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National Institutes of Health
NIH’s mission is to seek fundamental knowledge about the nature and behavior of living systems and the application of that knowledge to enhance health, lengthen life, and reduce illness and disability.
Your Application Could Be Funded by One of 24 NIH Institutes or Centers (ICs)

Office of the Director

- National Institute on Aging
- National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism
- National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases
- National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases
- National Cancer Institute
- Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development

- National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders
- National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research
- National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases
- National Institute on Drug Abuse
- National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences
- National Eye Institute

- National Institute of General Medical Sciences
- National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute
- National Human Genome Research Institute
- National Institute of Mental Health
- National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke
- National Institute of Nursing Research

- National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering
- National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health
- John E. Fogarty International Center
- National Center for Advancing Translational Research
- National Library of Medicine
- National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities

- Clinical Center
- Center for Information Technology
- Center for Scientific Review
24 NIH Institutes and Centers Fund Grants
Review and Funding of NIH Grant Applications

Center for Scientific Review
*Division of Receipt and Referral*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assigns to Institute(s) and Review Group</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level I Review: Study Section**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruits and Assigns Reviewers</td>
<td>2-4 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews for Scientific Merit</td>
<td>4-6 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>1-2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Releases Score</td>
<td>~3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produces Summary Statement</td>
<td>~ 30 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level II Review: Institute or Center**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates Relevance to Research Priorities</td>
<td>2-4 Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Recommends Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# NIH Peer Review System for Grant Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan-May</th>
<th>Receipt Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May-Sept</td>
<td>Review Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept-Jan</td>
<td>National Advisory Council/Board Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-Jul</td>
<td>National Advisory Council/Board Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept-Nov</td>
<td>Earliest Possible Beginning Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Mar</td>
<td>Earliest Possible Beginning Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[http://grants1.nih.gov/grants/funding/submissionschedule.htm](http://grants1.nih.gov/grants/funding/submissionschedule.htm)
Timeframe from Submission to Award

There are three main overlapping cycles per year

http://grants1.nih.gov/grants/funding/submissionschedule.htm
CSR Mission

To see that NIH grant applications receive fair, independent, expert, and timely reviews – free from inappropriate influences – so NIH can fund the most promising research.
Scope of CSR’s Operations

- 247 Scientific Review Officers
- >18,000 Distinct Reviewers
- >200 Chartered or Recurring Study Sections
- >1,450 Annual Review Meetings
- >75% NIH Applications (62,000 of 82,600)
## Division of AIDS, Behavioral and Population Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrated Review Groups</th>
<th>1. Community Influences on Health Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biobehavioral &amp; Behavioral Processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk, Prevention &amp; Health Behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Healthcare Delivery and Methodologies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Sciences and Epidemiology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 2. Clinical Data Management and Analysis
- 3. Clinical Informatics and Digital Health
- 4. **Clinical Management in General Care Settings**
- 5. Healthcare and Health Disparities
- 6. Health Promotion in Communities
- 7. Population and Public Health Approaches to HIV/AIDS
- 8. Health Services: Quality and Effectiveness
- 9. Interdisciplinary Clinical Care in Specialty Care Settings
- 10. Science of Implementation in Health and Healthcare
- 11. Organization and Delivery of Health Services
Clinical Management in General Care Settings (CMGC)

• Identify, develop, and evaluate clinical management of patients from a provider perspective in general care settings (i.e. primary care), home based care, and ambulatory settings (i.e. rehabilitation or assisted living)

• Common topics:
  – Advanced care planning/palliative care in home based settings or primary care
  – Mobile health technology and telehealth interventions linking patient & provider
  – Symptom management in chronic disease, cancer survivors, ADRD etc...
  – Prenatal, postpartum, pediatric non-specialty care
  – Patient and provider communication, shared decision making
  – Medication adherence
  – Caregiver support

• What we don’t review:
  – Oncology – patients in active cancer treatment
  – Specialized, inpatient, institutionalized care (i.e. hospitals, nursing homes, NICU)
  – Transitions of care between institution and home
  – Large dataset analyses or population level studies
  – Development of bioinformatics technology
  – Interventions in general community settings that do not include direct link to clinic or patients
Tips for Review in CMGC

• Mixed methods approaches commonly reviewed and reviewers well versed in qualitative research. Include detail about qualitative data collection and analysis. Include information on integrating mixed methods data or clarify if mixed methods versus multi-methods approach.

• CMGC reviews a lot of clinical trials that include clinical interventions. For applications in a clinical space (i.e. pediatric, prenatal, or primary care clinic) useful to include clinical expertise who can advise about planned interventions potential impact on clinical workflow.
Community Influence on Health Behavior (CIHB)

- How community level factors prevent or moderate health risks and behaviors. Applications may examine community-level social, cultural, and environmental risk factors and processes and their relationships with a broad range of outcomes.

- Community level defined in a variety of ways including; geographically, by social unit or practices, virtual spaces, and group affiliations etc

- Common topics:
  - Substance use
  - Obesity/physical activity
  - Environmental science

- Methods we review:
  - community based participatory research (CBPR)
  - ethnographic and other qualitative methods;
  - policy and document analysis,
  - mixed methods and other non-interventional study designs

- What we don’t review:
  - Interventional studies (HPC is usually a better fit)
  - Population level studies (e.g. nationally representative samples)
Tips for Review in CIHB

• Qualitative methods should be well detailed.

• Mixed methods studies should detail how qualitative and quantitative methods will be integrated.

• Community based research methods should be appropriately presented based on the level of community involvement (i.e. is it community-informed, community-engaged or true CBPR).
Health Promotion in Communities (HPC)

- Applications that develop/test efficacy and effectiveness of **interventions** with community-oriented approach for promoting health/moderating health risks
  - **interventions** to address health implemented in community organizations or other non-clinical settings (e.g., schools, worksites, service delivery organizations).
  - **interventions** that utilize community resources, organizations, and information systems for outreach, health education, and service delivery;
  - **interventions** that use social and organizational networks as systems for intervention and services delivery.
  - community or local environment characteristics; developing and evaluating **interventions** at the community level among the general population
HPC: Methods/Approaches

• Methods/Approach:
  – Community-based participatory research (CBPR) approach
  – Mixed methods
  – Experimental/quasi-experimental designs
  – Multi-level approaches
  – mHealth technology where community, community structure, or relationship to a local group/organization is a central consideration
  – Implementation science framework that emphasize efficacy and effectiveness of community-level interventions on health outcomes

• What we don’t review
  – Non-interventional study designs (CIHB is a better fit)
  – Qualitative only studies (CIHB is better fit)
  – Clinical/patient management in community health care or home-based settings (CMGC better fit)
  – Testing implementation and dissemination theories, models and conceptual frameworks in community settings (SIHH is better fit)
  – Meta-Analysis
Tips for Review in HPC

• Studies must be an intervention- social units assigned to different intervention groups (e.g.):
  – Pre-post study design
  – Quasi-experimental design
  – Non-randomized trials
  – Randomized trials
  – Cross over randomized controlled trials
  – Interrupted time series

• CBPR approaches
  – Researchers and community stakeholders engage as equal partners
What Makes a Competitive Application?

- **Documentation**
  - Publications
  - Resources and access
  - Compliant biosketches
  - Human subjects, vertebrate animals, biohazards, etc.
  - Budget / Resource Sharing Plans

- **Preparation**
  - Clear Organization-Headers
  - Readable figures & tables
  - Adequate resolution, font
  - Minimize abbreviations and acronyms
  - Complete & current references, numbers, labels, forms
  - Proofread - no typos

- **Rigor / Reproducibility**
  - Rigor of the Prior Research
  - Consideration of Relevant Biological Variables
  - Authentication of Key Resources.

- **Realistic Goals**
  - Clear, focused objectives
  - Realistic aims & timelines
  - Explained pitfalls & alternatives
  - Support expertise (w/ letters)

- **Significance**
  - Impact on and relevance to field
  - Connection: present and future

---

NIH Center for Scientific Review
Tools to Find Funding Opportunities and Study Sections
Steps to Getting Your Research Funded

- Find a funding opportunity
- Identify the right institute for your application
  - Find a program officer to discuss whether your research
- Identify the right mechanism
  - Do you have preliminary data?
- Identify the right study section
  - You can contact the Scientific Review Officer (SRO) to discuss assignment.
- After application submission, track what’s happening
  - Did it go to the right study section?
  - Track your scores and summary statements

- DON’T GET DISCOURAGED if you aren’t funded the first time.
Ways NIH Lets You Know What It Wants to Support

Funding Opportunity Announcements (FOAs)

- **Program Announcements (PA)** Identifies priority areas and/or funding mechanisms for an area.
  - **PAR**: a PA with special receipt, referral and/or review considerations.
  - **PAS**: a PA with set-aside funds.

- **Request for Applications (RFA)**: Identifies a focused area where NIH award grants with set aside funds.

- **Request for Proposal (RFP)**: Solicits contract proposals, usually with one receipt date.

- **Notices of Special Interest (NOSI)**: Simplified notices of specific research interests.

- **Notice (NOT)**: Announces policy and procedures, changes to earlier FOAs and general info.
How to find out what’s being funded:

https://report.nih.gov/
How to Find a Study Section, Browse

**Integrated Review Groups**
Review activities of the Center for Scientific Review (CSR) are organized into Integrated Review Groups (IRGs). Each IRG represents a cluster of study sections around a general scientific area. Applications generally are assigned first to an IRG, and then to a specific study section within that IRG for evaluation of scientific merit.

**Chartered Study Sections**
Reviews most investigator-initiated research applications (R01, R03, R21, R15, and R3). Chartered study sections are those with both regular and temporary members.

**Small Business Innovation Research and Technology Transfer Research Study Sections**
Recurring special emphasis panels (SEPs) review Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) and Technology Transfer Research applications (STTR). They include only temporary members, recruited based on expertise needed for each meeting.

**Fellowship Study Sections**
Recurring special emphasis panels (SEPs) review individual fellowship grant applications - F30, F31, F32, F33. Temporary members are recruited based on expertise needed for each meeting.

**All Other CSR Study Sections (Special Emphasis Panel)**
Other one-time or recurring Special Emphasis Panels (SEPs) are held to review applications on special topics and members conflict applications. They include only temporary members, recruited based on expertise needed for each meeting.

[https://public.csr.nih.gov/StudySections](https://public.csr.nih.gov/StudySections)
Assisted Referral Tool

https://art.csr.nih.gov/
Assisted Referral Tool

Enter application text and hit the Submit button to get a list of relevant study sections. Entering the Specific Aims is highly recommended.

Title: [field]

Optional:

Title: [field]

Submit

Terms will be weighted by frequency of appearance in the text above. The process is automated and confidential. ART does not track or store submitted text.
Example of ART Recommended Study Section/IRG
Assignment to CSR Study Sections

Within an IRG, applications are assigned to:

**Standing Study Sections**
- When subject matter of application matches the referral guidelines for the study section or

**Special Emphasis Panels (SEPs)**
- When the subject matter does not fit into any study section—recurring or for one time conflicts or initiatives.
- When assignment of an application to the most appropriate study section creates a conflict of interest
- When certain types of grants are sought (e.g., fellowships, SBIRs, AREAS)
Check the Status of Your Application in NIH eRA Commons
After Your Review

Your SRO

- Prepares summary statements within 30 days
- Provides information to NIH Institutes and Centers
Your Summary Statement

- Scores for each review criterion
- Critiques from assigned reviewers
- Administrative notes if any

If your application is discussed, you also will receive:
- An overall impact/priority score and percentile ranking
- A summary of review discussion

Questions?
Your program officer has the prime responsibility to answer questions about your review and preparing a new application.
Summary Statement

PROGRAM CONTACT: Privileged Communication
Austin Yang
301.486.9850
yangj13@mail.nih.gov

Principal Investigator

Applicant Organization:
Review Group: CMND
Cellular and Molecular Biology of Neurodegeneration Study Section

Meeting Date: 01/31/2019
Council: MAY 2019
Requested Start: 07/01/2019

Project Title:
SRG Action: Impact Score: 34 Percentile: 13
Next Steps: Visit https://grants.nih.gov/grants/next_steps.htm
Human Subjects: 10-No human subjects involved
Animal Subjects: 30-Vertebrate animals involved - no SRG concerns noted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Year</th>
<th>Direct Costs Requested</th>
<th>Estimated Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>349,997</td>
<td>564,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>350,802</td>
<td>665,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>361,871</td>
<td>583,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>387,212</td>
<td>624,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>384,834</td>
<td>620,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,834,716</td>
<td>2,959,839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET NOTE: The budget shown is the requested budget and has not been adjusted to reflect any recommendations made by reviewers. If an award is planned, the costs will be calculated by Institute grants management staff based on the recommendations outlined below in the COMMITTEE BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS section.

EARLY STAGE INVESTIGATOR
NEW INVESTIGATOR

Program Officer
Impact/Priority Score 10-90 range
Percentile in whole numbers
Indicator for Early Stage Investigators/New Investigator eligibility
Jumpstart Your Career: CSR Early Career Reviewer Program

www.csr.nih.gov/ecr
THANK YOU!!!

For more information visit:
https://public.csr.nih.gov/