

# **CCTS Patient & Community Peer Review Academy**

## **Eligibility & Guidelines**

Each community member will participate in the required training on research, clinical research and the academic grant review process. Following the training, each member will be expected to participate in one grant review session. Peer Review Academy graduates will complement and enhance grant reviews by ensuring that community needs, public perspectives, patients'/caregivers' priority problems, research participant concerns and other important considerations are voiced and addressed.

### **What is this about?**

The Pilot Funding Program of the Ohio State University CCTS is looking for 15-20 community members to help decide which health research ideas proposed by faculty should receive grant funding. Here are some perks for you:

- Get trained on the federal grant proposal review process and participate in a National Institutes of Health-style review session.
- Build your resume (great career development opportunity)
- Provide your valuable input on health-related research grant applications.
- Receive a program certificate for completing the program.
- Get compensated for your time.

### **What qualifications do I need to apply & participate?**

You do not need any formal qualifications to be a Patient or Community Peer Reviewer or to have knowledge of research. Concern for public health and a special interest in learning about science, medical or research terms would be desirable. Experience or understanding about a particular disease or condition may be helpful when reviewing proposals of the same topic. Please note that we have required grant applicants to provide a lay summary of their proposal. A lay summary is a brief summary of a

research project or a research proposal that has been written for members of the public rather than researchers or professionals. Instructions given were to write it in plain English without jargon and with simple explanations of scientific, medical and technical words.

### **Class Size and Eligibility**

In the upcoming 2020 Academy session, the class will include approximately 15-20 community members from Central Ohio who have not previously participated in either a proposal review or a proposal review training. Applicant eligibility includes English-speaking adults who are not current staff, students, faculty, or independent contractors of The Ohio State University or Nationwide Children's Hospital. Patients and caregivers/parents of patients are specially invited to apply. Applicants will be notified of selection into the Academy by the date noted on the program website.

### **What is a Pilot Funding Program?**

A pilot funding program specifically provides funding for early, preparatory studies that are used to test new concepts, study design and technical aspects before conducting a more costly and a larger scale study. Ideally, pilot studies must be completed within one year. The pilot-feasibility-incubation funding program of the CCTS Pilot Translational and Clinical (PTC) Studies Program is funded by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) [National Center for Advancing Translational Science](#) (NCATS), the primary agency of the [United States government](#) responsible for [biomedical](#) and [public health](#) research. The goal of NIH NCATS is to transform [translational science](#) to get more treatments to more patients more quickly. Our pilot funding program sends a call out for proposals known as the "RFA" (request for applications) and faculty researchers respond to our call with their pilot research proposals. Successful applicants define challenges or barriers in the conduct of research and propose the development of a solution or process that can be tested within the pilot project. We also consider whether the researcher will be able to continue and sustain their research with larger grants after we fund their initial project. Preference and highest priority is given to projects that demonstrate a clear path to sustaining extramural funding or to direct implementation of

improvements in clinical and translational research processes. Proposals are evaluated using a National Institutes of Health style peer review process.

### **What is a peer review?**

Since scientific research may lead to lifesaving discoveries and improvements in human health and wellbeing, peer review is a critical process for scrutiny by experts who understand the field of research and for quality control of funded research. The peer review process helps to determine whether to award the funds or not to the researcher. Reviewers are expected to be qualified to check the validity and suitability of the proposed study, impartial, free of conflict of interest, competing interest or implicit bias. The first step is to select experts from the same field who are qualified and able to review the work impartially. Ideally the work is evaluated by multiple experts, 2-3 reviewers, per study. Once the experts are selected, they use the review criteria established by the funding program to score each proposal and provide their input and advice on how to improve the proposed work. Reviewers are generally not paid for their time since peer review is simply considered to be part of the self-regulatory nature of the world of science and research.

Different funding programs have different peer review processes in place. At the CCTS, our peer review process has four tiers. The first tier is a selection of pre-application summaries of the idea through an internal peer review of scientific experts. Only those selected and invited through the first tier are invited to submit full proposals. The second tier is the peer review by external reviewers from other universities who conduct a rigorous review and assign scores to each based on our criteria which includes potential for future extramural (external) funding. The third tier is the peer review by a volunteer committee of OSU and NCH scientists and experts called the Pilot Council. The Pilot Council reviews all the scores provided by reviewers and discusses the highest ranked proposals to make funding recommendations. The Pilot Council shares the recommendations with our CCTS Executive Committee for final discussions and funding decisions and this represents the fourth and final peer review tier. Historically, community members have not been involved in our review process. We intend to use the Academy to involve patients and community members in the second and third tier of our review process. We also intend to evaluate how community involvement improves

the quality of the review process, the quality of future research proposals and increased research literacy among members who participate in the Patient & Community Peer Review Academy. Based on what we learn during this pilot phase, we hope to identify a pathway for a long-term community reviewer training program.

### **Why should I be interested in getting involved?**

The pilot grants that faculty researchers are competing for are federal funds from the taxpayers. Therefore, all taxpayers are the primary beneficiaries of the high quality, high-impact biomedical research funded by the NIH to improve human health.

Members of the public who choose to become peer reviewers will provide their opinion on important matters such as whether or not to fund the proposed research, whether the study addresses an important and relevant question to taxpayers, whether the methods used by researchers are acceptable and about the overall return of investment. You will be asked to comment on the research from your own perspective or the perspective of the community or public. Your unique contributions to the peer review process that are different from the scientific experts may include knowledge, experience and priorities related to a particular condition in the research topic, perspective of parents or other caregivers of patients, community/public perspective, advice on how to recruit study participants, etc. Some of the personal benefits you may experience include the ability to give your opinion to influence which research is recommended for funding, personal and career development including learning new skills, intellectual stimulation of engaging with latest research and acquiring new knowledge.

### **Responsibilities of Community Grant Reviewers**

- I acknowledge that the Pilot Grant Program represents a significant opportunity for the applying researchers. Grant funding is an important achievement for researchers and their careers.
- I acknowledge that applicants have put a large amount of time and thought into their proposals.
- I acknowledge that my voice as a community member is important and should be given equal consideration in the review process.
- I agree to attend, in person, any required grant reviewer training sessions held by The Ohio State University CCTS.
- I agree to adhere to the grant review processes as prescribed by Leadership. I agree to use the forms provided for review and to utilize the online grant review system as directed by Program leadership.

- I agree to review each grant assigned to me by the designated deadline. This includes completing the online review and provide comments to the researchers.
- I agree to attend, in person, the grant review study section (meeting) on the scheduled date and time.
- I agree to respond to emails, calls, and other communications from CCTS staff in a timely manner.
- I agree to share my honest opinions and assessments of the proposals I have reviewed.
- I agree to share my honest opinions and assessments during the study section, on all proposals, even those I have not personally reviewed.

### **Responsibilities of CCTS Staff & Leadership**

- We acknowledge that your time is valuable and agree to respect the time you are putting into the process.
- We acknowledge that your opinions are valuable and agree to show respect for them and promise to provide you with ample opportunity to share your opinions regarding your reviews.
- We acknowledge that your opinions are valuable and we promise to ensure that other reviewers also listen to and respect your opinions.
- We acknowledge that your opinions are valuable and promise to encourage your input (and the input of other community members) during the grant review study section with the Pilot Council on the scheduled meeting date.
- We agree to provide grant reviewer training, covering both the general aspects of how to provide a thoughtful grant review as well as the technical aspects of The Ohio State University CCTS Pilot Program's grant review process.
- We agree to answer emails, phone calls, and any other communications in a timely manner.
- We agree to provide prompt assistance to you regarding any aspect of the grant review process, including technical assistance needed for online reviews.
- We agree to notify you of the final award/funding decisions.
- We agree to send you an update on the success of the funded pilot awards after project completion (projects are one year in duration, we expect to send out an update a few months after completion).

### **Patient & Community Peer Review Academy Support**

This work is supported by grant UL1TR002733 and Sub-award #119680448 from grant UL1TR001855 from the National Center for Advancing Translational Science (NCATS) of the U.S. National Institutes of Health. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health. Current funding for this program allows for members to participate in one cycle.

### **Graduation Certificate & Honorarium**

Each graduate will receive a certificate upon completion. As a gesture of goodwill and appreciation, each community member who completes all sessions of the Patient & Community Peer Review Academy will receive a **\$300 honorarium** plus mileage for participating in the Patient & Community Peer Review Academy. If the community member attends both training sessions, completes an independent study and review of grant proposal materials and attends the review session to make funding decisions, then the training and participation is considered complete. Please note that the honorarium amount is a “thank you” and does not reflect the value of the work done.

### **Training Instructors & Leadership**

Dr. William Malarkey, Chair of the Pilot Council and Dr. Tanya Mathew, Pilot Program Administrator, will be providing the training to patient and community reviewers along with the support of other CCTS leadership and staff. Dr. Rebecca Jackson is the Director of the CCTS and Dr. Pamela Salsberry is the program director for Community Engagement at the CCTS. Dr. Vish Subramaniam and Dr. Henry Xiang are the program directors of the CCTS Pilot Program.

### **Coordination and Communication**

The Ohio State University CCTS pilot program staff will be responsible for coordinating all the meetings, trainings and communications regarding the Patient & Community Peer Review Academy. Questions related to the PCPR Academy schedule, activities, and guidelines should be directed to Dr. Tanya Mathew at [tanya.mathew@osumc.edu](mailto:tanya.mathew@osumc.edu) or 614-292-1020.