

OMB# 0925-0627

Expiration Date: 04/30/2017

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 30 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to:

NIH, Project Clearance Branch, 6705 Rockledge Drive, MSC 7974, Bethesda, MD 20892-7974, ATTN: PRA (0925-0627).

[Next](#)

0%

Introduction

This survey of NIH peer reviewers is to help examine **NIH's Peer Review Process** (http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/continuous_review.htm). The information you provide will be useful in assessing the recent changes in Peer Review policies 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 since January 2015. 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 30 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 private under the Privacy Act. 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 along with other data to guide NIH management in the continuous refinement of the peer review process.

Your participation is greatly appreciated.

OMB No. XXXX-XXXX

Next

0%



Q1 In what capacity have you ever served as a NIH peer reviewer?

Select all that apply *

Regular "appointed" member of a chartered Scientific Review Group (study section) who agrees to serve a fixed duration (typically 4-6 years) (may also be called a "charter" or "permanent" member)



If not selected, skip to instructions before Q3

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



If only option selected, skip to Q4

If neither option is selected, skip to Q5

Q2 Are you *currently* serving as an appointed reviewer on a chartered scientific review group (study section) for NIH? *

- Yes
- No

Back

Next

3%

Q3 As an appointed reviewer, how many full terms (typically 4 to 6 years each) have you completed for NIH?

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

Q4 For which component(s) of NIH have you ever served as *either* an appointed reviewer or as a temporary reviewer?

Select all that apply

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

Q5 On how many review meetings have you served as an appointed reviewer or as a temporary reviewer for NIH in the past year? (your best estimate is fine)

0 meetings

If 0 meetings (or no option selected), skip to final Q

1 meeting

2 meetings

3 or more meetings

If any option is selected, continue to Q6

Back

Next

5%



Section B: Review Process and Procedures

The next questions pertain to the NIH Biographical Sketch. NIH's Biographical Sketch format was recently modified to include items on "contributions to science." The new Biographical Sketch is available at:

http://grants.nih.gov/grants/funding/424/SF424R-R_biosketchsample_VerC.docx

Q6 Have you had an opportunity to review applications submitted using the new Biographical Sketch format?

Yes

If Q6 = Yes, go to Introduction before Q7A

No

Don't know

If Q6 = No or Don't Know, skip to Introduction before Q7B

If no option is selected, skip to Exhibit 1

Please answer the following question based upon your experience with the new Biographical Sketch format.

Q7A To what extent was the new biographical sketch format helpful in understanding the capabilities of a researcher as they relate to the proposed project?

1= Extremely Helpful 5= Not at all Helpful

	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know
Qualifications for the role in the proposed project	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Scientific accomplishments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How the researcher's accomplishments advanced science	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How the researcher's accomplishments led to the development of intellectual property, commercial products and other benefits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Researcher capabilities and technical expertise	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Impediments to progress in research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Back

Next

11%

Q7A7 To what extent is the new biographical sketch suitable for complex grant activities (such as the P30, P50, U19, UM1, UM2)?

- Extremely suitable
 - Somewhat suitable
 - Not at all suitable
 - Don't know (I have not reviewed complex applications)
-

Q8A The information contained in grant applications is adequate for me to identify potential conflicts of interest in my assigned applications.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
 - Not applicable
-

**If Q6 = No, continue with Q7B
Else, skip to Introduction before Q12**

Please answer the following question based upon your experience with the former Biographical Sketch format.

Q7B To what extent was the former biographical sketch format helpful in understanding the capabilities of a researcher as they relate to the proposed project?

1= Extremely Helpful 5= Not at all Helpful

	1	2	3	4	5	Don't Know
Qualifications for the role in the proposed project	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Scientific accomplishments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How the researcher's accomplishments advanced science	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How the researcher's accomplishments led to the development of intellectual property, commercial products and other benefits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Researcher capabilities and technical expertise	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Impediments to progress in research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Back

Next

17%

Q7B7 To what extent is the former biographical sketch suitable for complex grant activities (such as the P30, P50, U19, UM1, UM2)?

- Extremely suitable
 - Somewhat suitable
 - Not at all suitable
 - Don't know (I have not reviewed complex applications)
-

Q8B The information contained in grant applications that include the former biographical sketch is adequate for me to identify potential conflicts of interest in my assigned applications.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

If Q6 is NOT = Yes, skip to Introduction after Q11

Q9 In comparison to the former biographical sketch, do you think the new Biographical Sketch format improves, has no effect, or weakens an applicant's chance for a successful review outcome?

Select one

Improves

If Q9 = Improves, display Q10

Has no effect

Weakens

If Q9 = Weakens, display Q11

Don't know (I have not used the former format)

If any other option is selected (Has no effect, Don't Know) or no option is selected, skip to Exhibit 1

Q10 Please describe briefly how the new biosketch improves applications in the NIH review process.

Q11 Please describe briefly how the new biosketch weakens applications in the NIH review process.

The next questions pertain to the table of Additional Scoring Guidance for Research Applications. Please refer to Exhibit 1 when answering the following questions:

Exhibit 1.

[Text-only version](#)

Additional Scoring Guidance for Research Applications

The [NIH scoring system](#) was designed to encourage reliable scoring of applications. Reviewers or study sections who assign high ratings to all applications diminish their ability to communicate the scientific impact of an individual application. Therefore, reviewers who carefully consider the rating guidance below can improve the reliability of their scores as well as their ability to communicate the scientific impact of the applications reviewed.

The chart below was developed to encourage reviewers to consider strengths as well as weaknesses when evaluating applications for research grants and cooperative agreements.

Overall Impact:
The likelihood for a project to exert a sustained, powerful influence on research field(s) involved

Overall Impact	High	Medium	Low
Score	1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9

Evaluating Overall Impact:

Consider the 5 criteria: significance, investigator, innovation, approach, environment (weighted based on reviewer's judgment) and other score influences, e.g. human subjects, animal welfare, inclusion plans, and biohazards

e.g. Applications are addressing a problem of high importance/interest in the field. May have some or no weaknesses.

e.g. Applications may be addressing a problem of high importance in the field, but weaknesses in the criteria bring down the overall impact to medium.

e.g. Applications may be addressing a problem of moderate importance in the field, with some or no weaknesses

e.g. Applications may be addressing a problem of moderate/high importance in the field, but weaknesses in the criteria bring down the overall impact to low.

e.g. Applications may be addressing a problem of low or no importance in the field, with some or no weaknesses.

5 is a good medium-impact application, and the entire scale (1-9) should always be considered.

Q12 During your most recent review experience, was the scoring chart in Exhibit 1 provided to reviewers?

- Yes
- No
- Cannot recall

If Q12 = No, Cannot recall (or blank), Skip to Introduction before Exhibit 2

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

Q13 The 1 to 9 rating scale had sufficient range for me to communicate meaningful differences in the quality of the applications.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Back Next

32%

Q14 The Additional Scoring Guidance for Research Applications (Exhibit 1) for the 1 to 9 rating scale was useful for assigning preliminary overall impact scores in advance of the study section meeting.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
 - Not applicable. I did not use the Additional Scoring Guidance for Research Applications
-

Q15 The Additional Scoring Guidance for Research Applications (Exhibit 1) for the 1 to 9 rating scale was useful for assigning overall impact scores during the discussions of applications at the review group meeting.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
 - Not applicable. I did not use the Additional Scoring Guidance for Research Applications.
-

The next questions pertain to the Structured Critique Templates. Please refer to Exhibit 2 when answering the following questions.

Exhibit 2. Example of a Structured Critique Template

RPG/R01/R03/R15/R21 Review

If you cannot access the hyperlinks below,
visit <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm>.

Application #:

Principal Investigator(s):

Overall Impact

Reviewers will provide an overall impact 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 scored review criteria, and additional review criteria. An application does not need to be strong in all categories to be judged likely to have major scientific impact.

Overall Impact Write a paragraph summarizing the factors that informed your Overall Impact score.

Scored Review Criteria

Reviewers will consider each of the five review criteria below in the determination of scientific and technical merit, and give a separate score for each.

1. **Significance**

Strengths

.

Weaknesses

.

Based on your most recent review experience using the structured critique templates, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

Q16 The bulleted format in the structured critique templates was adequate for capturing the strengths and weaknesses of the applications.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
 - Not applicable. I did not use a structured critique template.
-

Q17 The narrative overall impact statement in the structured critique template helped me communicate how the review criteria contributed to the overall impact score assigned to applications.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
 - Not applicable. I did not use a structured critique template.
-

Q18 The narrative overall impact statement in the structured critique template helped me communicate why some applications were not discussed.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
 - Not applicable. I did not use a structured critique template.
-

Q19 The criterion scores helped me communicate why some applications were not discussed.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
 - Not applicable
-

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


Q20 My expertise was necessary and appropriately used in the review process.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
-

Q21 The other review group members seemed to be experts in their fields.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
-

[Back](#) [Next](#)

 45%

Q22 The format and duration of the discussions were sufficient for the reviewers not assigned to evaluate an application to be able to cast well-informed votes.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
-

Q23 An appropriate amount of time was spent discussing the potential impact of the applicants' research.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
-

Back

Next

47%

The NIH is introducing several new elements in the research grant application. Their purpose is to clarify the rigor and transparency of the science proposed, and to improve the quality of the information available to reviewers and NIH staff. Each element is listed below and additional details are available by following the hyperlinks.

The first three elements, relevant biological variables, scientific premise, and rigorous experimental design, will be considered in the scoring of Significance and Approach.

The fourth element, authentication of key biological and/or chemical resources, will be an additional review consideration that will not be scored individually and will not be considered in the overall impact score.

Q24 Please select two of the four elements below that you believe are most relevant to your own field of science. You will be offered follow-up questions related to the two elements you rate as most relevant.

- Relevant biological variables, such as sex as they are factored in the research designs and analyses in vertebrate animal and human studies.
If selected, ask Q25
 - Scientific premise: consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of any published research or preliminary data crucial to support your application.
If selected, ask Q30
 - Rigorous Experimental Design**: how the experimental design and methods proposed will achieve robust and unbiased results.
If selected, ask Q34
 - Authentication of **Key Biological and/or Chemical Resources**: methods to ensure the identity and validity of key biological and/or chemical resources used in the proposed studies.
If selected, ask Q38
-

Q24 Please select two of the four elements below that you believe are most relevant to your own field of science. You will be offered follow-up questions related to the two elements you rate as most relevant.

- Relevant biological variables, such as sex as they are factored in the research designs and analyses in vertebrate animal and human studies.
- Scientific premise: consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of any published research or preliminary data crucial to support your application.
- Rigorous Experimental Design**: how the experimental design and methods proposed will achieve robust and unbiased results.

Scientific Rigor: The strict application of the scientific method to ensure robust and unbiased experimental design, methodology, analysis, interpretation and reporting of results. This includes full transparency in reporting experimental details so that others may reproduce and extend the findings.

- Authentication of **Key Biological and/or Chemical Resources**: methods to ensure the identity and validity of key biological and/or chemical resources used in the proposed studies.

Key biological and/or chemical resources include but are not limited to cell lines, antibodies, and specialty chemicals that may differ from laboratory to laboratory or over time and whose qualities and/or qualifications could influence the research data. Standard laboratory reagents such as buffers and other common biologicals or chemicals not expected to vary are not considered to be key resources. Key biological and/or chemical resources are integral to the proposed research and do not need to be generated with NIH funds

Biological variables, such as sex as they are factored into research designs

Regarding research in your field of science, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Q25 Generally speaking, research studies in my field of science are conducted, analyzed, and reported in a way that helps us understand how biological variables, such as sex, influence the findings.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
-

Q26 More attention to biological variables, such as sex, in designing experiments will improve the reproducibility of research findings in my field of science.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
-

Q27 More information about biological variables, such as sex, in the research design will improve my ability to review grant applications in my field of science.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
-

Q28 If voluntary training were offered on the topic of designing research studies to address the potential influence of biological variables, such as sex, I would encourage my students and laboratory personnel to participate.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
 - Not applicable – I do not have students or lab personnel
-

Q29 Please tell us anything else you would like us to know about the importance of biological variables, such as sex, to your field of science.

Scientific premise: consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of any published research or preliminary data crucial to the support of your application.

Regarding research in your field of science, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Q30 Generally speaking, the published research in my field of science includes sufficient detail to ensure that methods and results can be reproduced.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
-

Q31 More attention to the scientific premise of proposed research will improve my ability to review grant applications in my field of science.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
-

Q32 If voluntary training were offered on the topic of developing a strong scientific premise to support the design of new research studies, I would encourage my students and laboratory personnel to participate.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable – I do not have students or lab personnel

Q33 Please tell us anything else you would like us to know about the relevance of the scientific premise to your field of science.

Back

Next

63%

Rigorous Experimental Design: how the experimental design and methods proposed will achieve robust and unbiased results.

Regarding research in your field of science, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Q34 More attention to rigorous experimental design will improve the reproducibility of research findings in my field of science.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
-

Q35 Clarification of the rigor of the proposed experimental design will improve my ability to review grant applications in my field of science.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
-
-

Q36 If voluntary training were offered on the topic of conducting research using robust experimental designs, I would encourage my students and laboratory personnel to participate

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
 - Not applicable – I do not have students or lab personnel
-

Q37 Please tell us anything else you would like us to know about the relevance of rigorous experimental design to your field of science.

Back

Next

68%

Authentication of Key Biological and/or Chemical Resources: methods to ensure the identity and validity of key biological and/or chemical resources used in the proposed studies.

Regarding research in your field of science, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Information on authentication of key biological and/or chemical resources will be collected as an "other attachment" and will be peer reviewed as an "additional review consideration" that will not be scored individually and is not to be considered in the determination of the overall impact score.

Q38 Generally speaking, most experiments in my field of science are conducted with key biological and/or chemical resources that have been appropriately authenticated or calibrated.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
-

Q39 More information about the plans for authentication of key biological and/or chemical resources, [provided as an additional attachment](#), will improve my ability to review grant applications in my field of science.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
-

Q39 More information about the plans for authentication of key biological and/or chemical resources, [provided as an additional attachment](#), will improve my ability to review grant applications in my field of science.

- Strongly agree Information on authentication of key biological and/or chemical resources will be collected as an "other attachment" and will be peer reviewed as "an additional review consideration" that will not be scored individually and is not to be considered in the determination of the overall impact score
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
-
-

Q40 If voluntary training were offered on the topic of authentication of key biological and/or chemical resources, I would encourage my students and laboratory personnel to participate.

- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree
 - Not applicable – I do not have students or lab personnel
-

Q41 Please tell us anything else you would like us to know about the relevance of authentication of key biological and/or chemical resources to your field of science.

The next questions pertain to the review guidelines, review criteria, orientation materials, and other instructions provided to reviewers.

Q42 During your most recent review experience, to what extent do you agree or disagree that reviewers were provided with adequate review guidelines, criteria and instructions to review the specific applications assigned to them?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

If Q42 = Disagree or Strongly Disagree, ask Q42A
Else skip to Q43

Q42A Please describe briefly what review guidelines and/or criteria would have been helpful.

Q43 Is there any aspect of the NIH peer review process for which better instructions, orientation materials or review guidelines are needed? Please specify in the space provided.

The next questions pertain to the change in the application submission policy in 2014.

Q44 In 2014, NIH announced a change to the application submission policy to allow applicants to resubmit a research idea as a new (A0) application following an unsuccessful resubmission (A1) application.
(<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-14-074.html#sthash.Eum9uk5y.dpuf>).

In your opinion, how has this new application submission policy affected the NIH peer review process?

- Helped If Q44 = Helped, display Q44A
 - Had no effect
 - Hindered If Q44 = Hindered, display Q44B
 - Don't know
-

Q44A Please describe briefly how the new resubmission policy has helped NIH's peer review process.

Q44B Please describe briefly how the new resubmission policy has hindered NIH's peer review process.

Section C: Your Global Opinions about the NIH Peer Review Process

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

Q45 Based upon your review experience during the past year (since month, 2014), how fair is the peer review process at NIH?

- Very fair
 - Somewhat fair
 - Neither fair nor unfair
 - Somewhat unfair
 - Very unfair
-

Q46 Based upon your review experience during the past year (since month, 2014), how satisfied are you with the peer review process at NIH?

- Very satisfied
 - Somewhat satisfied
 - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
 - Somewhat dissatisfied
 - Very dissatisfied
-

Section D: 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.

Q47 What type of organization do you work for?

Select all that apply

- Institution of higher education (including a university foundation)
 - Hospital/medical center (including teaching hospitals)
 - Independent research foundation or other non-profit institution
 - Private sector/for-profit organization (including small businesses)
 - Federal, state, or local government agency
 - Other (Specify)
-

Q48 What is your job title or position?

- Professor or equivalent rank
- Associate Professor or equivalent rank
- Assistant Professor or equivalent rank
- Other (Specify)

Q49 Have you ever submitted a research grant application to NIH as a Principal Investigator (PI) for a single-PI or multiple-PI grant?

Yes

No

If Q49 = No (or blank), skip to Q52

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.

Q50 When did you submit your first research grant application to NIH as a PI for a single-PI or multiple-PI grant?

- 2014 to 2015
- 2012 to 2013
- 2010 to 2011
- 2008 to 2009
- 2005 to 2007
- 2002 to 2004
- 1999 to 2001
- 1996 to 1998
- 1993 to 1995
- 1990 to 1992
- Prior to 1990

Q51 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), cooperative agreements, career development awards (K series), research training and fellowships (T and F series), and SBIR/STTR grants and contracts.

Select all that apply

- FY 2014 (October 2013 to September 2014)
 - FY 2013 (October 2012 to September 2013)
 - FY 2012 (October 2011 to September 2012)
 - Did not receive NIH funding for the fiscal years listed
-

Q52 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)
-

Q53 What is your age?

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

Q54 What is your gender?

- Female
 - Male
-

Back

Next

92%





Q55 What is your ethnicity?

- Hispanic or Latino
 - Not Hispanic or Latino
-

Q56 What is your race?

Select all that apply

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

Back

Next

95%

Thank you very much for completing the survey!

If you have any ideas for improving the peer review process at NIH, please enter your suggestions here:

100%