is appropriate for this funding opportunity, and its current maturity level.</p> <p>3a) Description: A description of the proposed solution, its scientific and technical basis, and an overview of the work completed to date (&lt;1000 words)</p> <p>3b) Optional File Upload: Upload a PFD of an image or diagram that helps describe your solution.</p> <p>3c) Fit: A description for how the proposed solution fits the stated objectives of the FPHS program. (&lt;500 words)</p> <p>3d) Solution Maturity: Please upload and complete the solution maturity checklist document (download blank)</p> <p>3e) Cited References: Please list cited references.</p>	<p>Did the applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describe the proposed solution and adequately describe the technology and link the proposed solution to the unmet medical need?</li> <li>• Show that the work fits the goals of the program to which the applicant applied?</li> <li>• Show that the maturity of the solution as indicated on the maturity checklist document is accurate and appropriate for this program and that it builds on prior work/data or new enabling technologies?</li> <li>• Cite robust, peer reviewed references that support the</li> </ul>

	scientific basis of the proposed solution? Did the applicant do their homework?
<p><b>4) Advantages &amp; Health Impact:</b> A description of why the proposed solution is better than alternative approaches and the expected benefits for players and former players</p> <p>4a) Advantages over the alternatives: A description of how the proposed solution, assuming it worked as intended, will be better than the current state-of-the-art and improve the standard of care or prevention (&lt;500 words)</p> <p>4b) Benefits: An overview of the expected health benefits for players and former players. (&lt;500 words)</p>	<p>Did the applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Show an understanding of the relevant alternatives and state-of-the-art?</li> <li>• Show how this solution is better than the available alternatives, whether it represents new technology or technology newly applied to the identified unmet medical need, and how it could be transformative if successful?</li> <li>• Explain how players and former players are expected to benefit?</li> </ul>
<p><b>5) Work Plan:</b> Please describe your proposed work as a series of "deliverables" using the Healthcare Innovation Cycle framework (See: <a href="#">LINK</a>). Add deliverables below and complete the requested information for each deliverable. The recommended deliverables are pre-populated for each "cell" in the Cycle (Domain and Milestone) and you have the option to add custom ones.</p> <p>This is a "Table" (meaning applicants can add deliverables). For each deliverable:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Relevant Domain &amp; Milestone in the Healthcare Innovation Cycle,</li> <li>2) Deliverable Name,</li> <li>3) Start Month and Duration (months),</li> <li>4) Approximate Fraction of Total Budget,</li> <li>5) Work Plan (&lt;500 words),</li> <li>6) Expected Results (&lt;500 words), and</li> <li>7) Risk Management Plan (&lt;500 words)</li> </ol>	<p>Did the applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Propose a clear set of deliverables?</li> <li>• For each deliverable adequately describe the scope of work, approximate fraction of the total budget to be allocated, start month and duration, the tangible results and plans to manage anticipated challenges?</li> <li>• Show that the deliverables are appropriate and work plan is feasible for the requested resources?</li> <li>• Describe tangible results that are clear enough to know at the conclusion of the work if they have been achieved?</li> </ul>

<p><b>6) Implementation Plan:</b> A description of the planned steps that would occur AFTER the proposed scope of work and approximate time to commercialization</p> <p>6a) Implementation Pathway: An outline of the next steps you anticipate upon the completion of the proposed work that will lead to rapid impact on the health of players and former players. (&lt;500 words)</p> <p>6b) Time to impact : the least number of months that the solution could be available in the market.</p>	<p>Did the applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Articulate a future pathway that will get the solution to players and former players in time line consistent with the goals of the funding program?</li> <li>• Provide a realistic time frame to reach players and former players that is consistent with this program?</li> </ul>
<p><b>7) Team and Resources:</b></p> <p>7a) Overview: Provide an overview of the team and explain how it has the requisite skills and access to the needed resources/ environment to be successful in accomplishing the planned deliverables. (&lt;1000 words)</p> <p>7b) Key Personnel: A Table with the following data: 1) Name, 2) Title, 3) Home institution/company, 4) Role and responsibility on the project, 5) Approximate average % time commitment, 6) Upload a 2-page NIH style bio sketch.</p> <p>7c) Letter of Support Upload: Please upload letters of support from key collaborators/vendors/lab directors if appropriate.</p> <p>7d) Does the project involves a site outside of North America? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No – If Yes, Note: Applications from sites outside of North America will require additional administrative review.</p>	<p>Did the applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Show that the team is composed of individuals with the needed strengths, expertise, and resources to accomplish the work plan?</li> <li>• Form a team that is likely to represent a productive collaboration rather than a “drive by” working relationship?</li> </ul>
<p><b>8) Budget:</b></p> <p>8a) Budget Upload: Each performance site must submit a separate budget using the <u>Center budget form</u>. Budgets must be signed by an authorized institution official.</p> <p>8b) Budget Justification: Upload a description of why the attached budget is appropriate for the proposed work. Be sure to include personnel responsibilities and effort commitments. Equipment is generally not supported but may be on occasion if well justified by the needs of the project.</p>	<p>Did the applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare a realistic budget that maps to the deliverables and the role of each team member as described earlier?</li> <li>• Provide tangible evidence of institutional support if appropriate?</li> </ul>

<p><b>9) Compliance:</b></p> <p>9a) Human Subjects <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No – If Yes,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Describe the subject population and enrollment plans.</li> <li>ii) Will the data be de-identified? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No – If Yes, explain who has the key.</li> <li>iii) Is the work expected to be exempt under 45 CFR Part 46? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No – If No, Describe 1) The risk to subjects, 2) Adequacy of protection against risks, 3) Potential benefits to the subjects, 4) Importance of the knowledge to be gained</li> <li>iv) Clinical Trial? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No – If Yes, provide an overview of the data and safety monitoring plans</li> </ul> <p>9b) Animal Subjects <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No – If Yes, describe the model and rationale, or your materials source if applicable</p>	<p>Did the applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriately identify and adequately describe the human subjects to be studied?</li> <li>• Choose the appropriate animal model?</li> <li>• Initiate and/or have made progress in the approval process?</li> </ul>
<p><b>10) Institutional Contact &amp; Approval</b></p> <p>10a) Responsible Institution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Address</li> <li>• Type (College/Univ, AMC/Hospital, CRO, Company – if company, Approximate number of employees)</li> </ul> <p>10b) Point of Contact: Identify the administrative point of contact for the responsible institution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Name (Given, Middle Initial, Family)</li> <li>• Title</li> <li>• Phone Number</li> <li>• Preferred e-mail</li> </ul> <p>10c) Institutional Approval: Upload a signed NIH 398 Face Page (<a href="https://grants.nih.gov/grants/funding/phs398_rev06-2009/fp1.pdf">https://grants.nih.gov/grants/funding/phs398_rev06-2009/fp1.pdf</a>) form to indicate institutional approval for the proposal (if applicable).</p>	

**Review Ratings:**

1. "Impact": The relative potential impact on the health of players and former players, assuming that the technology proves successful and the likelihood that it can be more rapidly implemented as a result of being supported. The most relevant proposal sections in developing this score are: 2) Unmet Need, 4) Advantages & Patient Impact, 6) Implementation Plan.

1 – Very Low  
2 – Low  
3 – Acceptable  
4 – High  
5 – Very High  
Comments

2. "Quality": The quality and innovativeness of the science/technology behind the proposed solution, strength of the team, thoroughness of the approach and adequacy of the budget. The most relevant proposal sections in developing this score are: 3) Proposed Solution, 5) Work Plan, 7) Team & Resources, 8) Budget & Justification, and 9) Compliance (if applicable)

1 – Very Poor  
2 – Poor  
3 – Acceptable  
4 – Good  
5 – Very Good  
Comments

3. Overall recommendation for funding by the Football Players Health Study:

1 – Definitely do not fund  
2 – Not recommended for funding  
3 – No objections to funding  
4 – Fund with moderate enthusiasm  
5 – Fund with high enthusiasm  
Comments