

STUDY SECTION MEETING PROCEDURES

I. PREPARATION FOR THE STUDY SECTION REVIEW MEETING

- Item 1. Please have the following items in front of you at the meeting: copies of grant applications, assignment sheet, your write-ups, copy of adjective scale, voting sheet (green sheet provided at the meeting), and this sheet.
- Item 2. Please note that if the assigned reviewers of a particular application agree that it falls into either the GOOD (3.0) OR THE ACCEPTABLE range, the overall discussion of that application will be very brief or omitted. Also, no priority score (unscored) will be given to the application. However, we still need a full written critique for these unscored applications. [note: this is not applicable for the training committees - DDK-B, DDK-C, and DDK-D]

II. STEPS FOR SCIENTIFIC REVIEW OF THE GRANT APPLICATIONS AT THE STUDY SECTION

A. PRIMARY, SECONDARY AND READER'S ADJECTIVE

The primary, secondary and reader will give an adjective that best reflects their degree of enthusiasm/merit for the application (please use an adjective and/or priority score from the chart).

Decision for full or no discussion of the application. If all assigned reviewers (primary, secondary, reader) agree that the merit of the application is 3.0, or worse, the application will be triaged and the discussion of this application will either be very brief or omitted.

B. PRIMARY REVIEWER (For those applications to be fully discussed)

First, give a brief statement of the overall Specific Aims of the grant application.

Second, summarize your assessment of the application in regards to the five individual criteria (Significance, Approach, Innovation, Investigators, and Environment).

Third, give the "rationale" for arriving at your level of merit (major strengths, major weaknesses, major problems, etc.). Remember, we are only interested in those MAJOR/KEY issues that contributed to your overall decision, and not the minute details. All of this information should be in your "Overall Evaluation" section of your write-up. Therefore, you could now read your Overall Evaluation. Please allow the primary reviewer to completely finish his/her discussion (rationale) of the application without any interruptions.

C. SECONDARY REVIEWER

Give the "rationale" for arriving at your level of merit (Overall evaluation, i.e., major additional strengths, major additional weaknesses, major additional problems, etc.). It is not necessary to repeat what has been stated by the primary reviewer, i.e., you might say that you agree with all that has been said, but would like to add the following. Please allow the secondary reviewer to completely finish his/her discussion (rationale) of the application without any interruptions.

D. READER

It is not necessary to repeat what has been stated by the primary and secondary reviewers, i.e., you might say that you agree with all that has been said, but would like to add the following additional item(s). You do not have to provide written comments if you choose not to.

E. CHAIR (After Assigned Reviewers Have Given Above Critiques)

- Step 1. Call for any additional discussion of the project by other committee members
- Step 2. Discuss the inclusion of children, women and minorities in study populations (if necessary)
- Step 3. Review of primary and secondary reviewer's level of enthusiasm for this project
- Step 4. Have members record their priority score on the green voting sheet for the appropriate application

III. STEPS FOR REVIEW OF THE BUDGET FOR THE INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS

Only major budget concerns should be noted at this time.

IV. DISCUSS ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH THE USE OF ANIMALS AND HUMANS IN RESEARCH

Humane treatment, ethical issues, hazards, etc.