

2026 Current Fiscal Year Report: Center for Scientific Review Special Emphasis Panel

Report Run Date: 05/26/2026 05:27:48 PM

1. Department or Agency

Department of Health and Human Services

2. Fiscal Year

2026

3. Committee or Subcommittee

Center for Scientific Review Special Emphasis Panel

3b. GSA Committee No.

796

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year? **5. Current Charter** **6. Expected Renewal Date** **7. Expected Term Date**

No 02/26/1992

8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year? **8b. Specific Termination Authority** **8c. Actual Term Date**

No

9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year **10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?** **10b. Legislation Pending?**

Continue Not Applicable Not Applicable

11. Establishment Authority Authorized by Law

12. Specific Establishment Authority **13. Effective Date** **14. Committee Type** **14c. Presidential?**

42 U.S.C. 282(b)(16) 11/20/1985 Continuing No

15. Description of Committee Special Emphasis Panel

16a. Total Number of Reports

No Reports for this Fiscal Year

17a. Open **17b. Closed** **17c. Partially Closed** **Other Activities** **17d. Total**

Meetings and Dates

No Meetings

Current Next
FY FY

18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18c. Administrative Costs (FRNs, contractor support, In-person/hybrid/virtual meetings)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18d. Other (all other funds not captured by any other cost category)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18e. Total Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.00	0.00

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary ...shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of -- (A) applications...; and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts. This committee is composed of recognized biomedical and behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of funding

applications and proposals, including but not limited to grant and cooperative agreement applications and contract proposals, for research projects and for research and training activities in areas relevant to neuroscience, development and aging, behavioral and population sciences, basic and integrative biological sciences, physiological and pathological sciences, and translational and clinical sciences. Operation of this committee is accomplished using a fluid membership with members designated to serve for individual meetings rather than formally appointed for fixed terms of service. During this reporting period the committee reviewed 35,458 applications requesting \$50,259,718,890.00.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

This committee has a fluid membership with members designated to serve for individual meetings rather than formally appointed for fixed terms of service. The reviewers for each meeting are selected to evaluate grant applications or contract proposals for a specific, perhaps narrow, expertise area. Participants for each meeting are assembled to most efficiently and effectively cover the number and breadth of applications or contracts requiring review. Members and chairs are authorities who are knowledgeable in the various disciplines and fields relating to neuroscience, development and aging, behavioral and population sciences, basic and integrative biological sciences, physiological and pathological sciences, and translational and clinical sciences.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

The Center for Scientific Review Special Emphasis Panel held 817 meetings during this

reporting period. The flexibility in review allowed by this committee structure has proved both efficient and effective.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

This committee is composed of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications and contract proposals. These evaluations and recommendations cannot be obtained from other sources because the specialized, complex nature of the applications and proposals requires a unique balance and breadth of expertise not available on the NIH staff or from other established sources.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

The meetings of the Center for Scientific Review Special Emphasis Panel were closed to the public for the review of grant applications. Sections 552(c)(4) and 552(c)(6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act permit the closing of meetings where discussions could reveal confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material and personal information, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

21. Remarks

This committee did not produce any public reports during the fiscal year. Due to the assignment of responsibilities within the Center, the roles of committee designated federal officer and committee decision maker are filled by the same

individual. Membership: The members of this Special Emphasis Panel (SEP) do not have standing appointments and serve on an as needed basis for meetings throughout the fiscal year. Therefore, the members list does not reflect appointment start and end dates. As often as possible, instead of appointment start and end dates, each meeting date on which the SEP member served is identified on the Members list. When necessary to protect peer review integrity, a fiscal year start and end date is used as the alternative to appointment start and end dates for some SEP members. As a result, the Members list, including the number of chairs, may not align or directly match to specific meeting dates. Meeting rosters, including members' affiliations and zip codes are available online at <https://public.era.nih.gov/pubroster/>. The list of members includes two records each with the same first and last name; however, these are different individuals. The names are: Shweta Bansal, Bin Chen, Jin Chen, Kai Chen, Xi Chen, Xu Chen, Yong Chen, Zheng Chen, Meng Cui, Lei Ding, Michael Elliott, Yong Fan, Michael L. Freeman, Jie Gao, David J. Garry, Bin He, Bin Huang , Yong Huang, Wen Jiang, Jeffrey Johnson, Rupinder Kaur, Rajesh Kumar, Feng Li, Hong Li, Hui Li, Jianrong Li, Luis Martinez, Benjamin Miller, Jun Li, Sheng Li, Zhenyu Li, Liang Liang, Bin Liu, Jun Liu, Peng Liu, Tian Liu, Yang Liu, Bo Lu, Allen Reitz, Madhavan Sangeetha, Jie Shen, Susan Smith, Brian Smith, Bangyan Stiles, Timothy J Triche, Dong Wang, Hongbing Wang, Hongjun Wang, Jin Wang, Rong Wang, Shaopeng Wang, Ting Wang, Yong Wang, Karla Washington, Bing Yao, Lei Yu, Yi Yang, Feng Yang, Yi Yang, Hongwei Yu, Bin Zhang, Bing Zhang, Hui Zhang, Lin Zhang, Qi Zhang, Rui Zhang, Jing Zheng, Yi Zheng, and Jun Zhu. The

list of members includes three records each with the same first and last name; however, these are different individuals. The names are: Xin Chen, Jing Li, Wei Li, Yi Li, and Ping Wang. The list of members includes four records each with the same first and last name; however, these are different individuals. The names are: Li Li, Yan Li, Chang Liu, Jing Wang, Yang Yang, and Hui Zhang. The list of members includes six records each with the same first and last name; however, these are different individuals. The name is: Jun Wang There are several records on the membership list that represent members who participated in two meetings that were held at different times within the same day.

Designated Federal Officer

John Bowers Division Director

Narrative Description

NIH's mission is to seek fundamental knowledge about the nature and behavior of living systems and the application of that knowledge to enhance health, lengthen life, and reduce illness and disability. NIH works toward that mission by supporting the research of non-Federal scientists in universities, medical schools, hospitals, and research institutions throughout the country and abroad. Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary ...shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of (A) applications...; and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts... The Center for Scientific Review (CSR) is the portal for NIH grant applications and their review for scientific merit. CSR receives about 80,000 applications a year. The majority of those grant applications (70%) are reviewed by peer review committees managed by CSR. Since 1946, our mission has remained clear and timely: to see that NIH grant applications receive fair, independent, expert, and timely reviews -- free from inappropriate influences -- so NIH can fund the

most promising research. NIH advisory councils provide a second level of peer review and make funding recommendations based on priorities set by Congress, DHHS, and the public. For over 60 years, this peer review system has enabled NIH to fund cutting-edge research that has allowed millions to leave their doctor's office with new drugs and cures for diseases. This committee is responsible for determining the scientific and technical merit of applications based on the type of science, unique program emphasis, possible conflict of interest, or other factors that would or appear to compromise the review process if they were assigned to one of CSR's Initial Review Groups. This committee operates using a fluid membership, with individuals designated to serve for individual meetings rather than formally appointed for fixed terms of service.

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

	Checked if Applies
Improvements to health or safety	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Trust in government	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major policy changes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advance in scientific research	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Effective grant making	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Improved service delivery	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increased customer satisfaction	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Outcome Comments

NA

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

	Checked if Applies
None	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unable to Determine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Under \$100,000	<input type="checkbox"/>

\$100,000 - \$500,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$500,001 - \$1,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Over \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cost Savings Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Cost Savings Comments

NIH supported basic and clinical research accomplishments often take many years to unfold into new diagnostic tests and new ways to treat and prevent diseases.

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

548,799

Number of Recommendations Comments

Grant Review

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

The mission of the Center for Scientific Review is to provide the funding Institutes and Centers of NIH with the scientific and technical merit of research grant applications submitted to the NIH. It is these Institutes or Centers and their advisory councils that make funding decisions. NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee’s recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be funded.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

The mission of the Center for Scientific Review is to provide the funding Institutes and Centers of NIH with the scientific and technical merit of research grant applications submitted to the NIH. It is these Institutes or Centers and their advisory councils that make funding decisions. NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be funded.

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes No Not Applicable

Agency Feedback Comments

Information resulting from closed initial peer review meetings is subject to the Freedom of Information Act. The public can view information on research projects funded by NIH on the RePORT (Research Portfolio Online Reporting Tool) website located at <http://report.nih.gov>.

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

Checked if Applies

Reorganized Priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reallocated resources	<input type="checkbox"/>
Issued new regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Approved grants or other payments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Action Comments

An action of "approved" or "recommended" for grants receiving initial peer review by this committee does not infer that the grant will be or has been funded. Research grant applications submitted to NIH must go through a two-step review process that includes

the initial peer review for scientific and technical merit and a second step of review and approval by a National Advisory Council for program relevance. In addition, prior to an award or funding being made, NIH staff must conduct an administrative review for a number of other considerations. These include alignment with NIH's funding principles, review of the project budget, assessment of the applicant's management systems, determination of applicant eligibility, and compliance with public policy requirements. After all these steps have been completed, NIH officials make funding decisions on individual grant applications.

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

Yes

What is the estimated Number of grants reviewed for approval

What is the estimated Number of grants recommended for approval 35,458
35,458

What is the estimated Dollar Value of grants recommended for approval
\$50,259,718,890

Grant Review Comments

Grant Review

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

- Contact DFO
- Online Agency Web Site
- Online Committee Web Site
- Online GSA FACA Web Site
- Publications
- Other

Access Comments

N/A