P41 Biomedical Technology Research Resource (BTRR) – Driving Biomedical Project

See the FOA for information regarding this component: [PAR-14-021](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PAR-14-021.html%20)

**DBP #:**

**Collaborating Investigator(s):**

**Source of Funding:**

**Funding Period:**

**Strength of DBP (High, Medium, Low):**

Driving Biomedical Project Critique

Reviewers will provide a brief narrative that gives an overview of the project and which describes how well it will drive the associated TRD(s) and serve as a test bed for newly developed technologies. Reviewers will also provide a qualitative one-word assessment (High, Medium, Low) of how well it will drive the associated TRD(s) and serve as a test bed for newly developed technologies.

At the review meeting, an overall critique of this component will also be prepared, providing a brief narrative summarizing the DBP section as a whole commenting on the selection process for projects and the appropriateness of the DBPs as TR&D drivers and test beds. Because the score for this component will also be informed by the discussion of each of the DBPs assigned to different reviewers, a preliminary score for this component is not requested before the review meeting.)

|  |
| --- |
| [DBP Critique](#DrivingBiomedicalProjects)*Write a brief narrative summarizing the factors that informed your evaluation of the Driving Biomedical Project.* |
|  |

**Summary Statements For NIGMS P41 Biomedical Technology Research Resource (BTRR) Applications**

[**http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PAR-14-021.html**](http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PAR-14-021.html)

A Summary Statement capturing the result of the review will be prepared after the meeting. This document enables both the applicant and program staff at the National Institute of General Medical Sciences (NIGMS) to understand the criticisms and priority score. The entire Summary Statement is usually about 20-30 pages long and should follow the order provided below rather than the order of components in the electronic application generated by the ASSIST system. Reviewers should prepare preliminary written critiques using the set of P41 critique templates available on the CSR website prior to the study section meeting. The final critique for each section of the application should be a single combined narrative (not bulleted) review for that section, rather than separate critiques from each assigned reviewer. The entire summary statement is read aloud to the panel and staff in attendance for comments before dismissal.

For amended applications, a section should be included about how the applicant has addressed the concerns identified in the prior summary statement.

A ***Resume*** (of the panel's deliberations) is prepared by the Scientific Review Officer. The applicant's abstract is included verbatim as the overall ***Description*** of the project.

An ***Overall Critique*** is drafted by the Chair of the study section after the panel has discussed the individual components of the BTRR. This should incorporate comments from other panelists, and be read back to the panel before dismissal. It should summarize the general strengths and weaknesses of the proposal (based on the unique aspects of the NIGMS Biomedical Technology Research Resource program), and include the panel's rationale for arriving at its final level of enthusiasm.

***Technology Research and Development***. Three or more reviewers are assigned to each of the projects in this section. In the blended critique. The scientific critique should evaluate strengths and weaknesses of the proposed research, and the qualifications and contributions of the key investigators. For an amended application, it is desirable to discuss changes in the amended version. For a renewal proposal, it is appropriate to consider progress during the previous funding period.

A concluding paragraph should be included to summarize the deciding factors for the critique. Immediately after the panel meets, the primary reviewer for a project will combine all reviews for that project and incorporate salient points made in discussion. The draft, "blended" critique is ultimately read back to the panel for additional comments.

***Infrastructure.*** This section is not always included in a BTRR application and does not receive a score. If it is included, briefly describe the project(s) presented. Critiques should address whether the infrastructure requested in this section is necessary and appropriate for the research proposed in the BTRR.

***Driving Biomedical Projects***. This section covers the Driving Biomedical Projects (DBP) section of the application. The review should include a paragraph assessing the DBPs as a group with respect to their overall appropriateness as technology development drivers, their scientific breadth and the extent to which they represent needs of the broader research community. Also included should be an assessment of the process the BTRR proposes for identifying DBPs. There should be a paragraph for each DBP that includes a 1-3 sentence description of the project, and the extent to which it drives, and is driven by, the Technology R&D projects. Reviewers are not expected to review the science of the DBPs. DBPs are only evaluated relative to their role in the Resource and the impact of the Resource technologies on them, regardless of whether the underlying science has previously been subjected to peer review. There is not sufficient information available to properly evaluate the underlying biomedical research project. A concluding paragraph for this section should be included to summarize the deciding factors for the critique. Draft "blended" critiques are read back to the panel to ensure there is agreement among reviewers on the message being conveyed in the written narrative.

***Collaboration and Service***. This section covers the Collaboration and Service (C&S) section of the application. The approach to collaboration and service and the process for identifying C&S projects should be evaluated. The review should also include a paragraph assessing the C&S projects as a group with respect to their need for the resources provided by the center. The critique should also assess the ease and fairness of access to the resource technologies and expertise. The critique should address whether projects are examples of good use of the technology under development.

The combined draft critique is read back to the panel to ensure there is agreement among reviewers on the message being conveyed in the written narrative.

***Training***. Describe and critique training programs (or in the case of a new center, plans for training programs) of the resource. Note that "training" here refers to specific and practical training in the technology for outside investigators and students, not the training provided by resource investigators to their own graduate students or postdocs. Assess expected effectiveness of the training as well as the national significance of the proposed activities. A blended critique is read back to the panel to ensure there is agreement among reviewers on the message being conveyed in the written narrative..

***Dissemination***. Critique mechanisms (or, for a new project, plans) for technology transfer to both expert and non-expert communities via publications, meetings, commercialization, the Internet or other modes. The draft review is read back to the panel to ensure there is agreement among reviewers on the message being conveyed in the written narrative.

***Administration and Management***. This section does not receive a score, but does contribute to the overall score. Assess the leadership and organization of the proposed BTRR. Evaluate whether the advisory committee is suitable. Note that individual advisory committee members should not be named for a new center, but the proposed areas of expertise to be recruited should be assessed. Evaluate the institutional setting and support, and any other significant factors. The draft critique is read back to the panel to ensure there is agreement among reviewers on the message being conveyed in the written narrative.

***Budget***. The budget is to be addressed after the scientific review is complete. It is important to consider whether each project is appropriately budgeted. The focus should be on judging whether the projects presented are appropriately resourced, and whether the proposed budget is well justified, rather than to “nickel and dime” the proposed budget. The bottom line should make sense. Recommended budgets are decided by consensus, with assigned reviewers usually leading the discussion for their components.

***Vertebrate Animals and Protection of Human Subjects from Research Risk***. Any comments or concerns are incorporated into the Summary Statement and are specifically brought to the attention of BTRR personnel in this section. This should be considered during the discussion of each component and if there are concerns, include comments into that section of the summary statement.

***Additional Comments***. As indicated above, a successful resource must be engaged in five activities: Technology Research and Development, Driving Biomedical Projects, Collaboration and Service, Training, and Dissemination. While technology development is the central mission of these centers, each area is important. An infrastructure section may or may not be present. It is possible for the resource investigators to collaborate with themselves; e.g., if they are using the resource to enrich their own R01-supported research (and presumably test the new P41 technique), it may be either a DBP or a collaborative project. However, overall, the DBP and Collaboration and Service projects should represent a broad geographic distribution of users. The technological research and development must be research on developing the technique (not just using it). The projects served by the resource must involve a variety of biomedical research areas. If narrow in scope (e.g., all cancer research) support should be sought from the specific institute that supports the research proposed. A proposed BTRR is expected to be a *national* resource. It is entirely appropriate for the panel to indicate whether the users are predominantly local.
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