Review Users Group Meeting

Date:	Fri., March 26, 2004
Time:	1:00–3:00 p.m.
Location:	Rockledge 2, Room 3087
Advocate:	Eileen Bradley
Analysts:	Tracy Soto, Daniel Fox, Mark Siegert
Next Meeting:	TBD

Action Items

1. (All) Send input to Daniel Fox (foxdan@od.nih.gov) regarding the type (Word documents, pdf, etc.) and size of files that you want to be able to share on-line with your Reviewers.

2. (All) Send ideas for ways the Review process could take advantage of Knowledge Management to Eileen Bradley (bradleye@mail.nih.gov).

Attachments

- Meeting Presentations: http://era.nih.gov/Docs/RUG_Presentation_03-26-04.pdf

- Knowledge Management: (Art Petrosian): http://era.nih.gov/Docs/CRASP3_03-26-04.pdf

Web Query Tool (Web QT)

Tracy Soto presented a synopsis of the new eRA Web Query Tool (Web QT). This tool, which will replace QuickView, ICSTORe and Crisp Plus, will be fully deployed in Spring 2004. Should anyone want more information or be interested in joining the pilot, they should contact Patti Gaines, gainsep@mail.nih.gov.

Peer Review Update

Mark Siegert reviewed the status of the Peer Review Module. There is a small maintenance release scheduled for the end of April, which will include the following two fixes:

- Problem of importing a meeting roster into a workgroup

- Problem of PIs being able to see the results of a review before the scores are officially released

The release will include the following enhancements:

- Change the "New Round" function in the Percentile Base Administration screen so that R01 is added as an activity code to be used for the Fellowship study-section bases.

- Change the functionality of the percentile Application Administration screen so that only designated users in CSR will be able to change which activity codes receive a percentile

regardless of the IC. Also, will do away with the "shadow" or "private" percentiles. These were decisions made by EPMC.

- Change the Summary Statement upload procedure to J2EE and add the functionality to the Web version of Peer Review. Security of the summary statement file is the main issue in making this change.

Mark noted that it would be beneficiary to change the client/server module to provide a preview of the final Summary Statement. However, with the client/server module being slowly replaced with J2EE version, there is no money (or interest) in enhancing the client/server version.

IAR Update

The IAR Focus Group has met twice to prioritize and clarify enhancement requests. The list of enhancements is on the eRA Web site under Peer Review, IAR business area: http://era.nih.gov/Docs/IAR_Requirements_02-26-04.pdf. Several are still under discussion but this provides a quick view of the work that is being done.

Latest Statistics—Tracy reviewed the most up-to-date IAR statistics:

- 8,321 Reviewers with active Commons accounts
- Meetings in IAR by Council (excluding purged):
  - 238 for January 2004
  - 474 for May 2004
  - 6 for August 2004
  - 6 for October 2004
- 54,231 critiques uploaded (excluding purged)
- 21,604 preliminary Summary Statements created

Helpdesk Support—To improve Helpdesk support, the following measures have been taken:

- Three new staff will be hired for the Helpdesk.
- One hour has been added to weekly coverage—new hours: 7 a.m.–8 p.m.
- Six hours of coverage on Saturday have been added.

Once these actions are in place, Tim Twomey will evaluate the possibility of providing coverage on Sundays and certain holidays (e.g., Presidents Day, Veterans Day).

Suggestion: Post the Helpdesk hours on the Web site under Contact Information.

Data Quality/Accounts Activation—To rectify the bottlenecks in account activation, a new approach has been taken:

- One government person now is responsible for and dedicated to activating "simple" account requests (single profile, all information correct) within two days.
- More difficult requests go to the contractor for clean-up, collapse, etc.

This approach has reduced the backlog from almost 400 requests to less than 75.

Virus Scanning—Implemented a short-term solution on March 22 called "On-access" scanning. This process scans and cleans critiques before converting them to PDF or creating preliminary summary statements. The long-term solution will include scanning on submission with immediate feedback to user if virus is found.

Reviewer Create Account—Improvements were made to the Reviewer Create Account process and screens. A Help document of procedures is posted on the Commons Support Page http://era.nih.gov/commons/index.cfm.

Commons Login—Improvements for *Provisional* accounts are planned.

Reviewers Enable Emails—Improvements to Reviewers Enable emails are planned (two new emails for *Provisional status*): http://era.nih.gov/Docs/Commons_email_messages_2_new_reviewer_emails.pdf

Major New Enhancements Planned and Improved Screens

- *Implement Cluster Security*—Allows a search for any meeting within Cluster. IAR will have cluster security.

- *Manage Meeting Materials*—Allows an SRA/GTA to upload documents or provide URLs for materials relevant to the meeting in a separate folder. This is another step toward a paperless office. These materials would be made available to Reviewers using IAR for the meeting. It was agreed that they want to move or replicate the Grant Folder to this. Send input to Daniel Fox (foxdan@od.nih.gov) regarding the type (Word documents, pdf, etc.) and size of files that you want to be able to share on-line with your Reviewers.

Action: **(All) Send input to Daniel Fox (foxdan@od.nih.gov) regarding the type (Word documents, pdf, etc.) and size of files that you want to be able to share on-line with your Reviewers.**

- *Export Score Matrix to Excel*

- *Turn off Reviewer's ability to submit non-numeric scores*

- *Allow SRA/GTA to submit unassigned critiques*

Daniel Fox reviewed the IAR screens and pointed out changes and enhancements.

Screen	Comments
List of Meetings	If all the fields are filled in, pressing the reset button will bring up all meetings in your cluster, e.g., workgroups, FACA.
List of Applications	Added the date the preliminary Summary Statement was created.
	Added the word "preliminary" throughout as appropriate.
	Added feature "(Submit Critique for Unassigned Reviewer)."
	Added "Lower Half" to indicate if score is in lower half.
	There are no preliminary Summary Statements for subprojects and this is a policy issue. It was suggested that subproject critiques be made available in Word with headers on each section. This would

Screen	Comments
	greatly aid in the efforts of those who must compile several critiques into one large file.
Submit Critique and Preliminary Score	Added "(View Existing Critique)." This shows that the critique has already been submitted and it doesn't need to be uploaded again. Because the critique filename doesn't show when the Reviewer returns to this page to enter a score, it looks like the critique has not been uploaded.

Knowledge Management

Art Petrosian presented an application that he and his son developed called NIH Electronic Application Submission/Review. Using Knowledge Management technology, this application aids in Reviewer selection and application assignments.

The SRA is charged with—

- Finding reviewers with appropriate expertise that matches best with application areas at a given Study Section

- Making reviewer/application assignments so that:

    – all applications are adequately covered

    – number of required reviewers at the meeting is minimized

    – number of assignments per reviewer is balanced

Using data from the application topic and from the Reviewer expertise, this program taps into PubMed, using the MeSH Thesaurus, and CRISP, using CRISP key words, to download applicable data:

- Download data from PubMed in XML format for **last authors** of all papers with "diagnostic imaging" as the major topic within the last 8 years.

- Download CRISP award data with specified sets of bioimaging keywords.

The program then maps between the two and prepares a brief profile page of a potential Reviewer. If the Reviewer looks like a match, the program also can provide a Full Profile with CRISP abstracts, and finally it can assign the Reviewer to a meeting.

Eileen asked for feedback on this application in regard to the Review module. It could open up new avenues and provide a new tool that could be used, for example, to find Reviewers or interdisciplinary studies. Once a Reviewer is in the system, a "robot" would act as an advanced Person search to PubMed and CRISP for key information. Eileen foresees the possibility of mining data in other databases to provide accurate data for the Review process.

Right now, Knowledge Management technology is on the table for scientific coding in 2004 and Receipt and Referral in 2005.

Action: **(All) Send ideas for ways the Review process could take advantage of Knowledge Management to Eileen Bradley** (bradleye@mail.nih.gov)**.**

Attendees

Binder, Roberta (NIAID)
Bradley, Eileen (CSR)
Dinterman, Kathy (CSR)
Flemming, Monica (NINDS)
Fox, Daniel (Z-Tech)
Githens, Sherwood (NCI)
Matus, Roberto (CSR)

Ometu, Karen (NINDS)
Petrosian, Arthur (CSR)
Pham, Phung (NCI)
Prenger, Valerie (NHLBI)
Seppala, Sandy (LTS/PCOB)
Shabestari, Behrouz (CSR)
Siegert, Mark (OD)

Sigler, Kristeena (CSR)
Simms, Sophonia (OD)
Sinnett, Everett (CSR)
Soto, Tracy (OD)
Stretch, Bob (NICHD)
Thee, Linda (CSR)