

***Mock Review:***  
***A Play in One Act***

**2016 Dissemination and Implementation Short Course**

**October 10-11, 2016**  
**Madison, WI**

**Ross C. Brownson**  
**Washington University in St. Louis**

# Scoring Descriptions

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	

# **The Set-up:**

**Scientific Review Officer**

**Study Section Chair**

# Key SRO Responsibilities

- Member & chair nominations
- Temporary reviewer selections
- Reviewer training
- Reviewers' assignments
- Present at all discussion
- Summary statement
- Communicate with PO about any specific issues
- Teamwork with chair: pre, during, post

# Leadership and Moderating the Discussion: The role of the chairperson

- Make certain that all aspects of the evaluation are covered
  - Should ensure that clear *strengths* and/or *weaknesses* are described for each of the *Scored Criteria*
- May participate in the discussion but will not use the ‘power and respect of the Chair’ to overly influence the discussion
- Be aware of time constraints
  - Provide time for fair discussion of every discussed application
  - Know when the discussion is completed
- Be diligent in covering “Other Review Criteria”
  - Human Subjects, Vertebrate Animals, Biohazards
  - [http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/guidelines\\_general/Human\\_Subjects\\_Protection\\_and\\_Inclusion.pdf](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/guidelines_general/Human_Subjects_Protection_and_Inclusion.pdf)
- Be diligent in covering “Other Review Considerations”
  - Budget, Resource Sharing, etc.

# Template-Based Critiques

- Critique template contains a total of 18 boxes
  - Reviewers should provide text for only those criteria that are applicable.

<b>1. Significance</b>	6. Resubmission	<b>13. Overall Impact</b>
<b>2. Investigator(s)</b>	7. Renewal	14. Budget and Period of Support
<b>3. Innovation</b>	8. Revision	15. Select Agents
<b>4. Approach</b>	9. Protection of Human Subjects	16. Applications from Foreign Organization
<b>5. Environment</b>	10. Inclusion of Women, Minorities, and Children	17. Resource Sharing Plan
	11. Vertebrate Animals	<b>18. Additional Comments to Applicant</b>
	12. Biohazards	

# Reviewing Rigor and Transparency of Research: **RPG** Applications

	<b>Applies to which applications?</b>	<b>Where will I find it in the application?</b>	<b>Where do I include it in my critique?</b>	<b>Addition to review criteria</b>	<b>Affect overall impact score?</b>
<b>Scientific Premise</b>	All	Research Strategy (Significance)	Significance	Is there a strong scientific premise for the project?	Yes
<b>Scientific Rigor</b>	All	Research Strategy (Approach)	Approach	Are there strategies to ensure a robust and unbiased approach?	Yes
<b>Consideration of Relevant Biological Variables, Such as Sex</b>	Projects with vertebrate animals and/or human subjects	Research Strategy (Approach)	Approach	Are adequate plans to address relevant biological variables, such as sex, included for studies in vertebrate animals or human subjects?	Yes
<b>Authentication of Key Biological and/or Chemical Resources</b>	Project involving key biological and/or chemical resources	New Attachment	Additional review considerations	Comment on plans for identifying and ensuring validity of resources.	No

# REVIEWS



# Act 1: Summary points

- **Significant health issue with PH impact**
- **Potential of “scale up” (fantasy Broadway musical camp)**
  - **One reviewer disagreed**
  - **May not appeal to all subpopulations**
- **Innovation of moving primary prevention to community settings**
  - **One disagree, no proof of concept**
  - **The context of a new setting**

# Act 1: Summary points

- **Approach: no “how” for the intervention (feasibility)**
- **Nice use of conceptual model**
- **Not a complete set of measures, including the weight loss outcome**
  
- **Investigators, environment, human subjects**
- **Budget issues (unscored)**

# Act 1

**GROUP DISCUSSION**

**FINAL SCORING**

# Final Scores

- Discussed applications will receive an overall score from each eligible (i.e., without conflicts of interest) panel member and these scores will be averaged to one decimal place, and multiplied by 10. The 81 possible *priority scores will thus range from 10-90*
- Percentiles will be reported in whole numbers