Tufts | CTSI Tufts Clinical and Translational Science Institute

2027 Tufts CTSI Small Grants to Advance Translational Science Program

Request for Applications

The Tufts CTSI Small Grants to Advance Translational Science (S-GATS) Program invites proposals for innovative projects that identify and test ways to overcome persistent scientific or operational barriers. These may include innovations that slow, limit, or prevent translation, or that investigate novel or insufficiently studied approaches for moving discoveries, evidence, research products, tools, methods, and interventions toward broader use and benefit.

Projects must advance the science of translation by generating generalizable knowledge or broadly applicable research products, methods, strategies, processes, frameworks, or principles. They should also present a clear and realistic pathway through which this contribution could improve research quality and efficiency, clinical care and health outcomes, health care delivery, community and public health, economic value, or policy or organizational decision-making.

Projects may address barriers or opportunities at any point along the translational pathway, from the development, validation, and evaluation of research products and approaches through their adoption, adaptation, implementation, dissemination, sustainment, scale-up, or spread. A particular disease or condition, intervention, population, health system, or setting may serve as a use case, provided that the project addresses a broader translational science question and generates knowledge or resources relevant beyond that use case.

Responsive S-GATS projects are expected to:

1) **Define a Translational Challenge or Opportunity:** Clearly define a persistent scientific or operational barrier the project will address, or the novel or insufficiently studied approach it will investigate. Explain why the challenge or opportunity represents a broader translational science question with relevance beyond the immediate study context.
2) **Propose a Translational Science Study:** Design a rigorous study that develops, tests, evaluates, or refines a generalizable contribution to understanding or addressing a translational barrier or opportunity. Where appropriate, the contribution may be developed or examined through one or more use cases. It may take the form of a research product, method, strategy, process, framework, standard, or principle. Examples include research methods and technologies, validation approaches, predictive models, decision support tools, operational processes, and strategies for adaptation, implementation, dissemination, sustainment, scale-up, or adoption.
3) **Describe a Pathway to Broader Application and Benefit**: Outline how the project's findings, products, methods, or approaches could be shared with relevant users and positioned for further development, testing, application, or adoption. Identify relevant users and stakeholders, anticipated next steps, and measurable near-term outcomes appropriate to the project's translational stage.

The application process requires an initial submission of a competitive Letter of Intent (LOI), due on **Tuesday, September 29, 2026,** and, if invited, a full proposal, due on Thursday, December 3, 2026. To ensure that the proposed research projects are responsive to the 2027 RFA**, prospective applicants must consult with the S-GATS Program team prior to the LOI submission.** Prospective applicants will receive a link to the LOI submission form following this consultation. To schedule a consultation or ask a question, contact the S-GATS Program team at **sgats@tuftsmedicine.org.**

Award Information

Number of Awards: Four to six awards (depending on award budgets)
Award Amount: $25,000–$50,000 in direct costs. Cost sharing is not permitted.
Project Period: May 1, 2027 through April 30, 2028. No-cost extensions are not permitted.
Key Dates:

- *Translational Science Is Improving the Process* information sessions (recommended):
  - Tuesday, September 1, 2026 at 4:00 PM
  - Wednesday, September 9, 2026 at 12:00 PM
- Competitive Letter of Intent due (required): **Tuesday, September 29, 2026 at 11:59 PM**
  - *Required applicant consultations available through Friday, September 25, 2026.*
- Invitation to submit full proposal: by Thursday, October 29, 2026
- Proposal due (by invitation only): Thursday, December 3, 2026 at 11:59 PM
- Award announcement: February 2027

About the S-GATS Program

Established in 2022, the Small Grants to Advance Translational Science (S-GATS) Program is a funding opportunity available through Tufts CTSI and supported by the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences (NCATS), one of the centers at the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The program advances the science of translation with the goal of improving the efficiency, effectiveness, and predictability of translational research. A core principle of translational science is understanding and addressing common causes of inefficiency and failure across targets, diseases, therapeutic areas, populations, and settings. Through its focus on these shared barriers and on novel or insufficiently studied approaches, the S-GATS Program seeks to improve how discoveries and evidence move toward broader use and benefit.

Consistent with the translational science principles identified by NCATS, the S-GATS Program supports rigorous and actionable studies that build the evidence base for effective scientific and operational approaches to translation. Reflecting both the NCATS mission and local priorities, the program supports projects across the full translational spectrum, from T0.5 through T4, with an emphasis on contributions that can inform translational research beyond the immediate study context.

Because translational barriers, opportunities, and potential solutions are often best understood through the perspectives of those who conduct research, use or implement its findings, regulate related activities, or are affected by its outcomes, meaningful engagement with relevant stakeholders is an important component of responsive S-GATS projects. Applicants must describe an engagement strategy appropriate to the proposed work. Relevant stakeholders may include members of the public, patients and advocates, health care providers, public health practitioners, policymakers, regulatory bodies, industry representatives, and other affected or interested groups. Engagement should be purposeful and appropriate to the project's translational stage and objectives, with a clear role in informing the design, conduct, interpretation, dissemination, or broader application of the project's findings and outputs. Tufts CTSI offers resources to assist investigators in developing appropriate stakeholder engagement strategies.

Examples of Types of Projects That May Be Supported
Projects may use exploratory, developmental, comparative, pilot, or validation designs, as appropriate to the translational question and scope of the award. Applicants are not expected to complete large-scale, multisite validation, implementation, or systems integration within the award period. Projects may

instead test the feasibility, performance, or underlying principles of an approach within a bounded study context while establishing a foundation for subsequent evaluation or broader application. The examples that follow are illustrative and not exhaustive.

- ***Improving Clinical Research Efficiency****:* Develop or evaluate generalizable research methods or processes that reduce scientific uncertainty, participant burden, delays, or operational inefficiencies in clinical research. Examples include projects that:
    - ***Develop and test*** *a framework for incorporating historical control data into clinical trials for rare genetic disorders, establishing criteria for when this approach can reduce sample size, time, and resource requirements without compromising study validity.*
    - ***Compare*** *collaborative approaches for developing informed consent materials for study participants with varying communication needs, identifying methods that improve comprehension and can be applied across study types.*
    - ***Pilot*** *a self-administered eligibility screening approach in a defined study population, assessing feasibility, participant burden, and its potential to improve study reach.*
    - ***Evaluate*** *a standardized approach for identifying site-level feasibility barriers during planning for a multicenter study, assessing its ability to identify and resolve potential sources of start-up delay or protocol modification.*
- ***Advancing Data Science and Artificial Intelligence:*** Develop or test generalizable approaches that improve the quality, accessibility, interoperability, transparency, or responsible use of data and artificial intelligence in translational research and decision-making. Examples include projects that:
    - ***Develop and evaluate*** *methods for validating geographic data in electronic health records, using neighborhood-level measures relevant to public health planning as an initial application and determining when such data are sufficiently reliable for research and decision-making.*
    - ***Evaluate*** *the performance and transparency of a computerized clinical decision support tool designed to reduce unnecessary diagnostic imaging, identifying criteria that could inform evaluation of similar tools.*
    - ***Develop and evaluate*** *a method for identifying diagnostic information that may warrant reassessment because of limited, outdated, or conflicting supporting evidence.*
    - ***Develop and pilot*** *an approach for reconciling medication data across selected clinical sources, identifying requirements that could inform broader interoperability efforts.*
- ***Accelerating Dissemination and Implementation****:* Study generalizable barriers, strategies, processes, or principles affecting the adoption, adaptation, implementation, dissemination, sustainment, scale-up, or spread of evidence-based or evidence informed practices, programs, tools, and other research products. Examples include projects that:
    - ***Compare*** *strategies for identifying and reducing low-value or unnecessary clinical practices within a network of independent practices, generating guidance applicable to other outpatient settings.*
    - ***Assess*** *adaptations to an evidence-based fall prevention program in selected primary care or community settings, identifying changes that improve feasibility while preserving its essential functions.*
    - ***Evaluate*** *factors affecting continued use of a care navigation program after initial implementation support ends, identifying approaches that could inform future sustainment or spread.*
    - ***Develop and pilot*** *a technology-assisted, community-guided process for translating research findings into accessible, locally relevant materials, assessing their accuracy, usability, trustworthiness, and use in selected community settings.*
- ***Enhancing Predictive Efficacy and Toxicology:*** Develop or evaluate models, methods, datasets, or performance standards that improve the prediction of therapeutic efficacy and toxicity, reduce reliance on poorly predictive testing approaches, and strengthen confidence in preclinical decision-making. Examples include projects that:

- ***Evaluate*** *the feasibility and predictive performance of a patient-derived organoid model for a defined treatment context, identifying criteria that could inform its application to other tumor types or drug classes.*
- ***Develop*** *a reference dataset and interpretive approach for a defined set of high-throughput transcriptomic toxicity screens, examining reproducibility across selected datasets or platforms.*
- ***Evaluate*** *methods for establishing performance criteria for an alternative test system, using a defined model as an initial application and identifying criteria relevant to fitness for purpose.*
- ***Evaluate*** *how genetic variation represented in a defined panel of human cell-based models affects prediction of neurotoxic responses.*

- ***De-risking Therapeutic and Product Development:*** Develop or evaluate generalizable tools, strategies, decision frameworks, or partnership models that reduce uncertainty, time, and costs in advancing therapeutic candidates and related products toward further testing and use. Examples include projects that:
  - ***Develop and evaluate*** *criteria for determining when a biomarker or diagnostic test is ready to advance from analytical validation to clinical evaluation, generating guidance applicable across test types.*
  - ***Evaluate*** *a systematic approach to drug repurposing for conditions with limited therapeutic options, identifying data requirements and decision criteria that improve candidate selection across conditions.*
  - ***Refine*** *tissue-based testing protocols for evaluating the performance of a needle-free auto-injector, identifying testing criteria that could inform the development and readiness assessment of other drug delivery systems.*
  - ***Compare*** *public-private partnership and governance models for advancing first-in-class therapeutics through key development decisions, identifying approaches that improve coordination, risk sharing, and decision quality.*

- ***Strengthening Translational Networks and Workforce Capacity:*** Develop or evaluate generalizable models for strengthening the partnerships, infrastructure, workforce, and skills needed to conduct translational science. Examples include projects that:
  - ***Pilot*** *a hub-and-spoke approach for extending specialized expertise to selected settings, identifying conditions that could support broader adoption.*
  - ***Evaluate*** *a shared services model for providing smaller or resource-limited institutions with access to specialized research methods, data resources, or technical expertise, identifying features associated with access, usability, and potential for continued operation.*
  - ***Evaluate*** *a scalable peer mentorship model for building translational science capacity across disciplines or institutions, identifying which model features are associated with skill development, collaboration, and continued participation.*
  - ***Compare*** *approaches for training research staff in remote or decentralized study procedures, assessing competency and application of skills in selected study settings.*

- ***Improving Evidence-Informed Decision-Making by Policymakers and Organizational Leadership****:* Develop or test generalizable approaches for disseminating research evidence to inform organizational, clinical, public health, payer, or policy decision-making. Examples include projects that:
  - ***Develop and evaluate*** *a rapid evidence-to-decision process for using emerging research to support health system, clinical, or public health decision-making, generating criteria for timely, transparent, and reproducible decisions.*
  - ***Assess*** *approaches for incorporating economic evidence into decisions about adopting or sustaining health interventions in resource-constrained settings, identifying principles for balancing effectiveness, affordability, and sustainability.*
  - ***Create and evaluate*** *a systematic approach for using diagnostic or clinical error data to identify recurring system-level problems and develop broadly applicable error-reduction strategies.*
  - ***Examine*** *how selected payer coverage and reimbursement practices, such as allowable charges or limits on covered services, influence access to outpatient mental health care, identifying principles that could inform evidence-informed benefit design in other health services.*

Applicant Eligibility
Applications must designate a Principal Investigator (PI) with an appointment or position at one of the Tufts CTSI partner or collaborator organizations (see here). Medical residents, fellows, post-doctoral fellows, or medical students are not eligible to serve as PIs. However, they may serve as key personnel, as may collaborators not affiliated with Tufts CTSI.

Project Eligibility
Applicants must propose projects that advance the science of translation, not simply projects that are translational in nature. This call is intentionally broad to encourage diverse approaches, including studies that address persistent scientific or operational barriers and those that investigate novel or insufficiently studied approaches to translation. Projects should examine broader questions about how translation works, why it succeeds or fails, or how it can be made more efficient, effective, reliable, or predictable.

A particular disease or condition, target, intervention, product, program, population, health system, or setting may provide the context for the proposed study. However, the project must generate knowledge, methods, resources, or principles that are relevant beyond that immediate context.

The S-GATS Program does not support basic or discovery-oriented research that lacks a broader translational science question. Projects are also not responsive if their primary purpose is to advance a particular target, intervention, product, or disease through a specific translational milestone, or to implement, deliver, expand, or evaluate a specific intervention, program, product, or service in a particular setting without generating a broader translational science contribution.

Foreign Components
Projects involving a foreign component are not allowable. Consistent with the NIH definition, a foreign component includes the performance of any significant scientific element or segment of a project outside the United States, either by the recipient, by an investigator employed by a foreign organization, or by a non-U.S. vendor carrying out substantive project activities, whether or not award funds are expended. Examples may include research involving human participants or animals at a foreign site; substantive collaborations with investigators at foreign institutions; sample analysis, data analysis, translation, or other research-related services performed by a non-U.S. vendor; use of facilities or instrumentation at a foreign site; or receipt of financial support or resources from a foreign entity.

Clinical Trials
Clinical trials, as defined by the NIH, are permitted but generally discouraged because of the additional NCATS approval, regulatory, and reporting requirements involved. Any proposed clinical trial must have a clearly defined scope that is feasible within the award period and supports appropriate reporting of results attributable to the NCATS-funded work, including when reporting occurs after the award ends. Any S-GATS-supported clinical trial is expected to be defined as a discrete study with an NCT record specific to the funded project. The trial should be structured so that the S-GATS-supported work is clearly delineated within the applicable NCT record and its results can be reported independently of any prior or subsequent research.

Budget and Funding Requirements
S-GATS funding is not intended to supplement or extend projects already supported by other sources. Proposed budgets must be between $25,000 and $50,000 in direct costs and fully supported by Tufts CTSI funds awarded through the S-GATS funding mechanism. Cost sharing, including supplemental funding or third-party in-kind contributions, is not permitted.

Subawards and Institutional Requirements

All awards will be issued as subawards from Tufts University to the project PI's home institution. Collaborations with investigators and partners at other institutions are permitted and will be supported through separate subawards issued directly by Tufts University.

All anticipated subrecipient organizations must be identified at the Letter of Intent stage. Applicants are expected to confirm that each proposed collaborating organization is aware of and agrees to participate in the proposed project. Applicants invited to submit a full proposal will be required to provide formal subrecipient documentation, including a statement of work and the required institutional authorization.

Third-tiering of subawards—i.e., issuing a subaward under a subaward—is not permitted. Due to restrictions set by Tufts CTSI's funding agency on the parent award, **unspent funds cannot be carried forward beyond the end of the budget period.**

Application Process

The S-GATS Program accepts full proposals *by invitation only*. All applicants are required to submit a competitive LOI presenting a concise description of their planned proposal. The LOI should describe the project and its proposed study methods in adequate detail so that the project's scientific merit and translational science focus can be assessed. **Applicants are required to consult with the S-GATS Program staff prior to submission of the initial LOI.** To schedule a virtual consultation, contact the program team at sgats@tuftsmedicine.org.

How to Apply

The 2027 S-GATS Program has a two-step application process that includes a competitive LOI and, if invited, a final proposal. Both must be submitted via Tufts CTSI's REDCap online submission portal. **Unique LOI and proposal submission links will be provided by the S-GATS Program staff.** Incomplete and late submissions will not be accepted.

- **Competitive Letter of Intent:** The LOI should total no more than three pages in length, including any references. The submission should also include a biosketch of the Lead Principal Investigator. Detailed instructions and application templates will be provided by the S-GATS Program staff. LOI submissions will be accepted through **Tuesday, September 29, 2026.**
- **Proposal (by invitation):** All LOI applicants will be notified of their status by Thursday, October 29, 2026. For those invited to submit full proposals, detailed instructions and program-specific form templates will be available in REDCap on the same day. Full proposals must be submitted by **Thursday, December 3, 2026**.

Use of Artificial Intelligence: Applicants remain responsible for the originality, accuracy, and integrity of all submitted application materials, including any content developed with the assistance of artificial intelligence tools.

Letter of Intent Review

The LOI review process is designed to identify promising and scientifically sound translational science projects for advancement to the full proposal stage and to support further project development. All competitive LOIs will undergo an administrative review by S-GATS Program staff for responsiveness to the program's objectives and eligibility requirements. LOIs deemed responsive to the 2027 RFA will be reviewed and scored by at least two scientific peer reviewers based on the significance of the translational challenge or opportunity, scientific rationale and rigor, generalizability of the proposed contribution, feasibility, and potential for impact. Applicants invited to submit a full proposal will be

identified in consultation with the Tufts CTSI Research Collaboration Team, Biostatistics, Epidemiology, and Research Design (BERD) Center, Dissemination and Implementation Core, Program Evaluation, and Community and Stakeholder Engagement programs, as appropriate.

Proposal Development Support
Tufts CTSI will provide tailored support for stakeholder engagement and, where applicable, recruitment and retention planning for studies involving prospective enrollment of human participants. Project teams are expected to take advantage of relevant CTSI support services as appropriate to their project's needs and translational stage.

Proposal Review and Funding Decisions
All complete proposals will be assessed and scored on the basis of the following criteria: Translational Challenge or Opportunity, Innovation and Generalizability, Translational Science Study Design, Feasibility, Pathway to Broader Application and Benefit, and Overall Impact and Advancement of Translational Science. Key funding considerations include the overall impact score, project feasibility, budget justification, available funds, and portfolio balance across the translational spectrum. Applications not selected for S-GATS funding may be considered for other Tufts CTSI support or opportunities, and applicants may be contacted regarding potential next steps, relevant resources, or connections to collaborators.

Review Criteria

Scientific Peer Review
Reviewers will be selected based on the fit between their expertise and the scientific and translational focus of each application. Reviewers may be drawn from Tufts CTSI partner organizations and the Clinical and Translational Science Awards (CTSA) External Reviewer Consortium (CEREC) II, of which Tufts CTSI is a member. Scientific review will use the NIH 9-point overall impact scoring scale and the modified criteria below.

Translational Challenge or Opportunity - *Evaluates the significance and clarity of the translational challenge or opportunity and its relevance to translational science.*

1. Is the translational challenge, barrier, or opportunity clearly defined and well supported?
2. Does it represent a broader translational science question with relevance beyond the immediate study context?
3. Is there a compelling rationale for why addressing or better understanding this challenge or opportunity could improve the efficiency, effectiveness, reliability, or predictability of translation?

Innovation and Generalizability - *Assesses the originality of the proposed work and its potential to generate knowledge or resources relevant beyond the immediate study context.*

1. Does the project introduce a novel approach, application, combination of approaches, or perspective on the translational challenge or opportunity?
2. Is the proposed contribution likely to advance current understanding or practice in translational science?
3. Does the project have the potential to generate knowledge, research products, methods, strategies, processes, frameworks, standards, or principles that are applicable or informative beyond the immediate disease, intervention, population, health system, or setting being studied?

Translational Science Study Design - *Evaluates the scientific rigor and appropriateness of the proposed study for addressing the translational science question and generating interpretable findings.*

1. Is the study design appropriate and sufficiently rigorous to address the stated research questions or objectives?
2. Are the proposed methods, measures, data sources, and analytic approaches appropriate and well justified?
3. Does the study design appropriately address important limitations, potential challenges, and sources of uncertainty, and is it positioned to generate useful translational science knowledge even if findings are null, negative, or unexpected?

Feasibility - *Assesses whether the proposed work can be successfully completed within the award period and available resources.*

1. Is the proposed work appropriately scoped and feasible to complete within the 12-month project period and available funding of up to $50,000 in direct costs?
2. Does the project team have the necessary expertise, resources, collaborations, access to data, participants, materials, or other resources, and institutional support to conduct the proposed work?
3. Does the proposal adequately address the practical considerations needed to carry out the project successfully within the award period, including foreseeable risks and appropriate contingency plans, as applicable?

Pathway to Broader Application and Benefit - *Assesses whether the project establishes a credible pathway for its findings or outputs to inform subsequent research, development, testing, application, adoption, or other forms of broader use and benefit.*

1. Does the proposal identify a clear and realistic pathway for further development, testing, application, or use of the project's findings, products, methods, or approaches?
2. Are relevant users and stakeholders appropriately identified, and is the proposed engagement strategy meaningful, stage-appropriate, and appropriately integrated into the design, conduct, interpretation, dissemination, or broader application of the project?
3. Are the anticipated next steps and measurable near-term outcomes appropriate to the project's scope and translational stage, with consideration of factors that may affect subsequent application or broader benefit?

Overall Impact and Advancement of Translational Science - *Provides an integrated assessment of the project's potential to make a meaningful contribution to the science of translation and enable broader future benefit.*

1. Considering the project as a whole, what is its overall potential to advance translational science?
2. How compelling is the project when its strengths and limitations are considered together?
3. How likely is the project to make a meaningful translational science contribution within the proposed scope and award period?

Review Scoring Framework

All applications will be evaluated using the National Institutes of Health (NIH) 9-point scoring scale, ranging from 1 (Exceptional) to 9 (Poor). Scientific reviewers will use this scale to assign an overall impact score to each application, taking into account its strengths and weaknesses across the review

criteria above and its potential to make a meaningful contribution to translational science. The table below outlines the scoring descriptors and corresponding impact levels.

Score	Impact	Descriptor	Strength/Weaknesses*
1	High	Exceptional	Exceptionally strong; essentially no weaknesses
2	High	Outstanding	Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
3	High	Excellent	Very strong with some minor weaknesses
4	Moderate	Very Good	Strong but numerous minor weaknesses
5	Moderate	Good	Strong but at least one moderate weakness
6	Moderate	Satisfactory	Some strengths but also moderate weaknesses
7	Low	Fair	Some strengths but at least one major weakness
8	Low	Marginal	Few strengths but also a few major weaknesses
9	Low	Poor	Very few strengths with numerous major weaknesses

Tufts CTSI Stakeholder Expert Panel Review

Regardless of the translational phase, all proposals must include a plan for engaging relevant stakeholders. This plan will be reviewed independently by at least two members of the Tufts CTSI Stakeholder Expert Panel. Panel members have a wide range of professional and personal backgrounds and are trained to assess the appropriateness, feasibility, and likely contribution of stakeholder engagement to the proposed research from a stakeholder perspective.

Inclusion of Relevant Stakeholders - *Assesses whether the stakeholders identified are appropriate to the project's translational stage, objectives, and potential broader application.*

1. Are the chosen stakeholders a good fit for the project's stage and goals?
2. Are any important stakeholder groups missing without a clear rationale, potentially limiting the project's relevance or impact?
3. Are stakeholders who could meaningfully inform the research or its broader application appropriately represented?
4. Where appropriate, are people or groups affected by the condition, issue, or translational process included in ways that could improve the relevance or applicability of the work?

Clarity and Specificity of the Engagement Plan - *Assesses how clearly the proposed engagement is described, including who will be engaged, when and how engagement will occur, and how stakeholder input will be used.*

1. Is there a clear and appropriate timeline for stakeholder engagement?
2. Are the proposed methods for engaging stakeholders clearly explained and appropriate to the project?
3. Does the proposal describe what aspects of the research stakeholders will inform and how their input could influence project decisions, activities, or outputs?

Feasibility of Engagement - *Assesses whether the engagement plan is realistic given the project's scope, timeline, resources, and goals.*

1. Is the proposed scope and level of stakeholder engagement appropriate for a one-year project?

2. Does the plan anticipate practical considerations that could affect engagement, such as time, accessibility, participation burden, or compensation, as appropriate?
3. Does the team have the capacity and resources to carry out the proposed engagement within the project timeline and budget?

Impact of Engagement on Research - *Assesses the extent to which stakeholder engagement is likely to meaningfully inform or strengthen the research.*

1. How likely is stakeholder input to meaningfully inform or improve the research?
2. Are stakeholders involved in substantive activities appropriate to the project, such as planning, design, interpretation, dissemination, or broader application?
3. Is there a clear connection between the proposed engagement activities and the project's research objectives?

Review Scoring Framework

Stakeholder Expert Panel members will provide an overall assessment of the stakeholder engagement plan based on its strengths and weaknesses across the domains above. Their assessment and comments will be considered as part of the overall review and funding decisions.

Confidentiality and Non-Disclosure

Submitted application materials will be treated as confidential, with the exception of the project abstract. Project abstracts will be used to identify prospective reviewers with appropriate expertise and will be shared with those individuals as part of the reviewer recruitment process. Applicants should not include confidential, proprietary, or sensitive information in the project abstract.

Other application materials will be shared only with Tufts CTSI staff, reviewers, and others involved in the application review and funding decision process, as appropriate. Reviewers are expected to maintain strict confidentiality and may not disclose or use application content outside the S-GATS review process

Additional Resources

- Case Studies in Translational Science
- Translational Science Principles
- Opportunities and Challenges in Translational Science
- Distinguishing between Translational Science and Translational Research in CTSA Pilot Studies

Questions?

We are here to help. Please contact us at sgats@tuftsmedicine.org with any questions or to schedule a virtual consultation.

Aviva Must, PhD, Director, S-GATS Program
Michael T. Chin, MD, PhD, Senior Advisor, S-GATS Program
Nadia Prokofieva, MSSc, Program Director, Research