

GUIDE FOR REVIEWER'S WRITTEN COMMENTS

Research Demonstration and Dissemination Project (R18)

The guidelines available here use language posted in the original funding opportunity announcement (FOA) and do not replace or modify the criteria established in the full announcement. If you have any questions, contact the Scientific Review Officer (SRO) in charge of the review panel. SRO contact information for your application can be found in [eRA Commons](#).

The National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (NIDDK) encourages NIH Research Demonstration and Dissemination Project grant (R18) applications from institutions/ organizations to test practical, sustainable, acceptable, and cost efficient adaptations of efficacious strategies or approaches prevent and treat diabetes and/or obesity. Research must target the prevention or reversal of obesity, prevention of type 2 diabetes, improved care of type 1 and type 2 diabetes, or the prevention or delay of the complications of these conditions. The approaches tested should have the potential to be widely disseminated to clinical practice, individuals and communities at risk. See the full text of the FOA at: <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PAR-12-172.html>

INSTRUCTIONS FOR WRITTEN CRITIQUE AND PRELIMINARY SCORES

Please use the following guidelines when preparing written comments on R18 research project grant applications assigned to you for review.

Written Critiques

- The format of the critiques should follow the structured template provided for each mechanism, which can be downloaded from the Internet Assisted Review (IAR) site.
- Each core criterion and additional review criteria are represented in the reviewer template and should be commented on, listing the strengths and weaknesses of each in a bulleted form.
- The goal is to provide the maximum and most pertinent information in a concise manner. ***Please do not sacrifice clarity for brevity.***
- After considering all of the review criteria, briefly summarize the strengths and weaknesses of the application in the Overall Impact section of the template.
- Assigned reviewers must upload critiques before entering an overall impact/priority score.
- Criterion scores should be entered in IAR before the review meeting.
- Assigned reviewers may submit criterion scores only after their critiques have been uploaded.
- The criterion scores may be changed following the review meeting during the EDIT phase.
- Please do not write your criterion scores on the critique template.

Preliminary Scores

- Each core review criterion should be given a score using the nine-point rating scale in accordance with the new Enhanced Peer Review Criteria.
- The criterion scores for the applications should be entered in the meeting Internet Assisted Review (IAR) site in NIH Commons before the review meeting using the same page that is used for submitting the preliminary impact/priority score and critique.
- The criterion scores may be changed following the review meeting during the EDITPhase.
- In the READ phase of the meeting reviewers may submit their scores and critiques, but may not edit them. Core criterion scores can be submitted only after your critique had been uploaded into IAR.
- The criterion scores will appear in the summary statement as part of your critique.

Overall Impact

NIH peer reviewers are asked to provide an overall impact/priority score to reflect their assessment of the likelihood for the project to exert a sustained, powerful influence on the research field(s) involved, in consideration of the following five core review criteria, and the additional review criteria (as applicable for the project proposed).

Core Review Criteria

Reviewers are asked to consider each of the five scored review criteria below in the determination of scientific and technical merit, and give a separate score for each. These individual criterion scores are considered part of

your critique and will not be discussed at the review meeting. They may be changed in the EDIT phase in Commons. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major scientific impact. For example, a project that by its nature is not innovative may be essential to advance a field.

Significance

Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field? If the aims of the project are achieved, how will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved? How will successful completion of the aims change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive this field?

Investigator(s)

Are the PD(s)/PI(s), collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project? If Early Stage Investigators or New Investigators, or in the early stages of independent careers, do they have appropriate experience and training? If established, have they demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s)? If the project is collaborative or multi-PD(s)/PI(s), do the investigators have complementary and integrated expertise; are their leadership approach, governance and organizational structure appropriate for the project?

Innovation

Does the application challenge and seek to shift current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilizing novel theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions? Are the concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions novel to one field of research or novel in a broad sense? Is a refinement, improvement, or new application of theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions proposed?

Approach

Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented? If the project is in the early stages of development, will the strategy establish feasibility and will particularly risky aspects be managed?

If the project involves clinical research, are the plans for 1) protection of human subjects from research risks, and 2) inclusion of minorities and members of both sexes/genders, as well as the inclusion of children, justified in terms of the scientific goals and research strategy proposed?

Environment

Will the scientific environment in which the work will be done contribute to the probability of success? Are the institutional support, equipment and other physical resources available to the investigators adequate for the project proposed? Will the project benefit from unique features of the scientific environment, subject populations, or collaborative arrangements?

Additional Review Criteria

As applicable for the project proposed, reviewers are asked to consider the following additional items in the determination of scientific and technical merit, but not to give separate scores for these items.

Translation

Is the approach to be tested novel and/or significant in relation to its potential to meaningfully improve healthcare or public health? Does the approach to be tested have the potential to reach and/or be generalized to a reasonably large segment of at risk individuals? If the translation is to a new population, is the adaptation or modification to the evidence based approach directed toward meaningful differences between the target population and the population addressed in the clinical efficacy research? For example, does the proposed intervention address unique barriers or differences in lifestyle and beliefs? Does the approach to be tested have the potential for wide dissemination and implementation at the conclusion of the research? Have the researchers justified the sustainability of the approach beyond the research period, including appropriate partnerships and consideration of cost and resources such as personnel and infrastructure? Is there a sufficient evaluation of the implementation costs in relation to sustainability and the health benefit achieved?

Protections for Human Subjects

For research that involves human subjects but does not involve one of the six categories of research that are exempt under 45 CFR Part 46 (as described in [Human Subjects Protection and Inclusion](#)), reviewers are asked to evaluate the justification for involvement of human subjects and the proposed protections from research risk relating to their participation according to the following five review criteria: 1) risk to subjects, 2) adequacy of protection against risks, 3) potential benefits to the subjects and others, 4) importance of the knowledge to be gained, and 5) data and safety monitoring for clinical trials.

If all of the criteria are adequately addressed, and there are no concerns, choose "Acceptable Risks and/or Adequate Protections" from the drop-down list on the template. A brief explanation is required, but may be brief

(i.e., "no concerns"). If one or more criteria are inadequately addressed, choose "Unacceptable Risks and/or Inadequate Protections" and document the actual or potential issues that create the human subjects concern. Also, if a clinical trial is proposed, evaluate the Data and Safety Monitoring Plan. (If the plan is absent, notify the SRO immediately.) Indicate if the plan is "Acceptable" or "Unacceptable", and, if unacceptable, explain why it is unacceptable.

For research that involves human subjects and meets the criteria for one or more of the six categories of research that are exempt, evaluate: 1) the justification for the exemption, 2) human subjects involvement and characteristics, and 3) sources of materials. If the claimed exemption is not justified, indicate "Unacceptable", and, if unacceptable, explain why it is unacceptable.

NOTE: To the degree that acceptability or unacceptability affects the investigator's approach to the proposed research, such comments should appear under "Approach" in the major review criteria above, and should be factored into the score as appropriate.

For additional information to assist you in making these determinations, please refer to

http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/guidelines_general/Human_Subjects_Protection_and_Inclusion.pdf

Inclusion of Women, Minorities and Children

When the proposed project involves clinical research, reviewers are asked to evaluate the proposed plans for inclusion of minorities and members of both genders, as well as the inclusion of children.

Public Law 103-43 requires that women and minorities must be included in all NIH-supported clinical research projects involving human subjects unless a clear and compelling rationale establishes that inclusion is inappropriate with respect to the health of the subjects or the purpose of the research. NIH requires that children (individuals under the age of 21) of all ages be involved in all human subjects research supported by the NIH unless there are scientific or ethical reasons for excluding them. Each project involving human subjects must be assigned a code using the categories "1" to "5" below. Category 5 for minority representation in the project means that only foreign subjects are in the study population (no U.S. subjects). If the study uses both then use codes 1 thru 4. Examine whether the minority and gender characteristics of the sample are scientifically acceptable, consistent with the aims of the project, and comply with NIH policy. For each category, determine if the proposed subject recruitment targets are "A" (acceptable) or "U" (unacceptable). If you rate the sample as "U", consider this feature a weakness in the research design and reflect it in the overall score. Explain the reasons for the recommended codes; this is particularly critical for any item coded "U".

NOTE: To the degree that acceptability or unacceptability affects the investigator's approach to the proposed research, such comments should appear under "Approach" in the major review criteria above, and should be factored into the score as appropriate.

<u>Gender Inclusion Code</u>	<u>Minority Inclusion Code</u>	<u>Children Inclusion Code</u>
G1 = Both genders	M1 = Minority and nonminority	C1 = Children and adults
G2 = Only women	M2 = Only minority	C2 = Only children
G3 = Only men	M3 = Only nonminority	C3 = No children included
G4 = Gender composition unknown	M4 = Minority composition unknown	C4 = Representation of children unknown
	M5 = Only foreign subjects	

Vertebrate Animals

Reviewers are asked to evaluate the involvement of live vertebrate animals as part of the scientific assessment according to the following five points: 1) proposed use of the animals, and species, strains, ages, sex, and numbers to be used; 2) justifications for the use of animals and for the appropriateness of the species and numbers proposed; 3) adequacy of veterinary care; 4) procedures for limiting discomfort, distress, pain and injury to that which is unavoidable in the conduct of scientifically sound research including the use of analgesic, anesthetic, and tranquilizing drugs and/or comfortable restraining devices; and 5) methods of euthanasia and reason for selection if not consistent with the AVMA Guidelines on Euthanasia.

For additional information to assist you in determining if the Vertebrate Animals section is "Acceptable" or "Unacceptable", please refer to: <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/olaw/VASchecklist.pdf>.

Biohazards

Reviewers will assess whether materials or procedures proposed are potentially hazardous to research personnel and/or the environment, and if needed, determine whether adequate protection is proposed.

Resubmission Applications

When reviewing a Resubmission application (formerly called an amended application), evaluate the application as now presented, taking into consideration the responses to comments from the previous scientific review group and changes made to the project.

Renewal Applications

When reviewing a Renewal application (formerly called a competing continuation application), the committee will consider the progress made in the last funding period.

Revision Applications

When reviewing a Revision application (formerly called a competing supplement application), the committee will consider the appropriateness of the proposed expansion of the scope of the project. If the Revision application relates to a specific line of investigation presented in the original application that was not recommended for approval by the committee, then the committee will consider whether the responses to comments from the previous scientific review group are adequate and whether substantial changes are clearly evident.

Additional Review Considerations

As applicable for the project proposed, reviewers will address each of the following items, but will not give scores for these items and should not consider them in providing an overall impact score.

Budget and Period Support

Reviewers will consider whether the budget and the requested period of support are fully justified and reasonable in relation to the proposed research.

Select Agents

Reviewers will assess the information provided in this section of the application, including 1) the Select Agent(s) to be used in the proposed research, 2) the registration status of all entities where Select Agent(s) will be used, 3) the procedures that will be used to monitor possession use and transfer of Select Agent(s), and 4) plans for appropriate biosafety, biocontainment, and security of the Select Agent(s). Select agent information is available via http://grants.nih.gov/grants/policy/select_agent/.

Resource Sharing Plans

Reviewers will comment on whether the following Resource Sharing Plans, or the rationale for not sharing the following types of resources, are reasonable:

1) Data Sharing Plan

(http://grants.nih.gov/grants/policy/data_sharing/data_sharing_guidance.htm) Applications requesting more than \$500,000 direct costs in any year of the proposed research are expected to include a data sharing plan in their application. Certain Program Announcements may request a data sharing plan for all applications regardless of the amount of direct costs. Assess the reasonableness of the data sharing plan or the rationale for not sharing research data.

2) Sharing Model Organisms

(<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-04-042.html>). All NIH grant applications are expected to include a description of a specific plan for sharing and distributing unique model organism research resources generated using NIH funding or state why such sharing is restricted or not possible. Unlike the NIH Data Sharing Policy, the submission of a model organism sharing plan is NOT subject to a cost threshold of \$500,000 or more in direct costs in any one year, and is expected to be included in all applications where the development of model organisms is anticipated.

3) Genome Wide Association Studies

(<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-08-013.html>). Applications and proposals that include GWAS, regardless of the requested costs, are expected to include as part of the Research Plan either a plan for submission of GWAS data to the NIH designated data repository or an appropriate explanation for why submission to the repository will not be possible.