

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PODIATRIC SPORTS MEDICINE

RESEARCH HANDBOOK

American Academy of Podiatric Sports Medicine
109 Greenwich Drive
Walkersville, MD 21793

888-854-FEET (3668)
info@aapsm.org

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PODIATRIC SPORTS MEDICINE

RESEARCH HANDBOOK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GENERAL INFORMATION AND POLICIES	3
GRANT AND AWARD PROGRAM	
Statement of Purpose	3
INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES	4
INSTRUCTIONS FOR GRANT APPLICATIONS	
Deadline & Submission Information	5
Specific Application Instructions	6-8
Continuation Applications	8
PROCESSING OF GRANT APPLICATIONS	
Administrative Information	8
Ranking System	9
Committee Evaluation	10
Award Notification	11
INFORMATION FOR GRANTEES	
Use of Funds	11
Equipment	12
Extensions	12
Required Reports	12-13
Conference Presentation	13
OUTLINE FOR REVIEW OF RESEARCH PROJECTS	14-16
APPENDIX: Required Forms	not numbered

For further information regarding material in this handbook, contact the AAPSM Research Committee, 109 Greenwich Drive, Walkersville, MD 21793.

GENERAL INFORMATION AND POLICIES

A major objective of the American Academy of Podiatric Sports Medicine (AAPSM) is to encourage scientific research. The Research Committee is responsible to the AAPSM Board of Directors for overseeing and developing research activities. All recommendations of the Research Committee concerning research grants are submitted for approval to the AAPSM Board of Directors.

Research grants are awarded for projects in biological and clinical sciences which bear with reasonable directness to podiatric sports medicine. Preference is given to clinical research and research directly related to the practice of podiatric sports medicine.

GRANT AND AWARD PROGRAM

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The purpose of the research program administered by the American Academy of Podiatric Sports Medicine (AAPSM) is to investigate problems of a biological nature that will result in a better understanding of podiatric sports medicine. While the areas of interest in research conducted are broad enough to encompass all medical and biological sciences, limited resources available necessitate a selective emphasis on grant projects.

Investigators are encouraged to identify areas that need podiatric sports medicine exploration and to seek out the best application of their own talents, skills, and interests to that exploration. Investigators are invited to discuss with the Research Committee or its designated representative their proposed projects while in the planning stage. Though the Research Committee neither helps prospective grantees to write application nor assumes responsibility for prospective grantees who have asked for consultations, such conversations can be useful in eliminating areas of duplication or identifying general problems requiring podiatric sports medicine research.

The American Academy of Podiatric Sports Medicine (AAPSM) is interested only in the highest quality of scientific investigation and limits its approval of applications to those projects that have reasonable promise of revealing important scientific knowledge.

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

General Assurances

Institutions sponsoring applications of investigators or institutions submitting applications for grants-in-aid to specific projects must present evidence that there is a contract or reasonable understanding with those whose services will be necessary for the conduct of the project over a sufficient period for reasonable progress to be made.

The institutions must also give assurance to the Research Committee that those responsible for the conduct of these projects will be allowed sufficient freedom from other college or hospital responsibilities, so as to have time to make significant progress in the projects.

The institution must also assure the Committee that adequate space and other customary facilities will be provided. Expenditures for physical plant renovation or improvements will not be approved for payment in research grants.

Research Subjects

The grant application should include a separate section that describes, in detail, the use of human subjects and/or animals.

All institutions in which AAPSM supported research is conducted must conform to the standards established for human and animal experimentation by the US Department of Health and Human Services and US Department of Agriculture.

Federal regulations for use of animals require the research facility to have a committee on animal care. The committee must require a description of euthanasia, description of all care for chronic animals, and justification for use of unanesthetized animals. It must also record receipt and require acknowledgment of use of anesthetized animals for acute (no recovery) procedures. The committee is responsible for realistic supervision and must report on both unanesthetized and chronic animal use.

Regulations should be checked in detail; this is only a general statement, to indicate the kind of concerns the institution must answer.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR GRANT APPLICATIONS

Deadline & Submission Information

Application information and forms area available from the AAPSM Research Committee, 109 Greenwich Drive, Walkersville, MD 21793.

Applicants are invited to contact the Research Committee if there is a question about the meaning of a specific provision in the application. By the time the application is received for evaluation, it must be complete.

All applications, including renewal requests for a previously approved project must be postmarked on or before December 15. Late applications will be returned unread. Applications must be complete to be considered.

The original and five (5) single sided copies of each application are required. The original must be signed by the individual who would be legally responsible for the research project and monetary obligations involved, i.e., the principle investigator and the appropriate officer of the sponsoring institution. The department chairman's signature, when applicable, assures that those responsible for the conduct of the project will be allowed sufficient freedom from other responsibilities to make significant progress in the project.

Applications should be presented in the following format:

1. Application Form (Form A)
2. Table of Contents
3. Text: typed single spaced on one side of the paper. Page numbers should be at the bottom center of each page. Informed Consent and Human/Animal use information with appropriate forms should be included.
4. Budget Request with Justification
5. Copies of relevant articles by the investigator(s).
6. Investigator's curriculum vitae.

SPECIFIC APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

Grant Application Form

The Application Form (Form A) must be completed and signed by authorized parties. This forms should be the first page of the grant application.

Project Summary (one page maximum)

The summary should provide a concise overview of the project. Information on details or explanations will be obtained from the remainder of the grant application.

Literature Review

Provide a brief description of the literature review available with respect to the project to be studied. List literature sources reviewed.

Statement of Project Significance and Potential Value to Podiatric Sports Medicine

Provide a brief statement as to how this project may be a valuable addition to Podiatric Sports Medicine literature in particular and science in general.

Specific Aims

The information sought by the study. State the hypothesis to be tested and list specific questions to be posed to test the hypothesis.

Design and Method

Describe, in detail, the research plan, methods, and controls you propose to use. This should include a description of proposed experiments or procedures; techniques to be used; number and type of subjects; control procedures for avoiding confounds; types of data that will be generated; and means by which obtained data will be analyzed and interpreted. If appropriate, a discussion of problems that may be encountered with techniques of procedures should be included. To the extent possible, a tentative schedule of progress through the investigation should be included.

Facilities

List the facilities available for carrying out this project, including laboratories, clinical resources, office space, and major items of equipment.

Personnel

List the personnel who will be involved. Estimate the percentage of each individuals effort which will be devoted to the project.

- a. For professional personnel, a biographical sketch and personal publications for the principal investigator and of co-investigators. Each curriculum vitae should include the following:
 - 1) Applicants position
 - 2) Major Degrees
 - 3) Journals in which he/she has published
 - 4) Previous grant support, if any
- b. For non-professional personnel, a description of the work to be done.

Budget

The applicant must provide a specific budget for proposed expenditures using standardized budget categories (personnel, supplies, equipment, travel, office expense, etc.) and vendor quotes on equipment over \$1,500. (Form B)

- a. Salaries of the principal investigator, co-investigator, or other professional researchers may not be a budgetary item in project grants.
- b. The Research Committee does not provide funding to duplicate major equipment which may be available elsewhere in the institution, and does not support renovations or improvements to the physical plant.

Budget Justification Narrative

Provide a narrative justification for itemized budget requests.

Evidence of Application to Appropriate Committees

Describe in detail, the use of human subjects and/or animals. Provide written documentation of application to IRB, IACC, Radiation Safety, or Biosafety Committees, if applicable. (Form S)

Informed Consent

If your project involves the use of human subjects, a copy of your Informed Consent Form should be included. Information that is given to the subject or the representative

should be in language that that person can understand. No informed consent may include exculpatory language through which the subject or representative is made to waive or appear to waive any of the subjects legal rights or which releases or appears to release the investigator, the institution or its agents from liability for negligence.

List Other Support for Project from All Sources

List all sources with amount of support from areas other than AAPSM in which support has been requested or obtained.

Plan for Publication and/or Presentations

Briefly outline your plans for publication and/or presentation of results of this project.

CONTINUATION APPLICATIONS

Grantees may reapply for support on a year-by-year basis beyond the initial year of support. The aims of the project cannot change significantly and the title should remain unchanged. The continuing application must contain a report of the progress that has been made in the previous year.

PROCESSING OF GRANT APPLICATIONS

Administrative Information

The Research Committee of the American Academy of Podiatric Sports Medicine (AAPSM) acknowledges all grant applications and prepares a “Grant Application Review Face Sheet” for each, noting any format deficiencies. The Research Committee Chair also sends each proposal to one or two scientists knowledgeable in the field(s) involved in the application for their review and evaluation. Each reviewer receives a copy of the American Academy of Podiatric Sports Medicine Research Handbook. Reviewers submit their written reviews within three weeks. Expert reviews are made available to each principle investigator as part of the release of information after the grant review process is completed. The identity of the expert reviewers is not made available to investigators nor to other individuals outside the AAPSM Research Committee.

Each member of the AAPSM Research Committee receives a copy of all grant proposals. While each member is expected to be familiar with all proposals submitted each year, each proposal is assigned to one committee member who is responsible for written review and critique of the proposal.

Ranking System

All proposals are considered for scientific acceptability, podiatric sports medicine significance and ranked as follows:

1.0 HIGHEST RANK

Clear Podiatric Sports Medicine significance; no revisions in protocol needed; excellent experimental design; good research problem; good approach; qualified investigators; suitable facilities; appropriate budget for work proposed.

2.0 MODERATE RANK

Moderate Podiatric Sports Medicine significance; minor revisions in protocol needed; average experimental design; good research problem; good approach; qualified investigators; suitable facilities; appropriate budget for work proposed.

3.0 LOW RANK

Little Podiatric Sports Medicine significance; major revisions in protocol needed; poor experimental design; old research problem; poor approach; problems with investigator(s) qualifications; problems with facilities; budget problems; barely acceptable scientifically; could be salvaged for later cycle if research problem is good.

4.0 LOWEST RANK

No Podiatric Sports Medicine significance; not scientifically acceptable; project could be salvaged only by totally rethinking and rewriting the protocol; expert consultation needed.

A grant is deemed to be scientifically meritorious if there is a conceptual correctness and a strong chance of success for completion.

COMMITTEE EVALUATION

Podiatric Sports Medicine Significance

The description of the ranking system clearly states the importance of the relevance of the project to podiatric sports medicine. The investigator should establish this relevance very clearly in development of the hypothesis.

In studying each proposed project, the Research Committee also considers the following :

1. Comments from reviewers
2. Adequacy of the proposed plan, including hypothesis, techniques, data analysis plans, and the ability of the applicant to describe the project.
3. The qualifications of the principal investigator, including publications and publication plans.
4. Adequacy of the facilities at the disposal of the investigator.
5. Availability of sufficient time for the investigator and other personnel to conduct the study.
6. Adherence to the rules for the application.
7. The Budget. The Research Committee will delete from the budget, funds for items that are not allowed. The Research Committee may also, in times of limited funds, reduce the budget by a given percentage and ask the investigator to reduce the budget within the new limit. A revised budget must be submitted to the AAPSM Research Committee and be approved before grant funds will be released. In cases where a revision in the proposal is requested, budgetary allocation is made before the revision is requested, but the Research Committee must approve the revised application before releasing any grant funds.
8. Ethical considerations, including completion of Certificate of Compliance, Protection of Research Subjects.

Proposals that are not deemed acceptable scientifically must be given a “4.0” ranking and will not be considered for funding.

After all proposals have been ranked the Research Committee reconsiders all proposals and makes funding decisions based on available funds.

Conflict of Interest

During the consideration of grant requests, any member of the Research Committee who is a staff member of the institution from which a request originates, shall excuse himself/herself from discussion of, and voting on , that request.

Award and Notification

The American Academy of Podiatric Sports Medicine Research Committee may commit only funds which are on hand. All funding decisions of the Research Committee are

submitted to the Board of Directors of the American Academy of Podiatric Sports Medicine for final approval.

The Research Committee will notify the applicants of its actions by certified letter. Information provided to applicants in this notification is limited to the disposition of the application and does not include details pertaining to the basis of decisions made by the Research Committee.

Release of Information

Information concerning grant applications will be provided only to the principal investigator and the authorized official that signs for the applicant's institution. Any other individual seeking information concerning a specific grant will be denied that information.

INFORMATION FOR GRANTEES

Each grantee must conduct his/her investigation in accordance with plans outlined in the application for which the grant was made and must also keep a careful record of his/her project and all matters pertinent to it, including accounting of funds, materials, and equipment.

Use of Funds

Grant funds must be used for the purpose requested in the budget presented with the application. The only exception to this would be if the principle investigator and an authorized officer of the institution request permission, in the course of the investigation to reallocate funds and the Research Committee approves. Formal written approval must be received by the investigator prior to reallocation of funds.

The finance office of involved institutions is provided with a list of funds awarded to each grantee. The institution in these cases is responsible for distributing the funds to the grantees.

Any funds unexpended at the end of the grant period must be returned to the AAPSM Research Fund.

No new grant funds can be released to any investigator or institution until approved financial records due to that point are received.

Equipment

Only under special circumstances are funds for major equipment provided. The grantee is responsible for reasonable care, maintenance, and insurance against liability resulting from use of such equipment.

Extensions

An extension of the grant period may be made only by authorization from the Research Committee, and the request must be filed within two months of the end of the grant period.

REQUIRED REPORTS

Progress Reports

A progress report to the Research Committee is required six months following the award of the grant funds. The progress report must include progress made in relation to the project as outlined in the application, problems that occurred regarding techniques, and prognosis as to anticipated progress and conclusions, if any, on work done to date.

Financial Reports

Detailed financial reports are due six months following the award of the grant funds and at the conclusion of the grant period. An itemized listing of expenditures is required.

Final Report

When a project is completed, a final report on the conduct of the study shall be submitted to the AAPSM Research Committee within eight weeks of the close of the grant period. The report should include statements of techniques used, results of the study, problems encountered, conclusions concerning the value of the investigation, suggestions related to further study, inventory of equipment purchased with grant funds, and a final financial report. Publications or manuscripts along with inventory of equipment purchased with grant funds and a final financial report may be accepted in lieu of progress reports.

Results of investigations may be published without review by the Research Committee. Each grantee, however, when publishing results of his/her investigations shall acknowledge support of the project by the American Academy of Podiatric Sports Medicine. Copies of manuscripts or publications shall be furnished to the Chair of the AAPSM Research Committee.

No new or continuing grants will be considered until reports that are due are submitted and approved.

Conference Presentation

All recipients of grant awards are required to present results of their study at a research or professional conference within two years after awarding of the grant. Failure to present results within this period will bar the investigator from receiving future grant award consideration.

OUTLINE FOR REVIEW OF RESEARCH PROJECTS

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PODIATRIC SPORTS MEDICINE
RESEARCH COMMITTEE

This outline is intended for reviewers as a suggested guide in preparing written comments on research grant applications. Use of these guidelines should assure coverage of all aspects essential for careful substantiation of the recommendations made by the Research Committee.

1. ***Proposal:***

Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of various aspects of the proposal. Is an adequate understanding of the pertinent literature demonstrated? Are the aims logical? Is the proposal timely, relative to the current status of research in this field? Is the design adequate to support or refute the hypothesis? Are the procedures feasible? What problems do you anticipate? Will the research add useful data to the body of knowledge? Is the purpose realistic? If this is a continuing project request, comment on the progress to date.

2. ***Data Collection and Analysis:***

Are the observations, measurements, and records which are proposed adequate to insure a productive project? Where appropriate, please comment on the statistical design of project.

3. ***Podiatric Medical Significance:***

Comment on the significance of this project in relation to podiatric sports medicine.

4. ***Investigator(s):***

Is the applicant capable and prepared to develop the project and publish the results? Discuss any special attributes of the personnel who would be associated with the project. Has enough time been allotted for the personnel to devote to this project to insure its timely progress?

5. ***Resources and Environment:***

Discuss any special aspects of the facilities or equipment. Comment on the availability of such resources. Discuss the extent of departmental, interdepartmental, and institutional cooperation, if appropriate.

6. ***Budget:***

Is the budget realistic in terms of the aims and methodology ? Are all the items justified based on the proposed procedures and data analysis ? Itemize and provide specific reasons for any budget changes you may suggest. If this is a continuing project, it may be appropriate to comment on the relation of this budget to previous budgets.

7. *Other Considerations:*

Are there ethical issues which should be addressed ? Is the welfare of subjects adequately protected ? If Informed Consent is required, is it adequate ? Are any potentially hazardous materials or procedures proposed ? Has the investigator considered all problems and proposed adequate protection ?

8. *Reviewer's recommendation:*

Summarize your recommendation in terms of action that the Research Committee should consider. When appropriate, discuss the revisions you feel should be made before this project receives grant support. Also assign a rank (1-4) to the proposal which reflects its technical merit. A proposal may possess all or some of the attributes listed for each rank. Intermediate ranks (1.5, 2.5, 3.5) may be given.

RANKING SYSTEM

1.0 HIGHEST RANK

Clear Podiatric Sports Medicine significance; no revisions in protocol needed; excellent experimental design; good research problem; good approach; qualified investigators; suitable facilities; appropriate budget for work proposed.

2.0 MODERATE RANK

Moderate Podiatric Sports Medicine significance; minor revisions in protocol needed; average experimental design; good research problem; good approach; qualified investigators; suitable facilities; appropriate budget for work proposed.

3.0 LOW RANK

Little Podiatric Sports Medicine significance; major revisions in protocol needed; poor experimental design; old research problem; poor approach; problems with investigator(s) qualifications; problems with facilities; budget problems; barely acceptable scientifically; could be salvaged for later cycle if research problem is good.

4.0 LOWEST RANK

No Podiatric Sports Medicine significance; not scientifically acceptable; project could be salvaged only by totally rethinking and rewriting the protocol; expert consultation needed.

ILLUSTRATIVE GUIDE FOR SCORING APPLICATIONS

SCORE	DESCRIPTOR	TERM PAPER
1.0	Truly exceptional, Only one every 3-4 years reaches this level of excellence	A+
1.2	Superb! Awesome ! One this good for each reviewer every 2-3 meetings	A
1.5	Excellent ! Fine work. Top 90% of applications.	A-
1.8	Impressive ! Only 1 in 15 better	B+
2.1.	Clearly better than average. Look forward to seeing it again	B
2.4	Needs work, but could be salvaged	B-
2.7	Strengths outweigh weaknesses, but major revisions required	C+
3.0	Average. Strengths and weaknesses cancel each other out	C
3.4	Probably below average; mediocre	C-
3.8	Clearly below average	D+
4.2	Bad	D
4.6	Really Bad	D-
4.9	Truly wretched	F