

## "WILLIAM C. STANLEY" EARLY INVESTIGATOR AWARD (EIA)

### **1. Definition**

The EIA highlights the scientific accomplishments of promising young researchers and is a major focus of the Annual Meeting of the Society for Heart and Vascular Metabolism. There will be four finalists, and for each the registration and accommodation costs will be waived and a personal check of 250 \$US will be issued. The finalists will present their work in a special section of the plenary sessions.

### **2. Eligibility**

Entrants for the EIA competition should be either students or postdoctoral fellows (postdocs or clinical fellows with over 6 year experience are not eligible for the competition). Previous winners of the "*William C. Stanley*" Early Investigator Award (or its precursor, termed "Early Investigator Commendation") are not eligible for this competition.

### **3. Entry to the competition**

Admission to the EIA competition is by submission of an abstract and a curriculum vitae by the deadline announced by the meeting organizer(s) on the meeting website. In the event that an entrant is not selected as an EIA finalist, the abstract will still be considered for presentation as a regular communication at the meeting and for publication as part of the meeting proceedings.

### **4. Submission Packet**

In addition to the abstract and the *curriculum vitae* the following information is requested for the Submission Packet:

- A statement of confirmation that the material presented has not been published as a full manuscript at the time of submission
- A statement of approval by the head of the laboratory (i.e. the person whose grant funding supports the work, or the applicant's supervisor). The e-mail address of this individual should also be supplied.

### **5. Jury**

The competition is judged by Jurors consisting of SHVM Board Members, which include the local Organizing Co-chairs. The SHVM President and Secretary-Treasurer act as Chair and Co-Chair of the committee and ensure that the process is conducted in compliance with regulations.

### **6. Conflict of interest**

If a member of the jury has a significant association with any of the entrants to the competition, the member must record a conflict of interest. The following situations are examples of significant associations that would constitute a conflict of interest:

- Familial, close personal or domestic relationship with an entrant
- Financial or monetary relationship with an entrant or his/her research

- Current or recent association with an entrant's sponsoring laboratory, department, or research institute, including scientific collaborations with the candidate.

If a conflict of interest is identified, or there is in any doubt as to a potential conflict of interest, the Juror should inform the Co-Chairs immediately.

It is recognised that there are gradations of conflict of interest. For example, a close personal relationship or membership of the same laboratory, department or research institute would constitute greater conflicts of interest than casual acquaintance through membership of the same university.

In borderline cases, the Co-Chairs' discretion will be respected. In more complex cases, the Co-Chairs may consult with other members of the jury. However, the Co-Chairs have executive authority to nominate a substitute juror whose details will be communicated to the jury and Council by mail/e-mail.

If a conflict arise with both Co-Chairs, they will be substituted by another committee member.

## **7. Selecting Finalists**

The Jurors will independently judge the quality of each application submitted based on the abstract (75%) and applicant's CV (25%) in order to select no more than four, applying the following criteria:

- Scientific novelty and importance of the work
- Technical and methodological aspects of the study
- A demonstration that the personal contribution of the candidate goes substantially beyond co-authorship or technical support

Each Juror will independently score each application on a scale between 1 and 10, where 1 is the best and 10 the worst possible score. The scoring shall be made independently without discussion or reference to other Jurors. Scores will be uploaded by each Juror via a SHVM portal system and will be handled in a blinded manner by Azuleon. The arithmetical mean score will be applied to each application and the list of scores will be made available to the Co-Chairs. The four highest scoring submissions will be selected for presentation. In the case of a tie between two or more submissions, the Co-Chairs may invite discussion between Jurors by correspondence and request further round of voting. N.B. Potential additional selecting criteria that may be considered include abstract format compliance to the limit of words and style.

## **8. Announcements of the Finalists**

The four finalists will be notified by the Co-chairs two weeks after the submission deadline.