Enhancing Peer Review Initiative

Survey of Peer Reviewers

Sponsored by:

National Institutes of Health

Introduction

This survey of NIH peer reviewers is to help examine **NIH's Enhancing Peer Review Initiative** (http://enhancing-peer-review.nih.gov/). The objectives of the initiative are to engage the best reviewers, improve the quality and transparency of peer review, and ensure balanced and fair reviews. This is the first annual "point in time" survey to gather reviewers' opinions about the peer review process. This information will be useful in assessing the changes introduced by the Enhancing Peer Review Initiative and may be used to further improve the peer review process.

You have been **randomly selected** to participate in this survey from a pool of individuals who served as peer reviewers for NIH at least once from May 2008 through September 2009. We are interested in the opinions of reviewers with different levels of peer review experience. Even if you have limited experience reviewing grant applications, **your opinions are very important to us.**

The survey should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. You can stop at any point and continue at another time. There are no right or wrong answers, so please give the answer that best describes your opinion. While we would like you to answer all the questions in this survey, you may skip any questions that you do not wish to answer.

Your participation is entirely voluntary. If you choose to complete the survey, your responses will remain **anonymous**. Your responses will **not** be linked to your name and will **not** be made known to NIH staff or grant applicants. They will not be used to assess the performance of individual NIH Institutes, Centers, or Scientific Review Groups. Aggregate responses will be used to guide NIH management in refining enhancements to the peer review process.

Your participation is greatly appreciated.

REVIEWER SURVEY (Version 8-18-09)

SECTION A: YOUR EXPERIENCES AS A PEER REVIEWER

A1. In what capacity have you ever served as a NIH peer reviewer?

Select all that apply

☐ Regular reviewer or "appointed" member of a chartered scientific review group (study section)
- A reviewer who agrees to serve a fixed duration (typically 4-6 years); may also be called a "charter" or "permanent" reviewer

☐ *Ad hoc* or "temporary" reviewer
- An *ad hoc* member of a scientific review group (study section) or Special Emphasis Panel (SEP)

A2. For which component(s) of NIH have you ever been a peer reviewer?

Select all that apply

☐ Center for Scientific Review (CSR)
☐ One or more NIH Institutes/Centers (ICs) (e.g., NCI, NIAID)

IF A1=1 (Regular) CONTINUE ELSE GO TO A5

A3. Are you currently serving as a regular reviewer on a chartered scientific review group (study section) for NIH?

O Yes
O No

A4. As a regular reviewer, how many full terms (typically 4-6 years each) have you completed for NIH?

O 0 terms
O 1 term
O 2 terms
O 3 terms
O 4 or more terms

IF A1=2 (*Ad hoc*) CONTINUE ELSE GO TO A6

A5. As an *ad hoc* reviewer, in how many review meetings did you serve for NIH from May **2008** to September **2009**?

O 0
O 1
O 2
O 3 or more

2

A6. In which calendar years have you served as a peer reviewer for NIH, including all peer review service as a regular reviewer and as an *ad hoc* reviewer?

Select all that apply

☐	2009	☐	1995-1999
☐	2008	☐	1990-1994
☐	2007	☐	1985-1989
☐	2006	☐	1980-1984
☐	2005	☐	1975-1979
☐	2000-2004	☐	Before 1975

A7. Now, please think about the time period May **2009** through September **2009**.

During this time, did you serve as a regular and/or an *ad hoc* reviewer for NIH?

O Yes
O No

IF A7=1 CONTINUE ELSE GO TO SECTION B

A8. Since May **2009**, what type(s) of grant applications have you reviewed?

Select all that apply

☐ Grant applications related to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009, such as the Challenge grants program and Grand Opportunities "GO" grants program

☐ Regular (non-ARRA) grant applications

3

SECTION B: REVIEW PROCESS AND PROCEDURES

In answering the questions in this section, please consider your experience with the enhanced peer review procedures **implemented in 2009**, regardless of whether they were applied in reviewing regular or ARRA grant applications.

Please refer to this table when answering the following questions.

Impact	Score	Descriptor	Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses
High	1	Exceptional	Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses
High	2	Outstanding	Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses
High	3	Excellent	Very strong with only some minor weaknesses
Medium	4	Very Good	Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses
Medium	5	Good	Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
Medium	6	Satisfactory	Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses
Low	7	Fair	Some strengths but with at least one major weakness
Low	8	Marginal	A few strengths and a few major weaknesses
Low	9	Poor	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, ND = Not Discussed

Minor Weakness: An easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen impact
Moderate Weakness: A weakness that lessens impact
Major Weakness: A weakness that severely limits impact

Based on your most recent review experience using the new scoring procedures, please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements.

> B1a. The 1-9 rating scale had sufficient range for me to communicate meaningful differences in the quality of the applications.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

> B1b. The 1-9 rating scale allowed me to communicate strengths and weaknesses for each review criterion.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

REVIEWER SURVEY (Version 8-18-09)

B1c. The descriptors for the 1-9 rating scale (exceptional to poor) helped me to determine the criterion scores for the applications.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

B1d. The descriptors for the 1-9 rating scale (exceptional to poor) helped me to determine the overall impact/priority scores for the applications.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

Based on your most recent review experience using the new scoring procedures, please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements.

B1e. Additional guidance on strengths and weaknesses for each score assisted me in determining the criterion scores for the applications.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

B1f. Additional guidance on strengths and weaknesses for each score assisted me in determining the overall impact/priority scores for the applications.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

Based on your most recent review experience using the structured critique templates (an example is shown here), please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements.

5

B2a. The structured critique templates allowed me to fully describe my evaluations of the applications.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

B2b. The bulleted format in the structured critique templates was adequate for capturing the strengths and weaknesses of the applications.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

B2c. The structured critique templates helped me complete my critiques efficiently.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

Based on your most recent review experience involving not discussed (ND) applications, please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements.

B3a. The structured critiques helped the reviewers to decide whether or not to discuss an application.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

B3b. The bulleted format in the structured critiques helped me communicate to the applicants why their applications were not discussed.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

B3c. The criterion scores helped me communicate to the applicants why their applications were not discussed.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

IF A8=1 **and** A8≠2 ONLY DISPLAY B4a-B4d THEN GO TO B5, ELSE RECEIVE ALL B4

Based on your most recent review experience, please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements.

B4a. My scientific expertise was necessary and appropriately used in the review process.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

7

B4b. The other review group members seemed to be experts in their fields.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

B4c. The format and duration of the discussion was sufficient for reviewers not assigned to evaluate an application to be able to cast well-informed votes.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

B4d. An appropriate amount of time was spent discussing the potential impact of the applicants' research.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

B4e. Clustering applications from New and Early Stage Investigators resulted in a more consistent review of those applications.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

B4f. Clustering clinical applications (those involving human subjects) resulted in a more consistent review of those applications.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

8

B5. How well did the reviewer orientation and any training materials you received prepare you to review applications using the new procedures, such as the 1-9 scoring scale, scoring of individual review criteria, and structured critique templates?

O Very well
O Somewhat well
O Not well at all

9

SECTION C: **YOUR OPINIONS ABOUT THE NIH PEER REVIEW PROCESS SINCE 2009**

When answering the questions in this section, please think of the **peer review process at NIH after enhancements were made in 2009,** the one under which your most recent peer review service occurred (regardless of whether it was related to regular or ARRA grant applications).

C1. Overall, which peer review system do you prefer – the new system (with enhancements) or the old system (without enhancements)?

O New system
O Old system
O No preference between the new or the old systems
O Not applicable – no experience with the new system

C2. How fair is the peer review process at NIH **after enhancements were made in 2009**?

O Very fair
O Somewhat fair
O Neither fair nor unfair
O Somewhat unfair
O Very unfair

C3. How satisfied are you with the peer review process at NIH **after enhancements were made in 2009**?

O Very satisfied
O Somewhat satisfied
O Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
O Somewhat dissatisfied
O Very dissatisfied

SECTION D: PEER REVIEW SERVICE

IF A1=2 CONTINUE ELSE GO TO D2

D1. Below are three aspects of the peer review process that may affect individuals' willingness to serve as *ad hoc* or "temporary" reviewers, such as *ad hoc* members of a standing review group or reviewers for a Special Emphasis Panel (SEP).

Please rate the importance to which each of the following affects your willingness to serve in the future as an *ad hoc* reviewer.

	Very important 🔲	Somewhat important 🔲	Not at all important 🔲	Not sure/ NA 🔲
D1a. The time commitment required to prepare for the meeting (read, assess, and critique applications)	O	O	O	O
D1b. The time commitment required to attend review meetings/discussions	O	O	O	O
D1c. The time commitment required to travel in order to attend meetings	O	O	O	O

IF A1=1 CONTINUE ELSE GO TO SECTION E

D2. Below are four aspects of the peer review process that may affect individuals' willingness to serve as regular reviewers or "appointed" members of a chartered scientific review group (study section).

Please rate the importance to which each of the following affects your willingness to serve in the future as a regular reviewer.

	Very important 🔲	Somewhat important 🔲	Not at all important 🔲	Not sure/ NA 🔲
D2a. The requirement for a multi-year commitment	O	O	O	O
D2b. The time commitment required to prepare for the meeting (read, assess, and critique applications)	O	O	O	O
D2c. The time commitment required to attend review meetings/discussions	O	O	O	O
D2d. The time commitment required to travel in order to attend meetings	O	O	O	O

11

SECTION E: BACKGROUND

As a reminder, the information you provide in this survey will remain anonymous. No individual respondents will be identified, and all responses will be summarized and reported in aggregate form.

E1. What type of organization do you work for?

Select all that apply

☐ University
☐ Research Foundation
☐ Private Sector/For-profit Organization
☐ Hospital/Medical Center
☐ Federal, State, or Local Government Agency
☐ Other Non-profit Organization
☐ Other (specify): _____

E2. What is your job title or position?

O Professor
O Associate Professor
O Assistant Professor
O Adjunct Professor
O Senior Scientist
O Other (specify): _____

E3. Have you ever submitted a research grant application to NIH as a Principal Investigator (PI) for a single-PI or multiple-PI grant?

O Yes
O No

THE QUESTION WORDING "PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR" WILL INCLUDE A HYPERLINK AND IF CLICKED THE FOLLOWING DEFINITION WILL APPEAR ON SCREEN:

> **NIH Definition of a Principal Investigator:** The individual(s) judged by the applicant organization to have the appropriate level of authority and responsibility to direct the project or program supported by the grant. The applicant organization may designate multiple individuals as PDs/PIs [Program Directors/Principal Investigators] who share the authority and responsibility for leading and directing the project, intellectually and logistically. Each PD/PI is responsible and accountable to the applicant organization, or, as appropriate, to a collaborating organization, for the proper conduct of the project or program including the submission of all required reports. The presence of more than one identified PD/PI on an application or award diminishes neither the responsibility nor the accountability of any individual PD/PI.

IF E3=1 CONTINUE ELSE GO TO E9

REVIEWER SURVEY (Version 8-18-09)

E4. When did you submit your first research grant application to NIH as a PI for a single-PI or multiple-PI grant?

O 2008-2009   O 1996-1998
O 2005-2007   O 1993-1995
O 2002-2004   O 1990-1992
O 1999-2001   O Prior to 1990

E5. As a PI, have you ever received a R01, R03, or R21 grant from NIH? (Please include single-PI grants and multiple-PI grants.)

O Yes
O No

IF E5=Yes CONTINUE ELSE GO TO E7

E6. In total, how many years of NIH funding have you received as a PI on R01, R03, and R21 grants? (Please include single-PI grants and multiple-PI grants.)

Enter total number of years here → _____

E7. In which of the following fiscal years did you receive any type of NIH funding as a PI? (Please include single-PI grants and multiple-PI grants.)

Examples of NIH funding include research grants (R series), program project/center grants (P series), career development awards (K series), research training and fellowships (T and F series), and SBIR/STTR grants/contracts.

Select all that apply

O FY 2009 (October 2008 – September 2009)
O FY 2008 (October 2007 – September 2008)
O FY 2007 (October 2006 – September 2007)

O Did not receive NIH funding for the fiscal years listed

E8. Did you submit any applications as a PI in response to NIH funding opportunity announcements related to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009, such as the Challenge grants program and the Grand Opportunities "GO" grants program?

O Yes
O No

E9. Please indicate the degree(s) you have.

Select all that apply

☐ Ph.D. or other research doctorate
☐ M.D.
☐ D.D.S.
☐ D.V.M. or V.M.D.
☐ Other (specify): _____

E10. What is your age?

O Under 35   O 46-50   O 61-65
O 35-40   O 51-55   O 66-70
O 41-45   O 56-60   O Over 70

E11. What is your gender?

O Female
O Male

E12. What is your ethnicity?

O Hispanic or Latino
O Not Hispanic or Latino

E13. What is your race?

Select all that apply

O American Indian or Alaska Native
O Asian
O Black or African American
O Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
O White

Thank you very much for completing the survey!

For more information about the peer review changes that have been implemented at NIH, please visit http://enhancing-peer-review.nih.gov/faqs.html**.**

If you have any ideas for improving the peer review process at NIH, please enter your suggestions at [insert URL].

REVIEWER SURVEY (Version 8-18-09)

SECTION B: REVIEW PROCESS AND PROCEDURES

In answering the questions in this section, please consider your experience with the peer review procedures used by NIH **prior to 2009**, the one under which your most recent peer review service occurred.

Based on your most recent review experience using the previous 41-point scale ranging from 1.0 to 5.0, please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements.

B1a. The 1.0 - 5.0 scale had sufficient range for me to communicate meaningful differences in the quality of the applications.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

B1b. The 1.0 - 5.0 scale allowed me to communicate the strengths and weaknesses of each application.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

Based on your most recent review experience using the previous narrative critique format, please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements.

B2a. The narrative critique format allowed me to fully describe my evaluations of the applications.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

15

B2b. The narrative critique format was adequate for capturing the strengths and weaknesses of the applications.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

B2c. The narrative critique format helped me complete my critiques efficiently.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

Based on your most recent review experience involving unscored applications, please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements.

B3a. The narrative critique format helped the reviewers to decide whether or not to discuss an application at the review meeting.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

B3b. The narrative critique format helped me communicate to the applicants why their applications were not scored.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

Based on your most recent review experience, please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements.

REVIEWER SURVEY (Version 8-18-09)

B4a. My scientific expertise was necessary and appropriately used in the review process.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

B4b. The other review group members seemed to be experts in their fields.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

B4c. The format and duration of the discussion was sufficient for reviewers not assigned to evaluate an application to be able to cast well-informed votes.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

B4d. An appropriate amount of time was spent discussing the potential impact of the applicants' research.

O Strongly Agree
O Agree
O Neither Agree nor Disagree
O Disagree
O Strongly Disagree

O Not Applicable

B5. How well did the reviewer orientation and any training materials you received prepare you to review applications using the previous peer review procedures, such as the 41-point scale ranging from 1.0 to 5.0, review criteria, and narrative critique format?

O Very well
O Somewhat well
O Not well at all

REVIEWER SURVEY (Version 8-18-09)

SECTION C: **Your Opinions about the NIH Peer Review Process Prior to 2009**

When answering the questions in this section, please think back to the **peer review process at NIH prior to 2009**, the one under which your most recent peer review service occurred.

C1. Overall, which peer review system do you prefer – the new system (with enhancements) or the old system (without enhancements)?

O New system
O Old system
O No preference between the new or the old systems
O Not applicable – no experience with the new system

C2. How fair was the peer review process at NIH **prior to 2009?**

O Very fair
O Somewhat fair
O Neither fair nor unfair
O Somewhat unfair
O Very unfair

C3. How satisfied were you with the peer review process at NIH **prior to 2009?**

O Very satisfied
O Somewhat satisfied
O Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
O Somewhat dissatisfied
O Very dissatisfied

18