

Enhancing Peer Review at NIH

University of Central Florida Grant Day Workshop

October 26, 2009

Anne K. Krey

Division of Scientific Review



Enhancing Peer Review

Receipt, Referral and Review of Applications

Recent Peer Review Changes

Upcoming Changes

Submission of Applications

- The old way to submit applications
 - Paper PHS 398 application form
 - FedEx@truckload
- The new way requires
 - Transition to the SF424 Research & Research-Related family of forms
 - Electronic submission of grant applications through Grants.gov

Paper or Electronic Submission

- Transitioned mechanisms require electronic submission of the SF424 to Grants.gov
 - RO1, RO3, R13, R21, R34, SBIR and K applications
- Mechanisms yet to transition require continued use of paper PHS 398 form
 - Training grant (T32) applications
 - Program project/Center grant applications

Electronic Submission Process

- Applications must respond to a Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA)
- Unsolicited applications respond to Parent FOAs listed at the OER website
- Application package attached to particular FOA must be used
- Submission to Grants.gov
- NIH retrieval of applications into eRA Commons

Assignment of Applications

Division of Referral assigns applications to

- Scientific Review Group
 - Center for Scientific Review (CSR) Integrated Review Group/Study Section
 - Institute Initial Review Group/Review Subcommittee
- Institute Program
- Referral Guidelines
- PI Cover letter

Assignment to CSR or Institute Review Group

Applications reviewed by CSR

- Research projects RO1, R21; Fellowships F32; Small business innovation research R43, R44

Applications reviewed by Institute Scientific Review Divisions

- Career development (K) applications
- Small research grant (RO3) applications
- Institutional training grant (T32) applications
- Conference grant (R13) applications
- Multicenter RO1 applications

Types of Review Committees

- Standing Committees
 - Chartered; multi-year commitment
 - Temporary members added as needed
 - Roster available in NIH Commons
- Special Emphasis Panels
 - All temporary (ad-hoc) members

Preparation for Review Meeting

Scientific Review Officer

- Analyzes content of applications
- Recruits and assigns qualified reviewers
- Manages conflicts of interest
- Establishes the 3 phases of Internet Assisted Review
- Transmits applications and orientation material to reviewers

Review Group Orientation

Responsibility of Reviewers

- Assess scientific and technical merit of applications using specified review criteria
- Reviewers do not consider program relevance or compare applications

Review Group Orientation

- Conflict of interest and confidentiality
- Guidelines for Reviewers
 - Review Criteria
 - Grant mechanism specific
 - Additional Review Criteria
 - Human Subjects, Inclusion of WMC
 - Additional Review Considerations
 - Budget
- Recent Peer Review Changes

Review Group Orientation

- Grant mechanism specific review criteria from Funding Opportunity Announcements Section V
 - Parent Announcement
 - Institute Specific Program Announcement (PA)
 - Request for Applications (RFA)
- FOAs describe objectives of specific program
 - e.g. Research grant (RO1)
 - e.g. Small research grant (RO3)
 - e.g. RFA “Neurological Recovery in TBI”

Review Group Orientation

Small grant (RO3) applications

- Objectives
 - Pilot or feasibility studies
 - Secondary analyses of existing data
 - Small, self contained research projects
 - Development of research methodology/new technology
- Provide a clear conceptual framework & general approach, less emphasis on methodological approach, preliminary data not required

Review Group Orientation

Career Development Applications

- Mentored Research Scientist Development Award (KO1)
- Mentored Patient-Oriented Research Career Development Award (K23)
- Midcareer Investigator Award in Patient-Oriented Research (K24)
- Mentored Quantitative Research Career Development Award (K25)
- Pathway to Independence Award (K99/R00)
- K Kiosk <http://grants.nih.gov/training/careerdevelopmentawards.htm>

Review Group Orientation

- Review of applications using grant mechanism specific review criteria
- Additional review criteria
 - Human subjects
 - Inclusion of women, minorities, children
 - Vertebrate animals
- Additional review considerations
 - Budget and period of support
 - Foreign applications

Peer Review Changes

Goals

- Clearer understanding of the basis of application ratings
- More emphasis on impact and less emphasis on technical details
- Succinct, well-focused critiques that evaluate, rather than describe, applications
- Routine use of the entire rating scale

Peer Review Changes

Specific changes effective with the June 2009 review meetings

- Enhanced review criteria
- Templates for Structured Critiques
- New 1-9 Scoring Scale
- Scoring of Individual Review Criteria

Enhanced Review Criteria

RO1 and RO3 Applications

- Former Review Criteria
 - Significance, **Approach**, Innovation, Investigators, Environment
- Enhanced Review Criteria
 - Significance, Investigators, Innovation, **Approach**, Environment

Review of R Applications

- Overall Impact
- Core Review Criteria (different for other grant mechanisms)
 - Significance, **Investigators**, Innovation, **Approach**, Environment
- Additional Review Criteria
 - Protection for Human Subjects; Inclusion of Women, Minorities, Children; Resubmissions
- Additional Review Considerations - Budget

Peer Review Changes

Specific changes effective with the June 2009 review meetings

- Enhanced review criteria
- **Templates for Structured Critiques**
- New 1-9 Scoring Scale
- Scoring of Individual Review Criteria

Critique Templates

- Use of templates to promote listing of strengths and weaknesses for
 - the overall impact
 - each of the core criteria
 - other review criteria such as protection for human subjects
- Templates are grant mechanism specific
 - RPG template – RO1, RO3
 - K template – KO1, K23, K24, K25, K99/R00

RPG Critique Template

RO1 and RO3 Applications

OVERALL IMPACT	Please limit text to 1/4 page
<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•••• <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">••••	

RPG Critique Template

RO1 and RO3 Applications

RPG Review Critique Template

1. <u>Significance</u>	Please limit text to 1/4 page
Strengths <ul style="list-style-type: none">••• Weaknesses <ul style="list-style-type: none">•••	

2. <u>Investigator(s)</u>	Please limit text to 1/4 page
Strengths <ul style="list-style-type: none">••• Weaknesses <ul style="list-style-type: none">•••	

Review of K Applications

- Overall Impact
- Core Review Criteria
 - Candidate, Career development plan, Research plan, Mentors, Environment
- Additional Review Criteria
 - Training in responsible conduct of research
 - Protection for Human Subjects
 - Inclusion of Women, Minorities, Children
 - Resubmission
- Additional Review Considerations

K Template

Overall Impact

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

1. Candidate

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

2. Career Development Plan/Career Goals & Objectives/Plan to Provide Mentoring

Strengths

-

Weaknesses

-

Peer Review Changes


Specific changes effective with the June 2009 review meetings

- Enhanced review criteria
- Templates for Structured Critiques
- **New 1-9 Scoring Scale**
- Scoring of Individual Review Criteria

New Scoring System

- The new NIH scoring system uses a 9-point rating scale for the overall impact score and the core review criteria
- Ratings are provided only in whole numbers, with “1” still being the best score

New Scoring System

Impact	Score	Descriptor	Strengths/Weaknesses
High Impact	1	Exceptional	
	2	Outstanding	
	3	Excellent	
Moderate Impact	4	Very Good	
	5	Good	
	6	Satisfactory	
Low Impact	7	Fair	
	8	Marginal	
	9	Poor	

Score	Descriptor	Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses
1	Exceptional	Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses
2	Outstanding	Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
3	Excellent	Very strong with only some minor weaknesses
4	Very Good	Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses
5	Good	Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
6	Satisfactory	Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses
7	Fair	Some strengths but with at least one major weakness
8	Marginal	A few strengths and a few major weaknesses
9	Poor	Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses

Minor Weakness: An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact

Moderate Weakness: A weakness that lessens impact

Major Weakness: A weakness that severely limits impact

Peer Review Changes

Specific changes effective with the June 2009 review meetings

- Enhanced review criteria
- Templates for Structured Critiques
- New 1-9 Scoring Scale
- Scoring of Individual Review Criteria

Old Scoring vs. New Scoring

Item	Old Way	New Way
Criterion Scores		1 to 9
Preliminary Score	1.0 to 5.0	1 to 9
Final Score	1.0 to 5.0	1 to 9
Impact/Priority Score	100 to 500	10 to 90
Percentiles	0.1 to 100.0	1 to 100



RO1 and RO3 Critiques

- Overall Impact - **Scored**
- Core Review Criteria (different for other grant mechanisms) - **Scored**
 - Significance, Investigators, Innovation, Approach, Environment
- Additional Review Criteria
 - Protection for Human Subjects; Inclusion of Women, Minorities, Children; Resubmissions
- Additional Review Considerations - Budget

Review Meeting



Review Meeting

- Assigned Reviewers
 - Indicate initial enthusiasm for application
 - Primary initiates discussion, 2nd, 3rd follow
- General discussion
- Assigned reviewers
 - State their final scores
- Private Scoring
- Budget

Review Meeting Cont'd

- Applications unanimously judged less competitive will not be discussed
Summary Statement
 - Indicates “Not Discussed”
 - Contains critiques and criteria scores from assigned reviewers
- Applications devoid of significant and substantial scientific merit still receive a rating of “Not Recommend for Further Consideration”

Summary Statement

Contains

- Summary of the discussion (if discussed)
- Essentially unedited reviewer critiques
- Criterion scores for all applications/
Impact score if application is discussed
- Recommended budget (discussed applications)
- Human and animal subject concerns
- Administrative Notes

Available to PI only via the eRA Commons

Advisory Council Review

- Most applications are approved en bloc
- Some undergo individual discussion
 - Foreign application
 - Human subjects or animal welfare concerns
 - Other concerns
 - PI appeals
- Funding recommendations to Institute

Upcoming Changes

- Effective for applications submitted on or after January 25, 2010, i.e. the June 2010 review meetings
 - New application structure and length
 - Alignment of applications with the peer review criteria
- New application forms and instructions must be used

Changes for R Applications

Research Plan

Current	Restructured
1. Introduction	1. Introduction
2. Specific Aims	2. Specific Aims
3. Background & Significance	3. Research Strategy Significance
4. Preliminary Studies/ Progress Report	Innovation Approach
5. Research Design & Methods	Preliminary Studies Progress Report

Changes for R Applications Cont'd

- Restructured Research Plan
 - Research Strategy limited to 12 pages for RO1s, 6 pages for RO3s
- Resources
 - Section requires information how the scientific environment will contribute to probably of success of the project
- Bibliographical Sketch
 - List of selected peer-reviewed publications limited to 15 (recent, important, relevant)

Changes for K Applications

- Restructured Research Plan
 - Introduction (resubmissions only)
 - Specific Aims
 - Research Strategy
 - Includes candidate information
 - Limited to 12 pages

Important Links to NIH

Enhancing Peer Review

<http://enhancing-peer-review.nih.gov>

Peer Review Process and Changes

<http://enhancing-peer-review.nih.gov/process&changes.html>

Guidelines for Reviewers

http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/reviewer_guidelines.htm

Restructured Applications <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-09-149.html>