

Cancer Target Discovery and Development Network

REVIEW ASPECTS

4/24/2012

Marvin L. Salin PhD

Scientific Review Administrator

RFA CA-12-006

Scientific Review Officer
Assigned

Dr. Adriana Stoica

Email: adriana.stoica@nih.gov

Phone: (301) 594-1408

KEY DATES IN CTDD APPLICATION PROCESS

- May 21, 2012: Letter of Intent
- June 21, 2012: Application
Receipt@5:00 PM Local Time
- Early November, 2012: Review Meeting
- October, 12, 2012: Last Minute Material
Receipt
- 3 Days Post- Meeting Score Release
- 45 Days Post Meeting Summary
Statement Release

LAST MINUTE SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

- At Discretion of SRO
- 2 Pages PDF Maximum
- For each article accepted, you may submit only the following: Authors, institutional affiliations, title of the article, the journal that accepted it, and the expected time of publication.
- Submitted 30 Days Prior to Meeting

WHOM TO CONTACT?

- From Now till Application Submission:

Program Staff

- After Application Submission till Application Review:

SRO

- After Panel Review:

Program Staff

Overall Review Guidance

- U01 Applications reviewed under this FOA must be a single well-developed project focused on the systematic identification and characterization of novel potential therapeutic targets and their perturbagens/modulators.
- Review Guidelines established by solely RFA

Review Guidelines

- 5 Core Review Criteria
 - Significance*
 - Investigator*
 - Innovation*
 - Approach*
 - Environment*
- Additions to Each of the Core Criteria Specific for the RFA –**critical to pay attention to criteria specific to FOA- Found in Section V: Review Information**
- Core Criteria are Given Scores by Individual Reviewers (Criteria Scoring)

Additional Review Criteria to be Included in the Overall Score

- Protections for Human Subjects
- Inclusion of Women, Minorities and Children
- Vertebrate Animal Care and Use

Additional Non-Scoring Criteria

- Budget
- Select Agents if Appropriate
- Resource Sharing Plan

9-Point Scoring (Overall Impact)

Impact	Score	Descriptor	Strengths and Weaknesses
High Impact	1	Exceptional	
	2	Outstanding	
	3	Excellent	
Moderate Impact	4	Very Good	
	5	Good	
	6	Satisfactory	
Low Impact	7	Fair	
	8	Marginal	
	9	Poor	

Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses
Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses
Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
Very strong with only some minor weaknesses
Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses
Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses
Some strengths but with at least one major weakness
A few strengths and a few major weaknesses
Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses

Non-numeric score options: NR = Not Recommended for Further Consideration, DF = Deferred, AB = Abstention, CF = Conflict, NP = Not Present.

Review Process

Highest Merit (Generally Top Half) of
Applications will be Discussed

All Applications Regardless of Discussion or
Non-Discussed will Receive Complete
Critiques

Appeals

- Appeals of initial review will not be accepted for applications submitted in response to RFA CA-12-006

RFA CA-12-006

Scientific Review Officer
Assigned

Dr. Adriana Stoica

Email: adriana.stoica@nih.gov

Phone: (301) 594-1408