



## Internet Assisted Review Focus Group

---

**Date:** April 13, 2004, Thursday  
**Time:** 9:30–11:00 a.m.  
**Location:** Rockledge 1, Room 3502  
**Advocate:** Eileen Bradley  
**Analysts:** Tracy Soto, Daniel Fox  
**Next Meeting:** TBD

---

### Action Items

1. (Tracy, Daniel) Regarding #50: redesign screen to accommodate these suggestions (e.g., streamlining options).
- 

### IAR Requirements

The group addressed IAR requirements, numbers 42–65 at the meeting. This table shows the changes and priorities the group agreed upon.

#	Requirement	Task Order Decision	Comments
42	Streamline voting: The SRA/GTA needs to define ineligible reviewers—Mail Reviewers are generally not eligible to vote for streamlining an application; however, others on the committee may wish to see the opinion of the Mail Reviewer. Thus, a screen with the list of reviewers and three columns is needed so as to exclude access, include but display only (i.e., don't count toward the criteria of two UN votes), or include fully. All regular reviewers should default to "include fully" while Mail Reviewers should default to "display only."	Low to Medium	The mail reviewer does add some value in comments and assessment of application. However, he/she has no official vote in the final meeting. The mail reviewer currently is allowed to enter preliminary scores.  The group agreed that allowing the mail reviewer to enter preliminary scores should be an option (Y/N) with the default being not to allow (N) scoring.
43	<del>The SRA/GTA needs to monitor votes—A display building on the 1500-50 (Tally) screen would be useful, with the number of UN votes (or scores) displaying next to that utilizing the same set of columns headings. This would allow the SRA/GTA to know who hasn't voted at all, who might have forgotten to vote on discussant assignments, or who has such a light load that the lack of UN votes</del>	Delete	

#	Requirement	Task Order Decision	Comments
	<del>may not be a concern.</del>		
44	The SRA/GTA needs to be able to exclude applications from streamlining based on activity code criteria.	Medium	“...needs to be able to exclude, e.g., Fellowships”. See #50.
45	There should be a separate date for streamlining to be set and for display. A bold display of the Deadline for Posting (set by the SRA/GTA) information should appear when reviewers log on to the Web. Any UN votes submitted after the deadline would register as “late votes” and would not count toward preliminary streamlining. They need to be confirmed at the meeting.	Low	
46	Export to Order of Review—Some SRA/GTAs like to manipulate the Order of Review so as to push all the UN applications to the bottom of the list. Such an Export button would transfer the existing streamlining information to the Order of Review screen, causing all UN applications to migrate down (but keeping the same order while doing so) and then be Resequenced.	Low	Defer for redesign. More of a Peer Review issue now.
47	Update & Transfer to Score Entry screen—After the meeting, the SRA/GTA or GTA could update UN results (add UN's or change to D), then transfer these results to the Master Sheet for score entry.	Low	Defer for redesign. More of a Peer Review issue now.
48	<del>(At the push of a button) The system should provide the ability for the SRA to determine which applications had two or more lower half votes (“tentative lower half”). The results should display for Reviewers and SRA/GTAs on the list of applications screen. Reviewers not in conflict should have the ability to register objections to the lower half designations. This will help SRAs and Reviewers prepare for the meeting and schedule reviews.</del>	Delete	See #50
49	<del>Using scores, the system should determine which applications have two votes of 3.0 or worse.</del>	Delete	See #50

#	Requirement	Task Order Decision	Comments
50	SRA/GTA needs the ability to establish “Floating Cutoff”—If scores or percentile votes are registered, pushing the Floating Cutoff button would perform an iterative procedure whereby a score or percentile is found for which at least 50% of the applications have two or more scores as bad or worse than the cutoff. A window should open indicating, for instance, “A cutoff of <u>2.6</u> resulted in <u>55</u> percent of the applications falling into the “floating lower half” (two or more votes of <u>2.6</u> or worse).” An “Accept” button would establish that as the cutoff, while “Step Back” and “Step Forward” buttons would move the floating cutoff to worse or better scores. SRA/GTA should have Cancel button to abort.	Medium	Based on individual scores, gives SRA the option of checking the lower-half scores. Need to see just the numbers that would be lower half and eligible ones for unscored (e.g., Fellowships). Track eligible applications only. See #44.  <b>Suggestion:</b> Have streamlining options in a separate place.  <b>Action: (Tracy, Daniel) Regarding #50: redesign screen to accommodate these suggestions (e.g., streamlining options).</b>
51	One additional column should be added to the Viewing Streamlining Votes screen to allow reviewers to add a late vote (only assigned reviewers/discussants). The system should allow “me too” (late) votes to be registered. This will help SRAs and Reviewers prepare for the meeting and schedule reviews.	Low	
52	The Critique Upload screen should allow SRA/GTA to submit user-defined alphanumeric preliminary scores.  If an SRA/GTA submits an alphanumeric score, the Critique Upload screen should limit the entry to 3 characters.  The Critique Upload Screen should verify that the alphanumeric score submitted by the SRA/GTA exists on the score list of values (acceptable values need to be determined by group).	Medium	<b>Suggestion:</b> After a particular date, give SRA the option to Hide/Show score matrix.
53	<del>If it is possible to come up with standard text and placement inside the pre-Summary Statement body across all ICs for Human Subject Concerns—the Text should be included in the document if there are Human Subject Concerns.</del>	Delete	See #54

#	Requirement	Task Order Decision	Comments
54	<p>The main post-meeting report is the assembled critiques in a pre-summary statement draft. Critiques would begin with the heading “Critique” (a nice touch would allow SRA/GTAs to rearrange the order of critiques; the default order should be by role). [Although many reviewers add the heading “critique,” they can be asked not to do this.] The description would be added if available. A further nice touch would create an output with as many template headings as possible. So, for example, if there are human subjects’ codes, the appropriate headings can be created in the output. The bolded statement proposed by OER for separating reviewer and SRA/GTA remarks can be added. If biohazard of foreign are checked, these headings can be added, etc. If such an option is provided, it will be important to be able to toggle off the template.</p>	High	Includes #53
55	<p><b>Export to Summary Statement Module.</b> This option would formally associate each file for the designated application to allow access through the summary statement module. Until the button is pushed, the files should remain in a temporary file. There would need to be an “update” button that would bring in the most recent posting, and there should be a warning when a newer version has been posted. The advantage of this scheme would be in knowing which version you are working with so that an update would not be posted without your knowing.</p>	On hold for redesign	<p>Have Summary Statement appear automatically in Peer Review.</p> <p>Would automatically pull latest version.</p>
56	<p><del><b>Direct Storage in the Summary Statement Module.</b> Submitted critiques would be available to the SRA/GTA through the IMPAC II Peer Review Summary Statement Module as soon as posted. The difficulty would be in keeping track of when a review has been modified. A log could show the SRA/GTA when updates have been posted, but it might be difficult to keep track of those changes when working offline on a draft in Word or Plain text.</del></p>	Delete	

#	Requirement	Task Order Decision	Comments
57	<p><del>Automated Assembly. The IAR and/or the summary statement module should have a display of which reviews are in and which are missing. When all expected reviews are there, an Export Raw Reviews button should assemble the reviews in a prescribed order (e.g., Primary, Secondary, Tertiary, Mail, Discussant) and allow the SRA/GTA to save the assembled document on the c: drive with the prescribed file name format needed for later upload.</del></p> <p><del><b>PROBLEM:</b> How to deal with files created in different word processing programs. As noted above, we'd like to retain special characters. If the SRA/GTA specifies that the downloaded document should be in Word, for instance, are there conversion programs to handle a WordPerfect document on the fly?</del></p>	Delete	
58	The summary statement contains a "Description" submitted on the grant application. Since applications are scanned and bookmarked, this "Description" section should be evaluated for feasibility of automatically incorporating it into the summary statement during generation/combination of critiques.	High	<p>This will be available with electronic applications.</p> <p>The data cannot be pulled out of the abstract, which is in a PDF file at this time.</p>
59	A feature can be provided to use the text to assemble the IMPAC II PDF draft summary statement avoiding an intermediary Word file. Often streamlined summary statements will need no editing and they can be rapidly released. However, such a function should be built to avoid inadvertent release of unread critiques. It could be combined with a checkbox indicating that the SRA/GTA has approved the critique. The checkbox would only be visible on the SRA/GTA's screen similar to the private check box on the Review module 1500 screen.		<p>Preliminary Summary Statements are in a zip file, and are created every time.</p> <p>The edit phase ends after the meeting date is set.</p> <p>Use the meeting release date if after meeting release or use meeting edit date to generate preliminary Summary Statement.</p>
60	<del>System should allow the ability to create a streamlining report to include PI name, application number, LH (lower half, no</del>	Delete	

#	Requirement	Task Order Decision	Comments
	objection), D (Discuss-Objection), single votes, late votes. This report can be distributed to Reviewers at the start of the meeting. It can also be adapted as, or used to guide setting up, the actual order of review.		
61	System should allow the ability to create a significant difference report. Identification of significant difference could occur one of two ways: SRA scans the list of scores and checks to indicate applications with major differences of opinions; or, allow SRA to set their own definition of what would indicate a significant difference. Reviewer should have the ability to sort by Lower Half or Significant Difference.	Medium	On Score Matrix screen, could put note that says “We flagged these because...”  Need to have some sort of indicator for significant differences, e.g., SD.
62	The format would need to be SRA/GTA controlled—either “Assignment List and Conflicts by Reviewer” (full assignment information on only those applications assigned to the reviewer) or “Assignment List and Conflicts by Reviewer (Restricted Version)” (no information on co-reviewers).	Medium to High	This customized report should be an option.  In Submit Phase, there should be a pop-up message at all times to show reviewers.
63	<del>SRA/GTA should have a Meeting Report 2— For reference, a copy of the master assignment list with reviewers who voted to streamline a particular application printing in bold. Sample:  1-1 R01 HL072472-01 ANNAPRAGADA, ANANTH V—(P1) Tsuda, A—Hsia, C CFD Simulation of the human respiratory system (S1) Loring, S—Mitzner, W —CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY  2-1 R01 HL069030-01A1 BISSONNETTE, JOHN M—(P1) Mifflin, S—Donnelly, D —Calcium Activated K+ Channels and Respiratory Control (S1) Gozal, D Bonham, A —OREGON HEALTH &amp; SCIENCE UNIVERSITY</del>	Delete	

#	Requirement	Task Order Decision	Comments
	Where Tsuda and Mitzner had voted LH for Annapragada		
64	<del>SRA/GTA will need a printable report of a list of applications that have been nominated by one reviewer for streamlining.</del>	Delete	See #50
65	<del>SRA/GTA will need a printable report of the significant difference list and their associated combined critiques.</del>	Delete	Included in #61

## Attendees

Cecil, Christina (NIMH)

David, Bobbie (CSR)

David, Tracey (CSR)

Dinterman, Kathy (CSR)

Fox, Daniel (IBM/Z-Tech)

Lyons, Ernie (NINDS)

Pike, Brian (NIGMS)

Seppala, Sandy (LTS/PCOB)

Sheridan, Peter (NIMH)

Soto, Tracy (OD)

Tatham, Thomas (CSR)

Thee, Linda (CSR)

Wojcik, Brian (NCI)