National Institutes of Health
Review Users Group Meeting Minutes
6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 3087
Bethesda, Maryland
October 12, 2006

Present:

Daniel Fox (OD), Tracy Soto (OD), Richard Kostriken (CSR), Kristeena Sigler (CSR), Jon Ivins (CSR), Ev Sinnett (CSR), Jeannette Hosseini (NCCAM), Lorrita Watson (NCMHD), Annie Schaffner (NEI), David Wilson (HL), Bita Nakhai (AG), Robert Binder (AI), David George (EB), Rita Anand (HD), Jerry McLaughlin (DA), Mary Kelly (DC), Neal Musto (DK), Ernie Lyons (NS), Kishena Wadhwani (AHRQ), Behrovz Shabestari (CSR), Angeline King (OD), Luci Roberts (CSR), Chris Langrub (CDC; by teleconference)

The meeting was chaired by Luci Roberts of CSR.

Old Business:

➢ **Approval of minutes from September Meeting**

• **J2EE Peer Review, status of problem with entering Conflicts of Interest and problem with importing of summaries**

➢ Tracy Soto reported that the Peer Review J2EE Conflict of Interest defect is scheduled to be fixed in the October 27th release. She also said that the summary statement upload issue had been corrected on October 12th.

➢ Tracy also suggested that Peer Review J2EE defect issues can be sent directly to the J2EE support group email, ORIS Peer Review J2EE Support.

➢ Peer Review J2EE users provided feedback on the performance of the application. Several of the attendees indicated that they were using Peer Review client server because of the defects in the J2EE version. They would like for the client server version to continue to be available until the J2EE version defects are addressed.

➢ Tracy said that she wants more users to use the J2EE version of Peer Review. That way, the issues can be found and corrected. She indicated that the client server version will be available until the end of this calendar year.

➢ The subject of training was brought up during the meeting, and Tracy wanted suggestions. Many of the attendees expressed an interest in a training session for Peer Review J2EE.

• **Report from the Multi-Component focus group (Daniel)**

• **Report from Electronic Conflict of Interest Focus Group (Luci)**
    o Office of General Counsel cleared the use of electronic signatures on electronic forms (no paper required from reviewers).

- o Six documents must be collected: roster, agenda, pre-meeting COI, post-meeting COI, Post-meeting summary and minutes
- o Need to verify with OGC that minutes can be signed electronically
- o Need to get feedback from RPC about whether Electronic COI will need to offer the choice to ask reviewer to prescreen a Key Personnel sheet prior to signing COI form.
- o If yes, the format of the Key Personnel must be resolved, system generated or SRA upload?
- o How to get reviewers to certify their post-meeting COI forms electronically

- ➢ There was some general discussion about the review process, specifically conflict of interest processing and electronic signatures.

- ➢ There was discussion on certifying the post meeting Conflict of Interest forms.

New Business:

- **Using the IAR site for Asynchronous Electronic Discussion, or Meetings with No Discussion: How best to work with the read and edit phases**
  - o When the discusson between individuals is small or non-existent, reviewer need to be able to update their scores and critiques and be able to read those of others at the same time
  - o At the same time is desirable to have a period of time, even a short one, where the IAR site is static so that everyone can be assured they are looking at the same critiques and materials.
  - o Is it possible to make the system allow reviewers to read during the edit?

  - ➢ Yes, the reviewers CAN read during the edit phase, and using an edit phase that overlaps substantially with the meeting dates may be a good way to achieve the desire access during a meeting in which only indirect interactions are possible.
  - ➢ Daniel Fox discussed IAR phases. The attendees had questions about the edit phase; one was whether the scores can be changed in that phase. Daniel indicated that the scores can be changed up until midnight on the last day if the meeting but not after the meeting date.

- **Demonstration of the Key Personnel Report in QVR - Different reports for paper and electronic applications**
  - ➢ Luci Roberts demonstrated the running of the Key Personnel Extract report in QVR.
  - ➢ This report needs considerable alteration after it is downloaded to be used by SRA's to prescreen reviewers for conflicts of interest. For example, the report generated for electronic applications lists the names of key personnel in freeform, so they cannot be sorted alphabetically by last name.
  - ➢ There was general agreement among RUG members that an automated Key Personnel report that draws complete and sortable information from the electronic applications would be desirable, even if it is not required for electronic conflict of interest forms.

- **Demonstration of the Assign Reviewers Screen in J2EE Peer Review**
  - ➢ One improvement on this screen over the client server version is the ability to use the check boxes to enter all of the assignments for each reviewer simultaneously.
  - ➢ However, the J2EE staff feel that further improvement can be made and they would like feedback from users on how to accomplish this
  - ➢ Daniel also mentioned the "sort bug" on the List of Applications screen of Peer Review.
  - ➢ A Focus Group to help with developing the "Assign Reviewers" screen was suggested, by Tracy. Volunteers were solicited to participate in this group.