

# 2026 Current Fiscal Year Report: Emerging Technologies and Training Neurosciences Integrated Review Group

Report Run Date: 06/21/2026 01:54:25 AM

<b>1. Department or Agency</b>	<b>2. Fiscal Year</b>
Department of Health and Human Services	2026
<b>3. Committee or Subcommittee</b>	<b>3b. GSA Committee No.</b>
Emerging Technologies and Training Neurosciences Integrated Review Group	33742

<b>4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?</b>	<b>5. Current Charter</b>	<b>6. Expected Renewal Date</b>	<b>7. Expected Term Date</b>
No	12/03/2007		

<b>8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?</b>	<b>8b. Specific Termination Authority</b>	<b>8c. Actual Term Date</b>
No		

<b>9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year</b>	<b>10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?</b>	<b>10b. Legislation Pending?</b>
Continue	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

**11. Establishment Authority** Authorized by Law

<b>12. Specific Establishment Authority</b>	<b>13. Effective Date</b>	<b>14. Committee Type</b>	<b>14c. Presidential?</b>
42 USC 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** 0 **17b. Closed** 0 **17c. Partially Closed** 0 **Other Activities** 0 **17d. Total** 0

**Meetings and Dates**

No Meetings

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

**20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?**

Section 492 of the PHS Acts 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 highly scientific and technical research 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 crosscutting technologies that serve all of the neurosciences, including neuroinformatic and imaging and molecular neurogenetics; crosscutting emerging science in small business area for all of the neurosciences; and the training areas for all of the neurosciences. During this reporting period the committee reviewed 865 applications requesting \$1,475,889,362.00

**20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?**

The committee is composed of members who are authorities knowledgeable in the various disciplines and fields relating to crosscutting technologies that serve all of the neurosciences, including neuroinformatic and imaging and molecular neurogenetics; crosscutting emerging science in small business area for all of the neurosciences; and the training areas for all of the neurosciences.

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

The committee held 10 meetings during this reporting period.

**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 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 the committee designated federal official and committee decision maker are filled by the same individual. Drs. Gulin Oz and Seth Hays were reappointed to the role of chairperson through 6/30/2026. The following members' terms ended early: Kurt Zinn (3/12/2025) and Jingwen Yan (7/2/2025). In general, initial/integrated review group (IRG) members serve up to six years, which is documented in the Members list. Temporary members are individuals recruited based on expertise needed for each meeting. Some

temporary members may attend one meeting only while others may attend multiple meetings. Instead of appointment start and end dates, each meeting date on which the temporary member served is identified on the Members list. Meeting rosters, including members' affiliations and zip codes are available online at <https://public.era.nih.gov/pubroster/>.

## Designated Federal Officer

Emily Foley Director, Division of Neuroscience,  
Development and Aging

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
Aronson, Joshua	07/01/2023	06/30/2027	Director of Epilepsy Surgery and Stereotactic Neurosurgeon	Peer Review Consultant Member
Bagnato, Francesca	08/28/2025	06/30/2028	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Bebin, Martina	09/03/2025	06/30/2028	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Benitez, Bruno	07/01/2023	06/30/2027	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Berglund, Andrew	07/01/2024	06/30/2028	Professor and Director	Peer Review Consultant Member
Bex, Peter	09/12/2025	06/30/2027	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Bibb, James	07/01/2022	06/30/2026	Professor and Vice Chair of Research	Peer Review Consultant Member
Bittner, Ava	08/28/2025	06/30/2029	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Bonmassar, Giorgio	09/03/2025	06/30/2028	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Caron, Sophie	08/11/2025	06/30/2029	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Carroll, Joseph	08/28/2025	06/30/2027	Richard O. Schultz and Ruth Works Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member

Caskey, Charles	09/03/2025	06/30/2029	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Chien, Aichi	07/01/2023	06/30/2026	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Davis, Simon	09/15/2025	06/30/2027	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Denisova, Kristina	09/05/2025	06/30/2029	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Drew, Patrick	08/28/2025	06/30/2028	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Dubra, Alfredo	08/28/2025	06/30/2028	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Dulin, Jennifer	08/20/2025	06/30/2029	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Fang, Hui	07/01/2024	06/30/2028	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Faria, Andreia	09/05/2025	06/30/2029	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Farrer, Matthew	08/13/2025	06/30/2029	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Fernandez-Granda, Carlos	09/01/2024	06/30/2027	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Finan, John	08/20/2025	06/30/2029	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Gabel, Harrison	08/11/2025	06/30/2029	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Gangwani, Laxman	07/01/2024	06/30/2028	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Gillis, Jesse	07/01/2022	06/30/2026	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Gomez, Luis	09/15/2025	06/30/2027	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Habeck, Christian	09/01/2024	06/30/2026	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Harris, Carolyn	07/01/2023	06/30/2027	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member

Hays, Seth	07/01/2021	06/30/2026	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Howell, Brittany	08/28/2025	06/30/2029	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Huang, Yu-Wen Alvin	08/11/2025	06/30/2029	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Hutchinson, Elizabeth	08/28/2025	06/30/2029	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Izzetoglu, Meltem	09/04/2025	06/30/2029	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Jacob, Mathews	09/01/2024	06/30/2026	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Karumbaiah, Lohitash	07/01/2023	06/30/2027	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Kashani, Amir	08/28/2025	06/30/2029	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Keller, Corey	09/03/2025	06/30/2029	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Kippin, Tod	07/01/2023	06/30/2026	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Komaromy, Andras	08/28/2025	06/30/2029	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Konopka, Genevieve	07/01/2023	06/30/2027	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Krishna, Vibhor	09/03/2025	06/30/2029	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Kuceyeski, Amy	09/01/2024	06/30/2026	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Kurt, Mehmet	09/01/2024	06/30/2027	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Lee, Phil	08/28/2025	06/30/2028	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Li, Lexin	09/01/2024	06/30/2027	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Lippmann, Ethan	07/01/2022	06/30/2026	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member

Marcos, Susana	08/28/2025	06/30/2029	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Medeiros, Felipe	08/28/2025	06/30/2029	Professor of Ophthalmology	Peer Review Consultant Member
Meyer, Kathryn	08/11/2025	06/30/2029	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Morgan, Jessica	08/28/2025	06/30/2027	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Neumann, Kiel	08/28/2025	06/30/2029	Assistant Member	Peer Review Consultant Member
Nowakowski, Tomasz	07/01/2024	06/30/2028	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Orsborn, Amy	08/20/2025	06/30/2029	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Oz, Gulin	09/01/2024	06/30/2026	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Parr, Ann	07/01/2022	06/30/2026	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Sattler, Rita	07/01/2022	06/30/2026	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Schaffer, Ashleigh	07/01/2023	06/30/2027	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Seidlits, Stephanie	07/01/2022	06/30/2026	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Shaikh, Aasef	09/03/2025	06/30/2027	Professor and Vice Chair	Peer Review Consultant Member
Shcheglovitov, Oleksandr	07/01/2024	06/30/2028	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Shi, Chengzhi	09/03/2025	06/30/2029	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Silva, Afonso	07/01/2022	06/30/2026	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Spence, Andrew	08/20/2025	06/30/2029	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Srinivasan, Vivek	08/28/2025	06/30/2028	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member

Sun, Shuying	07/01/2022	06/30/2026	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Tanifum, Eric	09/01/2024	06/30/2026	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Tucker, Budd	08/28/2025	06/30/2028	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Vitale, Flavia	07/01/2023	06/30/2027	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Vogel, Christine	07/01/2022	06/30/2026	Associate Professor of Biology	Peer Review Consultant Member
Wang, Daifeng	07/01/2024	06/30/2028	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Wang, Nian	08/28/2025	06/30/2029	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Wang, Xudong	08/20/2025	06/30/2029	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Wang, Yalin	09/01/2024	06/30/2026	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Wang, Z	09/01/2024	06/30/2028	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Weiland, James	07/01/2024	06/30/2028	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Williams, Lakiesha	07/01/2024	06/30/2028	Professor and Associate Chair	Peer Review Consultant Member
Wingo, Thomas	07/01/2024	06/30/2028	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Wood, Matthew	07/01/2023	06/30/2027	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Wu, Yu-Chien	09/01/2024	06/30/2027	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Zhang, Chaolin	07/01/2023	06/30/2027	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member

**Number of Committee Members Listed: 81**

### **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 be 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Trust in government	<input 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 checked="" 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



### **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?**

10,966

### **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 865

What is the estimated Number of grants recommended for approval 865

What is the estimated Dollar Value of grants recommended for approval \$1,475,889,362

**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**

NA