



Center for  
Scientific Review

# Peer Review Process

## Pre-Application Webinar

**Jacinta Bronte-Tinkew, PhD**  
**Chief, Risk Prevention and Health Behavior IRG**  
**Center for Scientific Review**

# Scored Review Criteria

## Overall Impact

- Reviewers provide overall impact score to reflect whether project exerts sustained, powerful influence on field(s).

## Significance

- Does project address important issue/critical barrier in field?
- Is the prior research that serves as key support for project rigorous?
- If aims achieved, how will scientific knowledge and/or technical capability be improved?
- How will successful completion of aims affect concepts, methods, and technologies related to the manufacture, distribution, and marketing of tobacco products?

## Investigator(s)

- Are the PD(s)/PI(s) well suited to project?
- If Early Stage/Career Investigator do they have appropriate experience/training?
- If established, have they demonstrated ongoing record of accomplishments that advanced their field(s)?
- If project is collaborative or multi-PD/PI, do investigators have complementary and integrated expertise; is leadership approach, governance and organizational structure appropriate for project?

# Scored Review Criteria (cont.)

## Innovation

- Does application challenge/shift current research in the field of tobacco science as it relates to the manufacture, distribution, and marketing of tobacco products?
- Is a refinement/improvement/ new application of theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, or instrumentation proposed?
- Will the outcomes provide new information to develop the knowledge base that informs the manufacture, distribution, and marketing of tobacco products in order to protect public health?

## Approach

- Is strategy, methodology, and analyses appropriate to accomplish the aims?
- Have the investigators included plans to address weaknesses in the rigor of prior research?
- Have the investigators presented strategies to ensure a robust and unbiased approach? Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented?
- If the project is in the early stages of development, how will risky aspects be managed?
- Have the investigators presented adequate plans to address relevant biological variables, such as sex, for studies in vertebrate animals or human subjects?

# Scored Review Criteria (cont.)

## Environment

- Will the scientific environment contribute to the probability of success?
- Are the institutional support, equipment and other physical resources available to the investigators for the project?
- Will the project benefit from unique features of the scientific environment, subject populations, or collaborative arrangements?

# Additional Review Criteria

**These are not given individual scores but will be considered as a part of the overall impact score**

## **Protections for Human Subjects**

-Justification needed for human subjects: 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 research that is exempt committee will evaluate: 1) justification for the exemption, 2) human subjects' involvement and characteristics, and 3) sources of materials.

## **Inclusion of Women, Minorities, and Individuals Across the Lifespan**

- When the proposed project involves human subjects, the committee will evaluate plans for the inclusion (or exclusion) of individuals based on sex/gender, race, and ethnicity, as well as the inclusion (or exclusion) of individuals of all ages (including children and older adults) to determine if justified in terms of the scientific goals.

- **Vertebrate Animals**

- **Biohazards**

# Additional Review Consideration

As applicable, reviewers will consider the following items, but will not give scores for them, and they are not considered in the overall impact score

- **Select agent research**
- **Resource sharing plans**
- **Budget and period of support**

# Peer Review Principles

- **Review will be conducted by Special Emphasis Panel**
- **Conflicts will be excluded**
- **Standard NIH review procedures will be used, and every applicant will receive written feed back (a “summary statement”)**

# Impact/Priority Scores

- **For reviewers, the NIH score scale is 1-9, in integers, 1 being best, highest impact**
- **All eligible reviewers on the panel will give an overall impact score for each discussed application. The average score is multiplied by 10, and rounded to the nearest integer, giving the priority scores from 10-90, 10 being the best overall score**
- **Not Discussed applications (about 50%) will not receive priority scores**



# Review Contact

**If you have additional questions specifically about the review process for these applications, please contact:**

**Jacinta Bronte-Tinkew, PhD**

**[Jacinta.bronte-tinkew@nih.gov](mailto:Jacinta.bronte-tinkew@nih.gov)**

**301-806-0009**