

## 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 (R03, R01, K23) 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 three 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.

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. RO1 vs RO3 vs K23)\*\**
- 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:*

- RO1 application (Research Project Grant)
- R21 application (Exploratory/Developmental Research Grant)
- K23 application (Mentored patient oriented Research Career Development Award)

The titles of the grants are:

- R01 – Molecular basis of MED12 in the pathogenesis of uterine fibroids
- R21 – Neuroangiogenesis in deep infiltrating endometriosis
- K23 – A prospective study of biochemical and genetic predictors of PCOS in high risk early postmenarchal girls

## Reviewer Assignments

SRA	Chair	Grant	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2	Reviewer 3
Lisa Halvorson	Hugh Taylor	R01	Arnold Mahesan	Anna Sokalska	Joseph Letourneau
		R21	Nicole Doyle	Rachel Mejia	Semara Thomas
		K23	Eleni Greenwood	Mohamad Irani	Justin Pilgrim

**Listed below are review guidelines links for these types of applications: please use the correct one for each application and refer to the announcements when reviewing the applications**

The announcements including review criteria for the various grants are at:

R01: <https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PA-15-200.html>

R21: <https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PA-16-161.html>

K23: <https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PA-16-198.html>