

FOR REVIEWERS

STAGE 1 REVIEW

1. Do you feel it is reasonable for editors (Stage One reviewers) to review about 300 applications for the first stage of this three stage review process?
 - Yes
 - No

- 1a. If no, how many applications per editor do you believe would be optimal at Stage One of this process?
 - a. 50
 - b. 100
 - c. 200
 - d. 400
 - e. Other ____

2. How can we change the instructions to applicants to make sure they provide the information needed for the editor's decisions that must be made at Stage 1? (max of 500 words)

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number of this information collection is **0925-0474**. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: NIH, Project Clearance Branch, 6705 Rockledge Drive, MSC 7974, Bethesda, MD 20892-7974 Attn: PRA (0925-0474). If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: CSR at, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Bethesda, MD 20892-7776, Attn: Evaluation Director.

3. If you referred to other sections of the applications prior to scoring, which sections were most helpful?
 - a. abstract

- b. approach
- c. appropriateness of the T-R01
- d. timeline
- e. biosketch
- f. bibliography
- g. not applicable, I only used the one page Challenge/Impact statement for the initial review

7. Of applications you reviewed, what percentage understood the goals of the Transformative R01 RFA?

- a. Most
- b. 75%
- c. 50%
- d. 25%
- e. 10%
- f. Less than 10%

8. What percentage of the applications you reviewed were capable of transforming science? (Did we get what we hoped we would get?)

- a. Most
- b. 75%
- c. 50%
- d. 25%
- e. 10%
- f. Less than 10%

STAGE 3 REVIEW

9. How often did the final face-to-face meeting of the editorial board dramatically change your priority assessment of an application?

- a. never
- b. rarely
- c. sometimes
- d. often
- e. always

10. Should future announcements have specific areas of science highlighted?

- a. Strongly disagree
- b. Disagree
- c. Neutral
- d. Agree
- e. Strongly agree

11. How helpful were comments from Stage 2 reviewers in arriving at a final score?

- a. very helpful

- b. somewhat helpful
- c. neutral
- d. unhelpful

12. How often did stage 2 reviewer comments dramatically change your initial assessments?

- a. never
- b. rarely
- c. sometimes
- d. often
- e. always

13. How often did stage 2 reviewers appear to have appropriate expertise to evaluate technical aspects of the applications?

- a. never
- b. rarely
- c. sometimes
- d. often
- e. always

14. Were stage 2 reviewer comments provided in a form that facilitated final decision-making?

- Yes
- No

If no, please suggest ways that second stage reviewer input could be made more clear, concise and helpful.

15. Did the inclusion of highlighted areas of science in the RFA facilitate the submission of transformative science?

- Yes
- No

15a.

Please suggest additions to the RFA that would increase the likelihood of receiving truly Transformative R01 applications.

