

## **EARLY INVESTIGATOR COMMENDATION (EIC)**

### **1. Definition**

The EIC highlights the scientific accomplishments of promising young researchers and is a major focus of the Annual Congress of the Society for Heart and Vascular Metabolism. There will be four finalists, and for each the registration fee (but not accommodation costs) will be waived. The finalists will present their work in a special section of the plenary sessions.

### **2. Eligibility**

Entrants for the EIC competition should be either students or postdoctoral fellows (postdocs or clinical fellows with over 6 years experience are not eligible for the competition).

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

Admission to the EIC 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 EIC 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. Abstracts**

The abstract submitted as part of the competition shall be so marked.

### **6. Jury**

The competition is judged by a panel of 4-Jurors. Entries to the EIC award competition will be evaluated for presentation. The jury will be nominated by the President of the Society and will include the local Organizing Co-chairs.

Once constituted, the jury will oversee the process of pre-selection and the conduct of the competition in compliance with these regulations.

### **7. Conflict of interest**

The jury constituted in Item 6 above has sole responsibility for judging of the entries.

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.

In some cases, a conflict of interest may arise with a Chairperson. In these circumstances, the Chairperson will be substituted by another senior officer.

## **8. *Selecting Finalists***

The Jurors will independently judge each application on the quality of the work submitted 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 5, where 5 is best. The scoring shall be made independently without discussion or reference to other Jurors. The arithmetical mean score will be applied to each application and 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 a further round of voting.

## **9. *Announcements of the Finalists***

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