

Specific Aims Page

Specific Aims attachment for an NIH research project grant application | Marked-up specimen

<https://www.editfast.com/editing-services/grant-writers>

A one-page attachment checked against the investigator's own project record and against the review factors that carry a score.

ORIGINAL, WITH EDITS MARKED

SPECIMEN, PREPARED BY EDITFAST FOR ILLUSTRATION. NOT A REAL RECORD.

Prepared for Dr. A. Okonjo (fictitious), Specific Aims attachment, R01 application

EXTRACT FROM THE INVESTIGATOR'S PROJECT RECORD (reproduced unchanged in both panels)

PR-1 Aim 1 as approved by the investigator: determine whether the assay detects the marker in stored samples.

PR-2 Aim 2 as approved: compare detection rates between the stored and fresh sample sets.

PR-3 Gap the project addresses, in the investigator's words: no published method distinguishes the two marker forms in stored samples.

PR-4 Expected outcome as stated by the investigator: a validated method other laboratories can adopt.

PR-5 Sample counts confirmed by the laboratory: 340 stored samples, 120 fresh.

PR-6 The Research Strategy for this application runs under the headings Significance, Innovation, and Approach.

SPECIFIC AIMS

Our laboratory has worked in this area for over twenty years and is internationally recognized for its contributions. The principal investigator has published widely and has served on three editorial boards. Our institution houses a core facility with equipment available to few other groups.¹

We propose two aims. Aim 1 concerns the assay. Aim 2 concerns detection rates.²

We expect the work to be useful.³

WHAT CHANGED, AND WHY

#	Was	Now	Reason
1	Our laboratory has worked in this area for over twenty years and is internationally recognized for its contributions. The principal investigator has published widely and has served on three editorial boards. Our institution houses a core facility with equipment available to few other groups.	No published method distinguishes the two marker forms in stored samples. / [Query to the investigator: the twenty-year record, the editorial board service, and the core facility have been lifted off this page. The publication and service record normally sits in the biosketch personal statement, and the facility in Facilities and Other Resources. Where they are already there, nothing further is needed.]	Track record and facilities are Investigator and Environment, which NIH evaluates under Factor 3 with a selection rather than a 1 to 9 score. The reviewer guide directs that no comments be included in that field where Factor 3 is rated appropriate, and it directs a reviewer who finds gaps to explain how they affected the overall impact score. NOT-OD-24-010 places Significance and Innovation under Factor 1, and PR-3 gives what the field currently lacks in the investigator's own words.
2	We propose two aims. Aim 1 concerns the assay. Aim 2 concerns detection rates.	Aim 1. Determine whether the assay detects the marker in stored samples. / Aim 2. Compare detection rates between the stored and fresh sample sets. / [Query to the investigator: PR-5 confirms 340 stored and 120 fresh samples but does not divide them between the aims. Where a count belongs in an aim, it can be inserted.]	PR-1 and PR-2 give the aims as the investigator approved them, and the draft named their subjects without stating them. PR-5 gives project-level counts and does not allocate them between the aims, so the counts are raised as a query rather than written in.
3	We expect the work to be useful.	The expected outcome is a validated method other laboratories can adopt.	The attachment's instruction asks the applicant to summarize the expected outcome. PR-4 states it, and useful is not an outcome.
4	(nothing addresses feasibility)	[Query to the investigator: the record does not state what makes the approach feasible, which is Factor 2 material. If there is preliminary data, it belongs here or in the Research Strategy, and we have not written any for you.]	NOT-OD-24-010 places Approach under Factor 2, which carries the second of the two scores. The project record does not say what supports feasibility, so the gap is raised rather than filled.