

2021 Current Fiscal Year Report: Interdisciplinary Molecular Sciences and Training Integrated Review Group

Report Run Date: 05/01/2021 01:38:45 PM

1. Department or Agency				2. Fiscal Year
Department of Health and Human Services				2021
3. Committee or Subcommittee				3b. GSA Committee No.
Interdisciplinary Molecular Sciences and Training Integrated Review Group				72191
4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?	5. Current Charter	6. Expected Renewal Date	7. Expected Term Date	
No	11/06/2009			
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	Grant Review Committee			
16a. Total Number of Reports	No Reports for this Fiscal Year			
17a. Open Meetings and Dates	17b. Closed	17c. Partially Closed	Other Activities	17d. Total
No Meetings	0	0	0	0

	Current FY	Next 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. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18d. Total	\$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 will be 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 highly scientific and technical research grant applications and/or contract proposals for research projects and for research and training activities in areas relevant to enabling bioanalytical and imaging technologies. During this reporting period the committee reviewed 603 applications requesting \$626,528,271.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

The members of this committee are authorities knowledgeable in the fields of enabling bioanalytical and imaging technologies.

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

The committee held 6 meetings during this reporting period.

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

This committee will be composed of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront or research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant application and contract proposals. These evaluation 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 experience 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 committee were closed to the public for the review of grant applications. Sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act permit the closing of meetings where discussion 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. Dr. Lan Huang's role changed to chairperson during the fiscal year. The following member's term ended early: Dr. James Rusling Due to the large number of members serving on this committee, NIH staff are unable to provide additional information on Occupation or Affiliation. Additional information on an individual's affiliation may be obtained by contacting the designated federal officer listed in this report. Zip Codes: Due to the large number of members associated with this committee, NIH staff are unable to provide individual zip codes for all members. Current individual meeting rosters, including zip codes are available on line at <https://public.era.nih.gov/pubroster/>.

Designated Federal Officer

Mark Caprara Chief, Interdisciplinary Molecular Sciences and Training IRG

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
BEWERSDORF, JOERG	07/01/2017	06/30/2023	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
Barker, Thomas	07/01/2019	06/30/2023	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Beatty, Kimberly	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Burdette, Joanna	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
CHEN, PENG	07/01/2017	06/30/2023	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
CUI, BIANXIAO	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
DEVARAJ, NEAL	07/01/2018	06/30/2024	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
Deo, Sapna	07/01/2019	06/30/2023	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
FITZGERALD, MICHAEL	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
Fabris, Daniele	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Fisher, John	07/01/2019	06/30/2023	Professor and Department Chair	Peer Review Consultant Member
GEORGE, STEVEN	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	WILLIAM J. LINK PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
Gerber, Scott	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Grayson, Warren	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
HAHN, KLAUS	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
HUANG, BO	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
Hackel, Benjamin	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Houston, Jessica	07/01/2019	06/30/2023	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Huang, Lan	07/01/2020	06/30/2021	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Jones, Lisa	07/01/2020	06/30/2026	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Kelly, Kimberly	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
LECKBAND, DEBORAH	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
LU, HANG	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
Leonard, Joshua	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
MECHREF, YEHIA	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
Palecek, Sean	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
REINHART-KING, CYNTHIA	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
ROBINSON, RENA	07/01/2018	06/30/2024	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SAUER-BUDGE, ALEXIS	07/01/2017	06/30/2021	SENIOR RESEARCH SCIENTIST	Peer Review Consultant Member
SHOWALTER, SCOTT	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
Salaita, Khalid	07/01/2019	06/30/2023	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Sant, Shilpa	07/01/2020	06/30/2024	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
TONER, MEHMET	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
WARREN, WARREN	07/01/2015	06/30/2021	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
WHITELEGGE, JULIAN	07/01/2016	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member

White, Forest	07/01/2019	06/30/2025	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
White, Ryan	07/01/2019	06/30/2023	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Yu, Yonghao	07/01/2019	06/30/2025	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
ZHANG, HUI	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
ZHONG, WENWAN	07/01/2018	06/30/2022	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 40

Narrative Description

The goal of NIH research is to acquire new knowledge to help prevent, detect, diagnose, and treat disease and disability, from the rarest genetic disorder to the common cold. The NIH mission is to uncover new knowledge that will lead to better health for everyone. 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...

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

Checked if Applies

- Improvements to health or safety
- Trust in government
- Major policy changes
- Advance in scientific research
- Effective grant making
- Improved service delivery
- Increased customer satisfaction
- Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements
- Other

Outcome Comments

NA

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

- None
- Unable to Determine
- Under \$100,000
- \$100,000 - \$500,000
- \$500,001 - \$1,000,000
- \$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000

\$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000

Over \$10,000,000

Cost Savings Other



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?

3,437

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

Institute Program Staff provides the committee with data pertaining to funding actions taken.

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 603

What is the estimated **Number** of grants recommended for approval 603

What is the estimated **Dollar Value** of grants recommended for approval \$626,528,271

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