Grant Reviewer Guidelines

Deadline to submit Grant Review to the PRIDE CC is April 9, 2018

Mock Study sections will be conducted similarly to authentic study sections using NIH guidelines. Sessions will be Moderated by a PRIDE Faculty member. At least two reviewers will review each grant; at least one reviewer will be an experienced investigator (i.e., a PRIDE program faculty or mentor) and the other will be a peer (i.e., another PRIDE mentee).

Please read, understand and comply with the **"Non-Disclosure Statement"** (see end of this document) regarding protecting the confidentiality of information arising from the efforts of the participants at this meeting.

A grant reviewer is expected to do the following.

1. Attend Grant Reviewer Webinar

- A Grant Reviewer Webinar hosted by an NIH study section review officer is held prior to the meeting, and is a **unique training opportunity provided specially for PRIDE mentees by NIH. Reviewers are required to attend,** but all PRIDE mentees (and faculty, mentors and staff) are welcome.
- The training session will help you understand the entire review process and what should be covered in a review.
- All of the materials and information you need in order to write a good review will be provided via this webinar and as handouts.
- Date of webinar will be announced later but should correspond to when you receive your application to be reviewed.

2. Submit Written Review

- Written review is due April 10th.
- Use the format and forms outlined in the Grant Review Webinar.
- Grant applications do NOT need to be complete. Some components will be **Required** while others will be **Highly Recommended** or **Optional** (see below).
- You should review the portions of the grant that are actually provided for your review. You are not expected to provide any comments for the sections that are missing.
- The application need not be in a final polished form, but should be complete enough so that you can provide good feedback.
- Your comments should focus on IMPROVING the application. If you have a criticism or find major problems, they should be discussed in an educational context intended improve the content.
- The grant assignment may or may not be in your research expertise. Do the best you can with your knowledge. Not all reviewers are experts on every grant that is reviewed in each session.

3. Sit At Panel During Meeting

- You will attend the Study Section session and sit with other panel members in a "round table" format at the front of the room. Please arrive early for instructions and seating with the entire group in that session.
    i. There will be microphones at the table

ii. The abstract of the grant application being discussed will be projected on the overhead screen.
- Several grants will be discussed. Each grant will be assigned a "1st" and "2nd" reviewer. For each application the following procedure is used.
    i. The 1st reviewer will give a brief summary or overview of the grant, and then provide their comments as outlined in the Grant Reviewer Webinar.
    ii. The 2nd reviewer will then give their comments. The 2nd reviewer should try to cover points that were NOT addressed by the first reviewer (i.e., try to avoid repetition).
    iii. The panel will then have a chance to provide any additional comments or ask questions.
        Note, you also will receive a copy of the other grants to be discussed in your session. You are NOT expected to review the other grants, but they may be useful to you during the open panel discussions.
    iv. The audience is then given an opportunity for Q&A.
    v. The moderator will then provide a summary of the major points discussed.
- Remember that the Mentee who submitted the grant will be in the audience so please be respectful and helpful in your comments.
- If you are prevented from attending in person, arrangements can be made for your participation via a proxy, although you should plan to submit your final review by the due date.
- After the meeting you will have two weeks to revise your written review (if you wish) based on comments made during the session and then to return your revision to the CC.
- The CC will provide copies of final written comments to the Mentees.
- Additional information about Study Section procedures and guidelines for writing your reviews will be distributed at a later date.

FYI, the following grant sections are **Required** and you should expect to review them. But, other suggested sections also may be submitted, and you may review them as well.

(1) Research Grants: (R awards)
a. Required
    i. Research Strategy: Specific Aims
    ii. Research Strategy: Significance
    iii. Research Strategy: Innovation
    iv. Research Strategy: Approach
    v. PI Biosketch / CV
b. Highly Recommended
    i. Research Strategy: Preliminary Studies
    ii. Introduction (if revision)
    iii. Summary statement from reviewers (if revision)
c. Optional
    i. Research Strategy: References
    ii. Multiple PD/PI

(2) Career Development Awards: (K awards)
a. Required
    i. Candidate's Background
    ii. Career Goals/Objectives

  iii. Career Development/Training Activities (if required)
  iv. Mentoring Plan
   v. Research Strategy: Specific Aims
  vi. Research Strategy: Significance
  vii. Research Strategy: Innovation
  viii. Research Strategy: Approach
  ix. PI Biosketch / CV

b. Highly Recommended
   i. Research Strategy: Preliminary Studies
   ii. Introduction (if revision)
  iii. Summary statement from reviewers (if revision)

c. Optional
   i. Research Strategy: References

(3) AHA

a. Required
   i. Research Plan: Specific Aims
   ii. Research Plan: Research Design/Methods
  iii. Research Plan: Background/Significance
  iv. PI Biosketch / CV

b. Highly Recommended
   i. Research Plan: Preliminary Studies

c. Optional
   i. References

(4) Other grant application types will be specified, as needed