Form Approved
OMB Control No. 0920-1050
Exp. Date 06/30/2025

FY22 Peer Review SEP Survey

Introduction

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's National Center for Injury Prevention and Control (NCIPC) Extramural Research Program Office (ERPO) is the focal point for the development, peer review, and post award management of extramural research awards for NCIPC, the CDC National Center for Environmental Health (NCEH), and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR). At CDC, extramural research applications typically undergo a sequential, 2-level peer review process. The first level or primary peer review is to evaluate the scientific and technical merit of research applications submitted in response to a Funding Opportunity Announcement. Primary peer review is a key step in assuring that CDC/ATSDR research grant applications receive a fair, unbiased review by experts with relevant knowledge. The second level or secondary peer review looks at the mission relevance and programmatic balance of the Center's research portfolio in advancing CDC's research agenda. The NCIPC ERPO needs your assistance in evaluating your participation in the primary peer review process for this fiscal year. As a reviewer, we value your opinion to assist us in making future improvements to the process.

Survey

Please complete the survey below, with respect to serving as a reviewer in the peer review process.

1. What was the first format of the peer review meeting that you participated in?
    a. In person
    b. Videoconference
    c. Hybrid (in person and videoconference)

2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

A. Preparation for the Peer Review Meeting					
	Strongly agree	**Agree**	**Neither agree or disagree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly disagree**
1. The materials for the review meeting (guidance and instruction, access to applications, etc.) were sent in a timely manner.					
2. The technical assistance provided by NCIPC ERPO staff was useful (e.g.,					

videoconference training for reviewers, one-on-one consultation with staff, etc.).					
3. **The NOFO review criteria was helpful in assessing the merits of the application.**					
4. The instructions regarding the review process were clearly explained.					
5. **I prepared myself to the best of my ability to conduct this review.**					
6. Overall, I felt prepared to conduct my review and critique of the applications.					

3. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

B. Science Quality of the Peer Review Meeting					
	Strongly agree	**Agree**	**Neither agree or disagree**	**Disagree**	**Strongly disagree**
7. Panel members assigned to the applications were knowledgeable of the content area under review in the applications.					
8. The time allowed for discussion and deliberation on the scientific merit of each application was adequate.					
9. The deliberation of the panel resulted in a quality and robust discussion of the scientific merit of each application.					
10. The panel included diverse members of all demographics and scientific expertise.					
11. The panel meeting was managed effectively for a fair and unbiased review of each application.					

4. Please rate each of the following aspects of the organization and satisfaction of the peer review meeting:

C. Organization of the Peer Review Meeting					
	Very satisfied	**Satisfied**	**Neither satisfied or dissatisfied**	**Dissatisfied**	**Very dissatisfied**
12. If in person, Meeting location, meeting room, accommodations, amenities, etc.					
13. Sound quality and ease of use					

for videoconferences					
14. Meeting duration					
15. Overall organization of the peer review meeting and process.					

5. How likely would you be to serve as a reviewer in the future?
    A. Very likely
    B. Somewhat likely
    C. Not likely

6. Please share any feedback regarding the technical assistance provided by CDC, specifically in the areas of preparation and overall organization of the peer review meeting.

7. Please share any feedback regarding the science quality of the peer review meeting.

8. What would you change about the review process?

9. In the space below, please share any additional feedback regarding the peer review meeting.