

GUIDE FOR ASSIGNED REVIEWERS PRELIMINARY COMMENTS ON COMPETING SUPPLEMENTAL APPLICATIONS

A competing supplemental application is a request for support for a significant expansion of a project's scope or research protocol. A supplemental application is not accepted until after the original application from the same Principal Investigator has been awarded, and it may not extend beyond the term of the parent grant. Applications for competitive supplements are not appropriate when the sole purpose is to restore funds that were administratively reduced by the funding agency. The budget request may be for equipment, supplies, personnel, or all three, and is typically in excess of \$50,000 direct costs per year.

Evaluation is based on the scientific merit of the new work proposed and the appropriateness of the expansion of the scope of the parent project. The body of the application should contain sufficient information from the original grant application to allow evaluation of the proposed supplement in relation to the goals of the original application. Substantial additions and changes in the research plan should be evaluated, but the work originally proposed should not be re-reviewed. Work accomplished since the parent grant was submitted should be presented in the Progress Report, and this progress should be taken into account in determining the appropriateness of the supplement. If the supplemental application relates to a specific line of investigation presented in the original application that was not recommended for approval by the Study Section, then reviewers should evaluate the response to the relevant criticisms in the prior summary statement.

In terms of the budget, if the parent grant is one that uses modular principles (R01, R03, R15, or R21), modular grant application procedures apply. If the budget is over \$250,000 per year, the budget should be itemized. Whether modular or itemized, only the cost of items for which additional funds are requested should be presented in the application and evaluated by reviewers.

The format for reviewer's comments should be appropriate for the parent grant mechanism (e.g. R01).