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**Goal:** To shape the **culture** around peer review service to ensure the process is recognized as:

- Prestigious
- Service to the community
- Benefit to institutions
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- Advancement of knowledge
- For the institution
- For the reviewer
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- By identifying the most meritorious research, contribute to -
  - advancement of science
  - overall public health impact
- Support areas of science by providing scientific expertise
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**Prestigious**

- Enhance reputation

**Service to the community**

- Visibility
- Researchers gain experience reviewing applications

**Benefit to institutions**

- Fosters collaborations
Cultural Shift Focus Areas

Reviewer recognition

Peer review value and culture
Reviewer recognition

Letter from NIH or CSR Director notifying institutions of service by their faculty can be an opportunity to:

• Highlight the value of peer review (for society, scientific community, institution)
• NIH recognition
• Value for individual reviewers' promotion
Communications to the community from NIH about the value of peer review service:

- A blog from OER or CSR on the value of peer review, including data and a thank you note listing all reviewers for the year
- Publish profiles of reviewers – highlight the value of review service to them personally and professionally
  - Share with the institution’s PR office
Collect data to assess links between peer review service and funding success:

• Is there a correlation between review service history and current success rate?
• ECR program: Is service correlated with subsequent success competing for an R01?
• Does review service correlate with a successful renewal?
Other possibilities:

- Assess reviewers’ perceptions about peer review following study section
- NIH outreach at conferences/scientific events
- Encourage institutions to host seminars by current peer reviewers at their institution on the value of the process
- Integrate value of NIH peer review as a topic into academic faculty development office sponsored events
Discussion

• Do these approaches seem reasonable and robust for producing the desired impact to enhance the overall prestige and culture of peer review?

• What other things can we do to enhance our WG’s mission?