

REI Mock Study Section Information NICHD Young Investigators Conference

At the Young Investigators meeting, there is a Mock Study Section. In this activity, we will be reviewing three actual grants as if we were a real study section. This session aims to provide you the experience of a NIH study section so you will understand the review process of the grants that you submit to NIH, the procedures, the specific evaluation criteria for different grant mechanisms (R01, R21, and K08) and how the final score is determined.

In this packet are three grant applications. These are actual grant submissions that we have received permission from the applicants to use in this session. You will see that identifiers (names, institutions, identifying portions of the CV, etc.) have been removed to protect their identity. We have included all of the pages so that you can see what a grant application looks like.

Everyone in the session will be expected to have read and critiqued the grant. In addition there are primary, secondary and tertiary reviewers identified for each of the grants in the mock study section (see table below). If you are a primary, secondary or tertiary reviewer you will need to prepare to present your detailed review. We recommend that you work with your primary mentor or fellowship director on this review.

After the three primary reviewers, everyone will be asked for additional comments from your review of the application. We expect that all of you will participate in the review of each application, so please come prepared.

The Scientific Review Officer (SRO) will give an introduction and overview of the administrative aspects of the meeting at the start of the session. General guidelines for review as well as conflict of interest information will be presented in detail. The general agenda for each grant in the study section is as follows:

- Reviewer 1, 2, 3 all give their impact or priority scores (i.e. 1-9)
- Reviewer 1 gives their critique as per the attached instructions, ***please use the guidelines for the type of application (i.e. R01 vs R21 vs K08) provided below***
- Reviewer 2 gives critique
- Reviewer 3 gives critique
- Statistician gives their critique
- General discussion – go around the table of reviewers (each to give input)
- Opinions from people outside the team/table
- Are there any Human subjects/animal concerns
- Are the gender and minority issues addressed?
- Are children included/addressed?
- Revote by Reviewers 1,2,3 for their scores
- Voting around the table (oral)
- Everyone in the room votes and records their score on sheet found in their packet
- Any budgetary concerns?

We will be reviewing three grant applications:

- R01 application (Research Grant Application)
- R21 application (Research Small Grant Program)
- K08 application (Mentored Patient-Oriented Research Career Development Award)

Reviewer Assignments

Grant	Primary	Secondary	Tertiary
R01	Dr. Joseph Letourneau	Dr. Natalie Stentz	Dr. Jacqueline Ho
R21	Dr. Katherine Green	Dr. Neil Chappell	Dr. Tiffany Jones
K08	Dr. Matthew Macer	Dr. Mili Thakur	Dr. Emily Goulet

**Listed below are review guidelines links for these types of applications.
Note that they differ for each application type.**

The announcements including review criteria for the various grants can be found at:

R01: <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PA-13-302.html>

R21: <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PA-13-303.html>

K08: <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PA-14-046.html>