

UNTHSC GRANT PEER READER PROCESS

Purpose: UNTHSC's Research Advisory Council (RAC) has formed a Grant Peer Reader Committee. The purpose of this committee is to improve the quality of grant applications submitted by UNTHSC faculty by providing feedback to principal investigators.

Eligibility to utilize this service: Any UNTHSC faculty member who is eligible to submit an application as a Principal Investigator may participate in this program. Faculty members with minimal experience in grant writing are particularly encouraged to take advantage of this mechanism to improve their proposals.

Responsibilities of the submitting faculty member: All individuals wishing to use this service must submit a draft of their proposal to the Research Office **no later than thirty days prior to the submission deadline**. At the discretion of the Committee Chair, applications submitted after this deadline may still receive review. However, the applicant should note that the likelihood of a late application receiving a thorough and timely critique may be diminished. The applicant is invited to suggest committee members (listed below) that may be particularly suited to review his/her proposal.

If the proposal is a resubmission, applicants are strongly encouraged to also submit the summary statements from the previous review, as well as their responses to those critiques.

Responsibilities of the Grant Peer Reader Committee: If no Peer Reader names are suggested, or if suggested Readers are unavailable, Glenn Dillon, Ph.D., Associate Vice President of Research and Biotechnology, will make assignments as deemed appropriate. Each application will be assigned to no fewer than two reviewers. Peer Readers are expected to provide their comments to the applicant at least two weeks prior to the applicant's submission date (i.e., turnaround time of approximately two weeks). **Reviewer identity will not be confidential** and reviewers are encouraged to meet personally with the applicant to review the critique.

Critique Format: The formats of critiques may vary somewhat depending on the length and type of the proposal, funding agency, etc. Nevertheless, each Peer Reader will consider the following in formulating his/her critique:

Summarize the major strengths and weaknesses of the proposal. Consideration should be given to the following, as appropriate:

- If a resubmission, has the applicant responded appropriately to the concerns of the previous reviewers?
- Is the hypothesis/objective plausible, original and important?
- Do the proposed experiments/interventions test the hypothesis?
- Is the proposal clearly presented?
- Is the experimental design and population to be studied appropriate?
- Is the investigator(s) knowledgeable and experienced in the field?
- Is there a major design flaw (e.g., Aims 2 and 3 can only be done if the "right" answer is obtained in Aim 1)?

- If preliminary data are presented, do they support the overall hypothesis and/or demonstrate feasibility?
- Is the data management section (power analysis, approach to hypothesis testing, data collection, consideration of variables, etc.) appropriately presented?
- Are adequate resources available?

Other factors that might warrant comment include:

- if animals are to be used, are the proposed numbers of animals justified?
- is the budget consistent with the amount of work proposed?

Receipt of critique: Peer Readers will submit written critiques directly back to the applicant and also to the Associate VP for Research and Biotechnology. **Reviewer identity will not be confidential.** Peer Readers have been asked to meet personally with the applicant to review the critique.