

ECD Global Alliance Grant Review Process

The ECD Global Alliance Grant Review Process is modeled after the NIH grant review process (see http://grants.nih.gov/Grants/peer_review_process.htm and http://grants2.nih.gov/grants/peer/reviewer_guidelines.htm for more information.) In an attempt to keep administrative activity to a minimum, the NIH procedures and forms will be utilized as is, with the simple addition of an ECD Global Alliance title. With that spirit in mind, the following outlines the ECD Global Alliance Grant Review Process at a high level.

1. Grant proposal applications are mailed to the President of the ECD-GA.
2. Applications are checked for completeness by the President of the ECD-GA. Missing items are requested of the Principal Investigator (PI), and if can be provided within 10 working days, the proposal will be considered complete. If not, the application will not be considered.
3. A Review Chair will be selected by the ECD-GA Board of Directors (BOD) from the ECD-GA Medical Advisory Board for each grant cycle. The Review Chair will be appointed after all grants are received so as to ensure there is no conflict of interest with the Review Chair and any of the grant applications.
4. Three (3) Reviewers will be selected from the ECD-GA Medical Advisory Board (MAB), if possible. If conflicts of interest result in too few ECD-GA MAB Reviewers being available, then outside reviewers will be solicited from the NIH or other published investigators in the field of ECD and/or histiocytosis.
5. Copies of all applications will be sent to the Review Chair, the 3 Reviewers and the members of the ECD-GA Medical Advisory Board (MAB) who will act as discussants in the review process.
6. Members of the ECD-GA MAB who are not acting as Reviewers will read the applications and be prepared to act as discussants in the review meeting when called by the Review Chair.

7. The 3 Reviewers will be given approximately 4 weeks to review applications. The review will be performed using the NIH criteria for small grant research (R03 projects.) Included in the review are the following:
- Declare Conflicts of Interest with specific applications following NIH guidance (see http://grants2.nih.gov/grants/peer/COI_Information.pdf for guidance)
 - Prepare a written critique (using “2010 Grant Critique Template” - attached) for each application assigned, based on review criteria and judgment of merit (see <http://grants2.nih.gov/grants/peer/critiques/rpg.htm>)
 - Assign numerical scores to each of five review criteria (see http://grants2.nih.gov/grants/peer/guidelines_general/scoring_system_and_procedure.pdf)
 - Make recommendations concerning the scientific and technical merit of applications under review, in the form of final written comments and numerical scores.
 - Make recommendations concerning appropriateness of budget requests. Budget modifications should be recommended to adjust the level of support to that appropriate for the work recommended.
 - Make recommendations concerning protections for human subjects; inclusion of women, minorities, and children in clinical research; welfare of vertebrate animals; and other areas as applicable for the application (see [guidance for reviewers on Human Subjects Protection and Inclusion, Human Embryonic Stem Cells, and Vertebrate Animals](#)).
8. The Review Chair will hold a review of all applications via a teleconference(s) or computer assisted meeting(s). The 3 Reviewers and the ECD-GA MAB members (discussants) will be in attendance. The purpose of this review will be to provide an overall impact/priority score to reflect the assessment of the likelihood for the project to exert a sustained, powerful influence on the research of ECD and/or to address an important problem or critical barrier to progress in the understanding of ECD. The score will be based on the NIH review criteria, the criteria documented in the ECD-GA Request for Proposals, and any additional review criteria deemed applicable. The output of this meeting will be a ranking of applications. The Review Chair will:
- Ensure review is fair, equitable and free of bias
 - *Beware of personal biases.* The Chair may state personal scientific opinions, but it is inappropriate for the Chair to champion favored ideas or areas of science over others
 - Facilitate discussion that allows all scientific points to be heard
 - Provide introduction of each application being reviewed, including project and reviewers' names, ensuring those with a conflict of interest are excused from the application discussion
 - Ask assigned reviewers and discussants to provide their initial level of enthusiasm or preliminary score
 - Ask assigned reviewers and discussants to provide concise reviews of applications with emphasis on its impact, strengths, and weaknesses
 - Open the review for further discussion by all members of the panel
 - Ask for any comments about each of the Additional Review Criteria (including human subject research, vertebrate animal research, or biohazards) prior to scoring

- Briefly summarize the discussion, pointing out any disagreements among the reviewers
- Ask for final scores from assigned reviewers and discussants
- Ask any reviewer scoring outside the stated range to state rationale if it has not been explained during the discussion
- Remind reviewers to modify their written critiques and criterion scores in light of the discussions
- After final scores have been entered, ask about Additional Review Considerations (including budget recommendations)
- Provide the ECD-GA President the final scores, critiques and ranking of applications. The Review Committee will communicate any reservations and reasons that might exist should they believe a project application is not fully developed enough to recommend funding.

9. The ECD-GA BOD will review the ranking of applications as provided by the Review Chair and make a final decision on funding.

10. Once the ECD-GA BOD has made a final grant funding decision, all applicants will be notified.