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1

00:00:03.720 --> 00:00:10.410

Monique LaRocque: Welcome everyone. This webinar will begin shortly. Before we get started, we want to go over a few tips on how to engage with us.

2

00:00:10.710 --> 00:00:19.380

Monique LaRocque: We want to make this an interactive session, so please feel free to drop in your questions, using the Q and A feature that's on the bottom of your screen.

3

00:00:19.950 --> 00:00:29.100

Monique LaRocque: I also want to encourage you to open your chat window and that will just appear on the right side. We will be sharing some links that are helpful resources for you.

4

00:00:29.580 --> 00:00:38.610

Monique LaRocque: You can also note that you can save your chat if you have the latest version of Zoom. We will also send some of these links to you and a follow up email.

5

00:00:39.150 --> 00:00:47.760

Monique LaRocque: This webinar is being recorded and we will make the presentation available to you. We are offering closed captioning as well as Zoom technical support.

6

00:00:49.710 --> 00:01:01.110

Monique LaRocque: Your feedback is vital to us. We want to know what you think? How did this help support your efforts? What should we do differently next time? If you would please click on the link that's in chat

7

00:01:01.770 --> 00:01:08.610

Monique LaRocque: and open up that feedback form, we'd really value 100% participation, if we can get input from you on how we did today.

8

00:01:10.110 --> 00:01:19.740

Monique LaRocque: Also, join the conversation online. Please follow us on our NCATS\_NIH\_GOV and #NCATSSBIR hashtag.

9

00:01:21.240 --> 00:01:22.140

Monique LaRocque: Next slide please.

10

00:01:24.000 --> 00:01:31.410

Monique LaRocque: With that I'd like to officially welcome you to our presentation today: Peer Review for Small Business Funding - An Overview of the Process.

11

00:01:35.010 --> 00:01:38.460

Monique LaRocque: Today we're joined by our esteemed guest, Dr. Allen Richon.

12

00:01:39.540 --> 00:01:46.620

Monique LaRocque: He is an expert on scientific review and is from our Center for Scientific Review at the National Institutes of Health.

13

00:01:47.370 --> 00:01:57.810

Monique LaRocque: and Dr Meena Rajagopol. She's a program officer at the Office of Strategic Alliances at NCATS NIH. My name is Monique LaRocque and I'll be the moderator for today.

14

00:02:00.870 --> 00:02:02.880

Monique LaRocque: To give you an overview of what we're going to cover,

15

00:02:03.510 --> 00:02:10.620

Monique LaRocque: we're going to briefly talk about the NCATS SBIR STTR program, looking specifically at the program overview,

16

00:02:10.920 --> 00:02:18.900

Monique LaRocque: as well as various opportunities and resources and upcoming funding opportunities and then we're going to do a deeper dive into the peer review process,

17

00:02:19.230 --> 00:02:24.900

Monique LaRocque: Including how we select reviewers and how the SBIR STTR applications are reviewed.

18

00:02:25.680 --> 00:02:38.340

Monique LaRocque: And then we'll have a moderated Q and A. Please use the chat or Q and A function to submit questions, preferably the Q and A function, and you can see a little diagram of that at the bottom of the screen, where you can click on Q and A.

19

00:02:41.040 --> 00:02:42.930

Monique LaRocque: With that I'd like to turn it over to Meena.

20

00:02:44.280 --> 00:02:50.250

Meena Rajagopal: Thanks Monique. Hi everyone. Thanks for joining us today. Can you go to the next slide please?

21

00:02:52.620 --> 00:03:04.980

Meena Rajagopal: I'm very happy to have Dr. Allen return from the Center for Scientific Review to talk about how the peer review process, particularly for the SBIR or STTR grants, works here up here at the NIH.

22

00:03:05.310 --> 00:03:11.940

Meena Rajagopal: But before I hand it over to him, I would like to very quickly go over the small business program at NCATS.

23

00:03:12.420 --> 00:03:23.580

Meena Rajagopal: So NCATS stands for National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences and it is one of the 27 Institutes here at the NIH. We promote research to

24

00:03:23.970 --> 00:03:33.750

Meena Rajagopal: identify and mitigate bottlenecks in the translational science pipeline, so that more treatment options are available to more patients more rapidly.

25

00:03:34.140 --> 00:03:43.980

Meena Rajagopal: Towards this, we have a number of initiatives, but for the purposes of today's talk I'm going to just talk about the small business program. Can we go to the next slide please?

26

00:03:45.840 --> 00:03:54.420

Meena Rajagopal: So, to qui- to quickly give an overview of the small business program, the SBIR, which stands for Small Business Innovation Research,

27

00:03:54.750 --> 00:04:09.090

Meena Rajagopal: and STTR, which is Small Business Technology Transfer Research programs, are also known as America's SEED Fund, and it is one of the largest sources of early-stage funding available for small businesses research and development.

28

00:04:10.200 --> 00:04:20.070

Meena Rajagopal: This is a congressionally mandated program that other federal agencies participate in, including the CDC and the NSF and, of course, the NIH.

29

00:04:20.460 --> 00:04:27.960

Meena Rajagopal: The budget for the small business program tracks the agency's budget and what this means is that here at NIH, it is about

30

00:04:28.410 --> 00:04:36.240

Meena Rajagopal: 3.65% of the agencies' budget that amounts to about a billion-dollar set aside just for the small business program.

31

00:04:36.990 --> 00:04:52.140

Meena Rajagopal: And I just want to add an additional information with you, share with you that a lion's share of this budget goes towards funding a small SBIR program. This is not to mean that the NIH prefers the SBIR over STTR. Definitely not.

32

00:04:52.770 --> 00:04:57.330

Meena Rajagopal: It is just how the Congress has mandated where the majority of the funds should go.

33

00:04:58.350 --> 00:04:59.880

Meena Rajagopal: Um, can you go to the next slide please?

34

00:05:03.150 --> 00:05:19.590

Meena Rajagopal: So, there are multiple benefits applying to the small business program, right? So, first of all, like I said, the budget for this program tracks agencies budgets, so the funding is stable and predictable. Second of all, it is non-dilutive meaning the IP rights belong to the small.

35

00:05:19.590 --> 00:05:27.510

Meena Rajagopal: Business and once awarded the small businesses can then leverage other programs within the NIH like the Technical and Business

36

00:05:27.780 --> 00:05:35.430

Meena Rajagopal: Assistance and I-Corps programs and also request for supplemental funding to further develop and commercialize the technology.

37

00:05:35.850 --> 00:05:43.980

Meena Rajagopal: But one of the biggest advantages of applying to the small business program here at the NIH is the topic of today's webinar event which is peer review process.

38

00:05:44.280 --> 00:05:58.320

Meena Rajagopal: So, every SBIR or STTR grant goes through a rigorous peer review process, which then the small business can leverage to go outside of the NIH looking for other funding opportunities and collaboration

39

00:05:58.860 --> 00:06:12.990

Meena Rajagopal: potential, but so that is one of the biggest advantages to applying for the small business program at NIH. Because guess what, now your work has been validated by the National Institutes of Health. Next slide please.

40

00:06:16.980 --> 00:06:23.880

Meena Rajagopal: In this slide, I just wanted to quickly touch upon the key differences between the two programs. Uh, first of all, under the SBIR,

41

00:06:24.330 --> 00:06:34.350

Meena Rajagopal: the small businesses is allowed to partner up with a nonprofit research institute. However, this is a mandatory requirement under STTR programs, so, in other words,

42

00:06:34.800 --> 00:06:45.750

Meena Rajagopal: if you are applying under the STTR program, the small business has to collaborate with a non-profit research institute in the United States, be it a college or a university

43

00:06:46.050 --> 00:06:52.260

Meena Rajagopal: or other federally funded research and development center, what we call the FFRDC. Excuse me.

44

00:06:53.190 --> 00:07:02.700

Meena Rajagopal: And the next difference comes with the primary employment of the principal investigator. So, under the SBIR program the primary employment for the principal investigator has to be with the

45

00:07:03.000 --> 00:07:15.630

Meena Rajagopal: small business. How-, however, there is some flexibility under the STTR program. The primary employment can, of the principal investigator can be either with the small business or the nonprofit research institute.

46

00:07:16.110 --> 00:07:25.380

Meena Rajagopal: There are also other guidelines that, you know, with regards to work requirement that differentiates between these two programs. For instance,

47

00:07:25.680 --> 00:07:34.500

Meena Rajagopal: under the SBIR program, a small business can outsource up to about 33% in Phase I and up to about 50% in Phase II. Still,

48

00:07:35.160 --> 00:07:42.330

Meena Rajagopal: under the STTR program there is a minimum requirement that is required, and at least about 40% of the work

49

00:07:42.660 --> 00:07:50.640

Meena Rajagopal: must be carried out at the small business and at a minimum of 30% of the proposed work must be carried out of the research institute.

50

00:07:51.180 --> 00:08:05.400

Meena Rajagopal: But the key takeaway from this slide is the line at the very bottom, which says that, you know, no matter which program that you apply under, the SBIR or the STTR the award, the money always goes to the small business. Next slide please.

51

00:08:10.080 --> 00:08:14.910

Meena Rajagopal: So, like I mentioned earlier, NCATS, you know, promotes research

52

00:08:15.810 --> 00:08:26.520

Meena Rajagopal: on projects and technologies and methodology that have a translational impact and this broadly falls into three buckets: one the preclinical drug discovery and development;

53

00:08:26.880 --> 00:08:33.630

Meena Rajagopal: two, biomedical clinical a health research informatics; and three, biomedical, dissemination and implementation research.

54

00:08:33.960 --> 00:08:49.080

Meena Rajagopal: I'm not going to get into each of these topics, but I would strongly urge you to please go to our website and read what is included under each topic, and if you have any specific questions, please reach out to us, and I will be more than happy to answer your questions. Next slide please.

55

00:08:52.860 --> 00:09:04.920

Meena Rajagopal: So, at NCATS we have a number of funding opportunities for small businesses and by this, I mean the investigated initiated on the solicitation targeted brand solicitation and contract solicitation.

56

00:09:05.430 --> 00:09:18.870

Meena Rajagopal: However, a majority of our applications comes through the Omnibus Solicitation. The deadlines for the Omnibus Solicitation are pretty standard. It’s, uh, like mentioned in the slide April 1 September 5 and January 5.

57

00:09:20.880 --> 00:09:29.130

Meena Rajagopal: And for the target, of targeted solicitations the deadlines usually track the Omnibus Solicitation but sometimes depending on the topic,

58

00:09:29.400 --> 00:09:42.120

Meena Rajagopal: it could vary so I would strongly encourage you to please visit our website again, and, you know, familiarize yourself with the targeted grant solicitations and if you have any questions, please reach out to us and we'll be happy to answer your questions.

59

00:09:43.140 --> 00:09:55.560

Meena Rajagopal: And then, once a year, we have what's called the Contract Solicitation, and this is typically around October - November timeframe and, since this is a contractual agreement that our deliverables that have to be met.

60

00:09:56.850 --> 00:09:57.840

Meena Rajagopal: Next slide please.

61

00:10:01.350 --> 00:10:10.920

Meena Rajagopal: So, the, the small business program at the NIH is a three-phase program and please be advised this this need not be confused with the phases involved in a clinical trial. This is

62

00:10:11.370 --> 00:10:18.180

Meena Rajagopal: definitely different. So in under Phase I we are looking for grant proposals that talk about a feasibility study where

63

00:10:18.540 --> 00:10:29.580

Meena Rajagopal: you have preliminary, preliminary data for a proof of concept and you could request up to about 276 K, for a period of say anywhere from six months to a year.

64

00:10:29.970 --> 00:10:38.190

Meena Rajagopal: We do have some topics and, if you wish, if you would wish to apply under one of those waiver topics, you could request up to about 325 K.

65

00:10:39.030 --> 00:10:42.930

Meena Rajagopal: And we have the phase III, to which is a more full-fledged R and D.

66

00:10:43.590 --> 00:10:55.110

Meena Rajagopal: So, we strongly urge that your grant proposal has a commercialization plan in place and there are two funding mechanisms onto the Phase II, the Direct-to-Phase II, and the Fast-Track.

67

00:10:55.530 --> 00:11:09.060

Meena Rajagopal: And under the Fast-Track you're basically combining the Phase I and Phase II, so an applicant request for Phase II funding but contingent upon meeting the Phase I milestones. The award is being made and

68

00:11:09.720 --> 00:11:15.420

Meena Rajagopal: if, while in the Direct-to-Phase II, like the name suggests, you skip Phase I, so you directly, go to the Phase II.

69

00:11:15.660 --> 00:11:21.540

Meena Rajagopal: And this is in cases where you are very comfortable with the preliminary data that you wanted to apply to the next level.

70

00:11:21.870 --> 00:11:29.430

Meena Rajagopal: There are some differences when it comes to peer review process between these two grant mechanisms, but I will let Dr. Allen Richon to talk about that.

71

00:11:30.420 --> 00:11:44.580

Meena Rajagopal: We also have what is called the Phase IIB, and not all Institutes of the NIH participate in this program. However, NCATS currently does, and this is where NCATS wants to provide additional supplemental funding to you,

72

00:11:45.390 --> 00:11:50.220

Meena Rajagopal: our awardees so they can you know go get to this key inflection point.

73

00:11:50.760 --> 00:12:01.740

Meena Rajagopal: Like, for instance, a, the small business needs a state-of-the-art complicated instrumentation or is filing an IND with the FDA so in such cases, you can request up to about a million dollars per year

74

00:12:02.010 --> 00:12:08.220

Meena Rajagopal: for up to three years, but the only caveat to the Phase IIB is that NCATS should have funded your Phase II project.

75

00:12:09.450 --> 00:12:17.250

Meena Rajagopal: And then the last one is the Phase III, which is more of the commercialization aspect, right? So, if you were to apply to other agencies like say the D o D.

76

00:12:17.820 --> 00:12:30.480

Meena Rajagopal: Phase III, is where the agency would actually buy your product or technology. But NIH and particularly at NCATS, we want to think we want the small businesses to think of an exit strategy and graduate out of the program.

77

00:12:32.070 --> 00:12:33.060

Meena Rajagopal: Next slide please.

78

00:12:35.280 --> 00:12:44.280

Meena Rajagopal: So, I just want to give you a quick timeline of this application process, um, you know, if you're looking for quick money, this is probably not the best route to take.

79

00:12:44.610 --> 00:12:59.880

Meena Rajagopal: And that's because say let's pick the April 5 deadline, right, so applications are due by April 5 and the peer review process happens sometime around June, July, and then we have an internal review at NCATS, which happens it on August when our Council

80

00:12:59.910 --> 00:13:01.080

Meena Rajagopal: members actually looked at the

81

00:13:01.080 --> 00:13:06.060

Meena Rajagopal: applications, and then they do a recommended, recommend the applications for further funding.

82

00:13:06.420 --> 00:13:17.010

Meena Rajagopal: And then the final notice of award are sent to the principal investigator from the grants management office sometime in late September or even December so this could take anywhere from six months to about,

83

00:13:17.370 --> 00:13:29.490

Meena Rajagopal: you know, eight months, so you know, there is some waiting. It can be nerve wracking but there's something to, you know, keep in mind so just wanted to make you aware of that timeline. Can we go to the next slide please?

84

00:13:33.090 --> 00:13:40.200

Meena Rajagopal: In this slide, I just wanted to spotlight a targeted funding opportunities that we have available for our small businesses that we are currently

85

00:13:40.950 --> 00:13:49.170

Meena Rajagopal: accepting applications for. Again, I'm not going to go into the details of this, but please, I would encourage you to go to our website

86

00:13:49.500 --> 00:13:55.560

Meena Rajagopal: and, you know, make you, familiarize yourself with these funding announcements and if you have any questions, please reach out to us.

87

00:13:55.980 --> 00:14:05.670

Meena Rajagopal: I believe this is my last slide but before I hand it over to Dr. Richon. I do want to drive home the message that you know the program officials here are,

88

00:14:06.540 --> 00:14:15.150

Meena Rajagopal: are here to you know guide small businesses through this process and we will be more than happy to have a conversation with you to even find out if your,

89

00:14:15.480 --> 00:14:23.820

Meena Rajagopal: you know, a Specific Aims and your proposed work is in alignment with our research priorities and mission and, at the very least, you know we would

90

00:14:24.750 --> 00:14:30.420

Meena Rajagopal: refer you to our colleagues at other Institutes whom we might think that your project is, could be more interesting.

91

00:14:31.140 --> 00:14:42.000

Meena Rajagopal: So, I really hope to talk to some of you very soon in the near future, and with that, I would like to have Dr. Allen Richon to talk about the peer review process. Thanks everyone.

92

00:14:45.780 --> 00:15:01.740

Allen Richon: Alright, thank you Meena and welcome everyone. I appreciate the fact that you all have taken time out of your day to come in here, what we have to offer you in terms of what the SBIR STTR programs all about. If you can give me the next slide please?

93

00:15:03.750 --> 00:15:13.560

Allen Richon: Okay, one of the from the top, all the slides that I have after this one will talk about what the mechanics of the processes.

94

00:15:14.100 --> 00:15:22.050

Allen Richon: All of this is done for one reason and that's to make sure that our review is consistent through every application so each application,

95

00:15:22.740 --> 00:15:30.480

Allen Richon: no matter what study section they go into, no matter where they're reviewed, will receive a fair, independent, expert and timely review.

96

00:15:30.870 --> 00:15:42.030

Allen Richon: And we want to make sure that it's free from any kind of conflict, any inappropriate influences, so that we make sure that NIH has the background to fund the most promising research.

97

00:15:42.960 --> 00:16:00.840

Allen Richon: For the SBIR and STTR review, what we ask our reviewers to look at is, will the project have a sustained influence not only on the research field, but also the marketplace involved. So, if I can have the next slide, we’ll start in taking a look at all of this.

98

00:16:02.190 --> 00:16:07.020

Allen Richon: All right from 10,000 feet, we look at an institution that has a great idea.

99

00:16:07.860 --> 00:16:15.120

Allen Richon: Once they have gone through creating all of their records with the government and that's The Small Business [Administration] - SBA.

100

00:16:15.540 --> 00:16:21.930

Allen Richon: So, there's a whole bunch of things that you need to do before you even start this process in order to let the government know that you're real.

101

00:16:22.410 --> 00:16:32.940

Allen Richon: So, once all that's in place, you come up with an idea you send your application in, and it will go into the system, and we'll talk about all this. It'll go to the Center for Scientific Review.

102

00:16:33.420 --> 00:16:42.630

Allen Richon: We will do the peer review in our study sections, the results of those go to the Institute, where they also will conduct their own review.

103

00:16:43.110 --> 00:16:51.120

Allen Richon: Now there is kind of a hard line between the study section in the Institute. The study sections look at science, we do not discuss funding.

104

00:16:51.510 --> 00:16:59.310

Allen Richon: The Institutes take the background that we gave them and the information that we gave them on the science, and they are the ones that determine funding.

105

00:17:00.000 --> 00:17:11.130

Allen Richon: I cannot tell you the number of questions I get from applicants about well where's the cutoff line? Am I going to be funded? And so on, and I have to tell them I don't know because I don't deal in that world. That is not anything I do.

106

00:17:11.580 --> 00:17:28.830

Allen Richon: So, the Institute will look at their programming from the pro-, ah, sorry. From the programmatic issues and objectives, and they will make recommendations to their advisory board. The Institute Director will then distribute the funds so that's kind of the the top

107

00:17:29.880 --> 00:17:38.790

Allen Richon: view of how this process works. Now let's take a deeper dive into our study sections and review for the scientific content. Next slide please.

108

00:17:40.890 --> 00:17:57.570

Allen Richon: We get on average about 35,000 applications per year. We, CSR, try and locate somewhere between 18 and 20,000 scientists who will participate as reviewers and the 13 to 1500 review meetings that we run. Each

109

00:17:58.350 --> 00:18:17.520

Allen Richon: of those, about 7500 our SBIR STTR and we have about 40 study sections within CSR that are dedicated to these reviews on you can figure out which one best fits your application by using the CSR assistant brief your referral tool and there's the URL URL take a look at it.

110

00:18:19.050 --> 00:18:36.120

Allen Richon: So, um if you then use that tool, you can be you can look at the assignment request form that is part of your submission package or SF424 package and suggest which study sections that you feel is the most appropriate.

111

00:18:36.450 --> 00:18:37.800

Allen Richon: You can also suggest an

112

00:18:37.830 --> 00:18:41.520

Allen Richon: Institute that you would like to see your application looked that.

113

00:18:42.270 --> 00:18:57.330

Allen Richon: There is also the piece that most people don't understand, which is, you can use this form to request that certain individuals or certain companies not review your application because they're competitive and we'll get into that in just a bit. Next slide please.

114

00:19:01.260 --> 00:19:12.420

Allen Richon: Um, when you go through the application submission section, there are two or three different avenues. One is ASSIST. The other is Grants.gov.

115

00:19:13.050 --> 00:19:27.540

Allen Richon: You will assemble your package and send it off to the system to be checked it will run through a preliminary check make sure that the application has all the pieces, make sure that they are consistent and so on. Once

116

00:19:32.700 --> 00:19:43.530

Allen Richon: that process is complete the application is sent into the eRACommons site, where you have for approximately two days to check for errors. If you find errors, you can correct them.

117

00:19:44.190 --> 00:19:51.180

Allen Richon: But after that two-day window, your application is essentially frozen and sent to DRR in the state that it's in.

118

00:19:51.990 --> 00:20:01.380

Allen Richon: DRR - the Division of Receipt and Referral - will then assign an Institute and, and a review group to look at the application.

119

00:20:01.920 --> 00:20:09.510

Allen Richon: They prescreened the applications to make sure that they comply with all the rules, regulations, font sizes, page sizes and all that.

120

00:20:10.170 --> 00:20:20.040

Allen Richon: Once they have finished their review, they will send it off to their IRG chief or Integrated, Integrated Review Group chief will assign this the application to study sections.

121

00:20:21.390 --> 00:20:26.970

Allen Richon: Um, so we got basically and then the SRO will make sure that it fits their

122

00:20:27.630 --> 00:20:39.540

Allen Richon: study section. They'll notify the applicants that you, that they have the application. You have a chance at that point to say, ‘wait I'm not comfortable with this,’ so there's, there's some back and forth during this period between

123

00:20:39.930 --> 00:20:47.610

Allen Richon: all of the divisions within NIH and you and we finally at the things set up and into the correct study section for review.

124

00:20:48.870 --> 00:20:49.830

Allen Richon: Um, next slide please.

125

00:20:57.330 --> 00:21:07.200

Allen Richon: Okay, the referral officer is one of the people that that you probably don't know a lot about. Um, that is kind of in the background, making sure that the system kicks off correctly.

126

00:21:07.620 --> 00:21:19.620

Allen Richon: This is a scientific review officer who has spent some time doing review, but they receive a significant amount of training in the art of referral, so they learn which Institutes have the

127

00:21:20.670 --> 00:21:33.990

Allen Richon: areas that might match your applications, they have the background to know which study sections have the best fit, they will be the ones that understand where all the rules and regulations are for each for each FOA or each

128

00:21:34.620 --> 00:21:40.260

Allen Richon: program announcement. They will match all of that, make sure the application complies and send it forward.

129

00:21:40.650 --> 00:21:50.190

Allen Richon: They work with the Institutes and Centers to make sure that the applications’ goals match NIH’s goals and they have the in-depth knowledge of each first study sections.

130

00:21:51.000 --> 00:21:57.300

Allen Richon: They have some input that you can provide them and that's the assignment request form that I was just talking about.

131

00:21:58.020 --> 00:22:06.930

Allen Richon: Here you can ask for a particular study section. If it matches, there's a 90% plus chance that it will be assigned to your request.

132

00:22:07.350 --> 00:22:17.670

Allen Richon: Occasionally you'll see applications that come in, where the PI is requesting a specific study section, but that study section only does RO1s and R21s. section only does our ones are 20 ones.

133

00:22:18.090 --> 00:22:28.710

Allen Richon: And so it may not go to, for example, GGG, which is a standing studies section for genomics. Um, it may instead go to IMST (15), which is the small business equivalent.

134

00:22:29.040 --> 00:22:36.090

Allen Richon: So, they will take care of all of that, but you have the chance, as a PI to request which study section you would like to have

135

00:22:36.420 --> 00:22:46.350

Allen Richon: the application go to. You also have the chance to recommend based on conversations with program officers that there's an Institute that you believe, has an interest in what you're doing.

136

00:22:47.670 --> 00:23:00.210

Allen Richon: At this point, you also have the chance to put together your list of companies and individuals who may be in conflict with your application and when we get into the conflict I'll go into a little bit more of that.

137

00:23:01.350 --> 00:23:02.700

Allen Richon: Next slide please.

138

00:23:06.930 --> 00:23:15.480

Allen Richon: The scientific review officer is the designated federal official for the review of the applications and for the review process.

139

00:23:15.990 --> 00:23:28.290

Allen Richon: We run under federal law that is defined by the Federal Advisory Committee act of 1972 and there are several points in that law that define what it is that we have to do.

140

00:23:29.010 --> 00:23:37.140

Allen Richon: We know that we have to have at least three reviewers look at every application. Those reviewers have to be in the room when the application is discussed.

141

00:23:37.740 --> 00:23:55.590

Allen Richon: We are generally PhD level, mid-level scientists with expertise related to the types of science, that are reviewed in the study section for SBIR. That means that we try and get people who have experience in small businesses who have experience in commercializing products and so on.

142

00:23:57.180 --> 00:23:59.190

Allen Richon: We also look at

143

00:24:00.330 --> 00:24:02.550

Allen Richon: doing a level of review,

144

00:24:04.050 --> 00:24:17.040

Allen Richon: basically, a precut for the applications to make sure that the applications match what is the scope of our particular study section. We do another check in terms of compliance to make sure that

145

00:24:18.180 --> 00:24:34.020

Allen Richon: applications haven't been overstuffed. That each application is complying with the rules and regulations. They're doing similar types of things, so you know Phase I is a six-page research plan, Phase II is 12 page-research plan with a 12-page commercialization plan and so on.

146

00:24:35.610 --> 00:24:43.980

Allen Richon: Once we have an idea of what is in our study section so each SRO will look at every single application that comes into their study section.

147

00:24:44.610 --> 00:24:53.760

Allen Richon: We will read it either fairly closely if it's something new to us at least we will read through it fairly quickly to understand what science is being done.

148

00:24:54.270 --> 00:25:04.950

Allen Richon: We then will recruit a panel, based on the content of those applications. This is where SBIR is different from the standard types of standing study sections.

149

00:25:05.370 --> 00:25:15.420

Allen Richon: And a standing study section, you have a specific type of science, which is being reviewed and it doesn't change that radically from round to round so you have a pretty good idea of what it is that’s coming at you.

150

00:25:15.930 --> 00:25:24.450

Allen Richon: In the SBIR world each round is going to be different. There might be a different blend of science, there might be a different mix of Phase I Phase IIs.

151

00:25:25.140 --> 00:25:40.260

Allen Richon: We really don't know from round to round. So, that means that that SBIR panels are special emphasis panels or SEPS and each round means that potentially we could have an entirely different panel, depending on the content of the applications that come in.

152

00:25:41.820 --> 00:25:45.480

Allen Richon: So, we will then recruit reviewers based on what we have

153

00:25:45.870 --> 00:25:56.160

Allen Richon: and make sure that those reviewers will give us the best review process for every application, make sure that the review is going to be consistent, follow all the rules, regulations, best practices.

154

00:25:56.820 --> 00:26:05.640

Allen Richon: SROs are going to be your initial point of contact, from the time the application comes into NIH until you receive your final summary statement.

155

00:26:06.090 --> 00:26:13.560

Allen Richon: Once the summary statement is released you go back to your program officer and work with them, so a little bit of a difference there. Next slide please.

156

00:26:18.360 --> 00:26:18.720

Allen Richon: Okay.

157

00:26:20.040 --> 00:26:36.660

Allen Richon: A lot of times we get questions: how do we find reviewers? Um we, as I said, recruit based on the expertise needed to look at the applications. We want people with demonstrated technical skills, scientific skills, market expertise and people who are impartial.

158

00:26:37.860 --> 00:26:51.360

Allen Richon: We preferably look for people who have experience in the SBIR program, so we want people with research support in the SBIR program, mostly small businesses or academicians who are starting small businesses.

159

00:26:52.650 --> 00:27:01.560

Allen Richon: We also look for people who are senior in their career so terminal PhD-MD, mature judgment, breadth of perspective,

160

00:27:02.520 --> 00:27:12.450

Allen Richon: upper-level management in the companies, and so, so we try and find people who are the highest quality for the area that we're working in.

161

00:27:13.110 --> 00:27:21.870

Allen Richon: Now I say try and find because this is a volunteer effort. Um, these are folks that agree to serve. They are,

162

00:27:22.470 --> 00:27:31.410

Allen Richon: you know, that the advantages that we give, at least when I was reviewing, the advantage to me when I came in as a reviewer was I was going to get to see a range of science, that I wouldn't

163

00:27:31.830 --> 00:27:40.590

Allen Richon: ordinarily see in my day job and that was great. So, you know. But everyone knows that they're busy. Everyone knows that they may not have the time.

164

00:27:40.950 --> 00:27:51.390

Allen Richon: So frequently we will go out as SROs. We will put out a lot of invitations and build the panel with the group that excee- accepts our invitations and comes in.

165

00:27:52.620 --> 00:27:53.940

Allen Richon: Our next slide please.

166

00:28:01.230 --> 00:28:01.590

Allen Richon: Okay.

167

00:28:02.670 --> 00:28:13.800

Allen Richon: As you can imagine, when you look at an SBIR application it’s going to have a range of techniques. It's going to have a range of types of things that they're going to do.

168

00:28:14.220 --> 00:28:27.270

Allen Richon: You have Phase I applications, you have Phase II applications, you have mixtures of both. So, what we look for our reviewers that come from academia, who can talk about the quality of the science.

169

00:28:28.380 --> 00:28:39.630

Allen Richon: We look for people from industry who are experienced using the tools that are being developed. We look for small businesses, because they have the experience and try to get products out to market.

170

00:28:40.020 --> 00:28:51.900

Allen Richon: And we also talk to tech transfer and VC investment firms, so that they have the view of what kinds of paperwork they need to see to get further funding and then really push this thing to market.

171

00:28:52.650 --> 00:29:01.530

Allen Richon: We encourage all of our study sections to have 25% of the panel being made up of small business or other industry members.

172

00:29:02.040 --> 00:29:07.260

Allen Richon: Keep in mind, though, we can invite, but that doesn't mean that people are going to accept, so the goal is 25%.

173

00:29:07.830 --> 00:29:15.420

Allen Richon: We also look for representation from underrepresented minorities, from women, from geographically diverse people.

174

00:29:15.960 --> 00:29:24.720

Allen Richon: We also look for fresh perspective, so you know someone that has been working on a panel for 15 years is probably going to be a little bit,

175

00:29:25.230 --> 00:29:36.900

Allen Richon: shall we see staid in their view, so we want to avoid excess service on a given panel that generally means that reviewers are invited to serve for roughly 12 study sections.

176

00:29:37.260 --> 00:29:43.920

Allen Richon: And that can be spread over three years, four years, six years, whatever, but at the end of that time we try and rotate people off.

177

00:29:44.730 --> 00:29:53.220

Allen Richon: So that's that's kind of a quick background of of what we're looking at in terms of the types of people. Um, I will put in a plug here

178

00:29:53.670 --> 00:30:03.390

Allen Richon: to request that if you're interested in doing this contact me as the SBIR coordinator. I am more than happy to send people who are interested in reviewing

179

00:30:03.720 --> 00:30:11.640

Allen Richon: on to the study sections where they would be a good match. I also have a database that has roughly 10,000 people in it right now

180

00:30:12.240 --> 00:30:30.810

Allen Richon: who are interested in doing SBIR and we can do keyword searches on those people, so if you're, if you're interested and you would like to try it out, let me know, please. Um, I think my email addresses is in this presentation somewhere, if not I'll pop it up, at some point in time. Next slide please.

181

00:30:32.220 --> 00:30:38.490

Allen Richon: The construct is pretty simple it's Allen dot Richon at N-I-H dot gov. Okay, where do we find reviewers?

182

00:30:39.150 --> 00:30:54.030

Allen Richon: Absolutely successful applicants, so we will look for within our NIH databases, the types of people who would be submitting the applications in the study sections that we run who have been funded at a Phase I, Phase II and beyond level.

183

00:30:55.050 --> 00:31:06.750

Allen Richon: There are several commercial products out there, including dimensions which allow searches based on keywords for patent documents. We also run LinkedIn keyword searches and groups. We do keep.

184

00:31:07.440 --> 00:31:15.780

Allen Richon: Google keyword searches. There are, as you know, regional incubator hubs where scientists are working to develop their products.

185

00:31:16.470 --> 00:31:21.900

Allen Richon: We also have nonprofits. We have the academic technology transfer groups.

186

00:31:22.440 --> 00:31:36.840

Allen Richon: Professional societies and like I said volunteers from industry, so anywhere we can look to find reviewers we're going to be searching in those locations to find the people that are qualified to look at the applications that we're reviewing. Next slide please.

187

00:31:41.910 --> 00:31:46.110

Allen Richon: Alright, once the applications come in, now the SRO’s first

188

00:31:47.160 --> 00:31:58.080

Allen Richon: role is to find the panels which we've just talked about, and then figure out how they're going to take the pile of applications. They have and assign them to the reviewers that they have recruited.

189

00:31:58.860 --> 00:32:11.190

Allen Richon: Now, as I said, we are required by law to have three reviewers assigned to each application and complex applications, we may have more so, it could be anywhere from three to five reviewers per application.

190

00:32:12.060 --> 00:32:23.940

Allen Richon: We will match expertise of the panel members to the content of the application, keeping in mind that each application is not dedicated to one particular thing.

191

00:32:24.390 --> 00:32:29.370

Allen Richon: They may have an instrument that they are looking to do genomic sequencing with.

192

00:32:30.030 --> 00:32:35.820

Allen Richon: For that type of application, you need someone that understands what the current state of the art is with genome sequencing.

193

00:32:36.060 --> 00:32:45.330

Allen Richon: Someone who understands where the instrumentation is in that particular area and then someone that might understand how to get the product to the next stage - so different types of expertise.

194

00:32:46.890 --> 00:32:57.990

Allen Richon: Five to six weeks before the meeting we will assign the application to the reviewer pools, and they will be trained on what it is that we expect of them and try and match

195

00:32:58.590 --> 00:33:05.220

Allen Richon: their view of what an application does to what we expect in the SBIR-STTR program and we will provide

196

00:33:06.180 --> 00:33:12.810

Allen Richon: probably more training than anyone wants to know about, I mean the slide deck that I have is 97 slides, which

197

00:33:13.470 --> 00:33:24.900

Allen Richon: is a bit much I know but it's easy to go through. But we do train all of our reviewers. If people have questions, we also offer them the ability to contact us at any time.

198

00:33:25.470 --> 00:33:36.420

Allen Richon: We also, as a group, will look at the critiques as they post them to make sure that they match the kinds of things we're looking for; that the statements that they're making are not off the wall.

199

00:33:37.320 --> 00:33:47.280

Allen Richon: You know just just as a first level look before they're released to the panel and before they become part of the review process. Okay next slide please.

200

00:33:51.300 --> 00:34:03.300

Allen Richon: One of the things that that PIs will frequently asked about naturally is conflicts of interest, and that is one of the three areas that and I actually focus on.

201

00:34:04.170 --> 00:34:09.180

Allen Richon: That we spend a lot of time managing that we spend a lot of time in covering and that we.

202

00:34:09.870 --> 00:34:19.590

Allen Richon: try and make sure we have as few as possible, so conflict of interest, confidentiality and research misconduct are the three topics that that we really hit on.

203

00:34:20.070 --> 00:34:35.520

Allen Richon: For conflicts of interest, there are three levels that we can look at. You can let us know, as I said that you have a problem with particular individuals or particular companies and you use the assignment request form to do that when you're submitting your application.

204

00:34:37.110 --> 00:34:46.680

Allen Richon: Now please keep in mind that you don't get to say, I want to exclude all reviewers that have to do with zebrafish if you're submitting a zebrafish application because, obviously, if that's the case.

205

00:34:46.950 --> 00:35:00.960

Allen Richon: We can't find people who are knowledgeable enough to review the application. So, while we encourage you to identify particular companies and particular individuals who might be a problem for you, don't go crazy.

206

00:35:02.400 --> 00:35:06.150

Allen Richon: In addition to that, the rosters are published 30 days prior to the meeting.

207

00:35:06.660 --> 00:35:14.700

Allen Richon: So please be on the lookout when, you know, you've been told, when the meeting is roughly 30 days before that you can look at the roster.

208

00:35:15.180 --> 00:35:21.090

Allen Richon: And it is on our it's on the government website for the meeting. You can look at the roster.

209

00:35:21.570 --> 00:35:30.960

Allen Richon: And if you see someone that you haven't caught before that you know is going to be a problem, immediately contact the SRO and let them know about your concern.

210

00:35:31.440 --> 00:35:42.210

Allen Richon: We will do everything that we can to manage the conflicts and, believe me, we take them all very seriously and try and take care of them before the review continues for too long.

211

00:35:43.500 --> 00:35:49.620

Allen Richon: Okay, so that's that's the applicants input to managing conflicts of interest. Next slide please.

212

00:35:53.460 --> 00:35:59.010

Allen Richon: So the SRO is going to be looking at a lot of different aspects.

213

00:35:59.610 --> 00:36:11.280

Allen Richon: If reviewers come in who have a major role in any application that's in the meeting, they can't participate in the review, because obviously they're going to bring way too much bias into to the

214

00:36:11.760 --> 00:36:22.770

Allen Richon: review to be useful. If there are letters of support in the application, where the potential reviewer is going to be a major component of the

215

00:36:24.240 --> 00:36:32.970

Allen Richon: scientific project or if they're going to be providing some type of support and being compensated for it then there's an issue there.

216

00:36:33.450 --> 00:36:46.140

Allen Richon: If, however, letter of support is generic, this is really great. I'm looking forward to seeing it then you know it's it's a little bit different than that. They, well, they might be excluded from reviewing the application, they are allowed to participate in the meeting.

217

00:36:49.890 --> 00:37:03.930

Allen Richon: We do not allow people that are employed by the same organization to review applications from that organization. Now, there's a three letter three-year limit on that so if they leave the organization three four years later and an application comes in that's not a problem.

218

00:37:05.160 --> 00:37:18.120

Allen Richon: Co-authors on publications, collaborations and so on three-year limit again, in this case it's once again the ah, you can't review the application, but you can participate in the meeting

219

00:37:19.170 --> 00:37:27.450

Allen Richon: We do not allow members of NI-, any NIH advisory council to participate in review, because that constitutes an undue influence.

220

00:37:28.230 --> 00:37:39.450

Allen Richon: If an application is responding to a specific RFA, if key personnel, even if the application is not part of the group that has been reviewed by this SRO, they can't be on the study section.

221

00:37:41.220 --> 00:37:47.970

Allen Richon: Right and then we have the whole issue of frequently serving panel members, so if a panel member has been in the

222

00:37:48.570 --> 00:37:56.490

Allen Richon: particular IRG four times within the last six years they submit an application to that study section then they're going to be out of the meeting.

223

00:37:56.790 --> 00:38:09.150

Allen Richon: So those are the kinds of things that the SRO worries about. They're they're the types of conflicts that are pretty well defined, you can find them doing searches comparisons. And, so, um, next slide please.

224

00:38:15.270 --> 00:38:30.510

Allen Richon: Reviewers also have a part in they can identify applications where they do not feel comfortable because their work is in direct competition with the applicants proposed work so, for example, let's say you're working on

225

00:38:31.380 --> 00:38:38.760

Allen Richon: myocardial infarction and you have a particular gene structure that you're looking at that you think is important, um,

226

00:38:39.450 --> 00:38:48.570

Allen Richon: if applications come in from that area, you're probably not going to want to review them because there's a potential down the road that through freedom of information,

227

00:38:49.080 --> 00:39:01.350

Allen Richon: the company can say this person was on this grant application, they obviously understood what we were doing, they used it further research in their own company and we're going to sue them.

228

00:39:02.040 --> 00:39:10.260

Allen Richon: So to in order to avoid that a lot of the companies will have their attorneys look at the types of applications.

229

00:39:10.560 --> 00:39:15.480

Allen Richon: And they will recommend to the reviewer what they can and can't look at. That's true for bigger companies.

230

00:39:15.780 --> 00:39:23.220

Allen Richon: For smaller companies it's the individuals, the reviewer if they look at an application and we give you the chance before you see anything.

231

00:39:23.580 --> 00:39:39.600

Allen Richon: To look at the name of the institution that the reviewers and the title of the project if that sets alarm bells you can talk to the SRO and say, ‘Okay, based on the conversation I'm not comfortable reviewing this application and we will put you in conflict.’ So,

232

00:39:41.760 --> 00:39:50.040

Allen Richon: there is, as I said that the three levels of removing reducing conflicts of interest. Okay, so the next slide please.

233

00:39:51.480 --> 00:39:52.440

Allen Richon: And this is all before

234

00:39:53.460 --> 00:40:01.560

Allen Richon: we've even turned applications over to people, so the kinds of conflicts that we're talking about are shown here personal, professional, financial,

235

00:40:02.100 --> 00:40:11.370

Allen Richon: institutional, personal biases, long-time disagreements and so on. So those are, those are the kinds of issues that we asked people to consider. Next slide.

236

00:40:16.530 --> 00:40:30.840

Allen Richon: One of the things that we are very cognizant of is the whole issue of confidentiality. I mean you as an applicant are turning over basically the jewels of your company to a group of people to look at and evaluate.

237

00:40:31.980 --> 00:40:42.810

Allen Richon: As part of that reviewers, before they are allowed to even see the list of applications, are required to complete ethics training. They are required to sign a confidentiality agreement.

238

00:40:43.320 --> 00:40:51.810

Allen Richon: Before they read any application and they are required to assert to NIH legally that they will keep all materials confidential.

239

00:40:52.230 --> 00:40:58.290

Allen Richon: and confidential means that they can't talk to their colleagues about them, they can't talk to their spouses they can't talk to anyone.

240

00:40:58.770 --> 00:41:10.770

Allen Richon: Any of the materials can only be reviewed by them, they can only discuss the applications in the review meeting and they can only discuss issues with their SRO so that's

241

00:41:12.300 --> 00:41:13.050

Allen Richon: the first level.

242

00:41:14.280 --> 00:41:19.740

Allen Richon: At the end of the review meeting the reviewers must destroy or return any review related materials.

243

00:41:20.310 --> 00:41:30.360

Allen Richon: All the review meetings are closed to the public, so no one can listen in to the discussions and reviewers don't get to discuss the review proceedings with anyone except the SRO.

244

00:41:30.810 --> 00:41:39.810

Allen Richon: Not even to the extent of going out in the hallway and talking about the two reviews that you did before with your colleagues before the

245

00:41:40.290 --> 00:41:54.870

Allen Richon: meeting is reconvened, so it's really done basically in a bubble. You have a group of applications, you have a group of people, you get together you discuss those, you've come to conclusions and that's the end of it, everything else is is done.

246

00:41:55.950 --> 00:42:12.030

Allen Richon: One of the parts of that is that applicants are not permitted to communicate with any member of a study section about applications, they only can contact and discuss the application and what's going on with the SRO or with their program officer. Next slide please.

247

00:42:16.710 --> 00:42:26.370

Allen Richon: As I said, these are bound by laws of the federal advisory committee act, there are consequences for breaching confidentiality and COI.

248

00:42:27.480 --> 00:42:36.060

Allen Richon: Reviewers are told that they are ad hoc advisors to the federal government, and that is a formal legal role. Rules and regulations are co defined in FACA [Federal Advisory Committee Act].

249

00:42:36.900 --> 00:42:42.720

Allen Richon: they will legally certified lack of conflict of interest that three different stages of the review.

250

00:42:43.710 --> 00:42:48.750

Allen Richon: The first stage is before they see the application, the second stage is once they've looked at the application.

251

00:42:48.990 --> 00:43:04.920

Allen Richon: And the third stage is after the review to make sure that nothing has ticked their COI flag during the discussion of any of the applications. So, three different documents that they signed legally attesting to the fact they don't have a conflict in reviewing those applications.

252

00:43:06.300 --> 00:43:09.510

Allen Richon: If it has found that there is a problem with any of that,

253

00:43:09.900 --> 00:43:23.190

Allen Richon: they can be removed from study sections reviewers can be they can be barred from feature service they can be barred from receiving federal funding and cases can and have been referred to the office of the Inspector General for prosecution.

254

00:43:23.580 --> 00:43:39.060

Allen Richon: And some of those will appear in the notices that you see of legal action that that NIH has taken so we take this seriously. We have several systems that look into how to manage it, and there are consequences for violating it.

255

00:43:40.230 --> 00:43:41.730

Allen Richon: All right next slide please.

256

00:43:47.580 --> 00:43:52.590

Allen Richon: Okay now let's get down to some nuts and bolts, now that we scared everyone to death um.

257

00:43:53.970 --> 00:44:02.400

Allen Richon: What is it that we tell reviewers to look for in SBIR applications? There are several things first.

258

00:44:03.180 --> 00:44:14.220

Allen Richon: SBIR is a mixture of science and product, so what we are asking people to look at is what is the need for the product that’s envisioned by the science that's being developed?

259

00:44:14.610 --> 00:44:28.800

Allen Richon: Is there going to be something somewhere down the road and it doesn't have to be this year, next year, but there has to be a vision for where this thing is going and how it's going to turn to a product that the marketplace is looking to spend money to support.

260

00:44:30.390 --> 00:44:36.240

Allen Richon: How is the product going to change things? Will it improve practices over what's being done?

261

00:44:36.630 --> 00:44:43.650

Allen Richon: Is it a first in class? Is it something that no one has thought of before? Is it, you know, going to make life really interesting?

262

00:44:44.100 --> 00:44:55.110

Allen Richon: One of the things that we really tried to drive home to our reviewers is that you don't need to look at an application as being innovative, because it is something that's brand new science.

263

00:44:55.590 --> 00:45:07.260

Allen Richon: An innovative application in an SBIR world is something that takes known types of information and combines it in a unique way. Our example is with a drug.

264

00:45:08.100 --> 00:45:14.640

Allen Richon: If you try and go to the FDA with something that is totally unknown, that has no basis in science, that is, the first thing class,

265

00:45:14.940 --> 00:45:25.950

Allen Richon: it's going to take you much, much longer to convince them to consider it than, if you are saying here's a logical extension for how we're doing things; here's how it's going to change things and here's the difference it's going to make the world.

266

00:45:26.340 --> 00:45:34.980

Allen Richon: So you know it's it's not that we demand innovation from the pure science point of view but it's from the product developed as well.

267

00:45:37.620 --> 00:45:51.180

Allen Richon: And this is consistent, no matter what type of application you're coming in, so for a Phase I application where you're doing a feasibility study, yes, you're generating data that you are going to use to continue the development, but in that

268

00:45:52.350 --> 00:46:01.170

Allen Richon: application you've got to convince the reviewers that there is something there that's another that will develop into something interesting and useful as a product later on.

269

00:46:01.470 --> 00:46:06.180

Allen Richon: Phase two obviously you’ve got to get closer to the marketplace, you have a 12-page commercialization plan.

270

00:46:06.450 --> 00:46:15.090

Allen Richon: That you can put together that tells the the reviewer here's our company, here's our plan, here's the market, here's the market poll, here is the kind of

271

00:46:15.480 --> 00:46:24.450

Allen Richon: emphasis it's going to make and change it's going to make, here's the amount of money we need to develop that and here are the plans going forward. Next slide please.

272

00:46:30.060 --> 00:46:35.310

Allen Richon: So, what are the issues that we commonly see the reviewers commonly point out.

273

00:46:37.680 --> 00:46:57.330

Allen Richon: Um, the top one is that there is a problem that's being addressed that is really a minor interest; it has an unconvincing case for how it's going to be developed into a commercial product; it doesn't have any chance of making an impact on the way long practices are conducted or

274

00:46:58.590 --> 00:46:59.610

Allen Richon: the market response.

275

00:47:01.560 --> 00:47:11.280

Allen Richon: If there is an inadequate consideration of the scientific literature, so this is the rigor of prior research, what is it that you're basing your work on.

276

00:47:11.940 --> 00:47:19.080

Allen Richon: Obviously, if you come in to the SBIR program and you're going to be proposing that you're developing a time machine,

277

00:47:19.620 --> 00:47:31.590

Allen Richon: there are very few people that are going to be interested in that so you have to give us some kind of an indication that here is the foundation upon which my work is going to make a difference.

278

00:47:32.370 --> 00:47:41.430

Allen Richon: If you have a lack of knowledge of the technologies in the marketplace that's a killer a lot of reviewers will say well you know the

279

00:47:42.180 --> 00:47:44.760

Allen Richon: software product that they're talking about here for doing

280

00:47:45.480 --> 00:47:56.160

Allen Richon: variant calling is purely very interesting, but you know, there are six others out there already and they don't talk about those at all, they don't compare to them, they haven't done any of the preliminary work, so I just don't

281

00:47:57.000 --> 00:48:00.330

Allen Richon: accept that this is something that's going to go anywhere that's a big problem.

282

00:48:01.560 --> 00:48:10.740

Allen Richon: There should be a very firm foundation for what you're doing as well as a reasonable approach to the experimental work that you're doing.

283

00:48:11.520 --> 00:48:17.220

Allen Richon: You should have the problems you know potential problems outline.

284

00:48:17.550 --> 00:48:24.090

Allen Richon: Alternative solutions outlined and, yes, I know you've only got six pages in a Phase I to do this, but you can at least give a sentence or two

285

00:48:24.390 --> 00:48:36.210

Allen Richon: that says, this is what we're after and that's what reviewers are going to look for. Um, incomplete detail. Don't think that you can do a ‘trust me’ because, believe me, the review panel doesn't.

286

00:48:37.680 --> 00:48:51.660

Allen Richon: Expert expertise in the essential methodology, so when you're putting your bio sketches together you haven't demonstrated that you know what you're doing in this particular area or a member of your team does so that that's also very important.

287

00:48:52.740 --> 00:49:03.180

Allen Richon: Weak milestones, lack of scientific rigor unrealistic amount of work, a lot of times, we will see an application come in as eight years of work crammed into two years.

288

00:49:03.600 --> 00:49:20.070

Allen Richon: And the reviewers will look at it and say I don't see how it is possible that this can be done, therefore, there is no significance, and therefore the score is going to be dinged appropriately so those are the kinds of big picture, things that that really derail an application um.

289

00:49:21.240 --> 00:49:21.720

Allen Richon: Next slide.

290

00:49:27.510 --> 00:49:39.930

Allen Richon: Right. So those are the the overview. Now, how about the nuts and bolts of the peer review system is guided by an SBIR STTR template that we have. It's.

291

00:49:40.560 --> 00:49:52.470

Allen Richon: linked on IAR on every application and NIH, for better or worse, has decided, our scale is one is exceptional, is nine is poor so every five criterion:

292

00:49:52.710 --> 00:49:59.550

Allen Richon: the significance, the quality of the investigators, the innovation, the approach the environments, are all graded on a one through nine scale.

293

00:49:59.880 --> 00:50:11.820

Allen Richon: And then there are additional review criteria that considering, are you using human subjects, do you consider biological variables, hHave you taken care of biohazards, do you treat animals humanely?

294

00:50:12.930 --> 00:50:22.080

Allen Richon: If it's a resubmission, have you addressed some of the problems that were done in the previous review? So, all of that goes into what is the overall impact.

295

00:50:22.590 --> 00:50:31.950

Allen Richon: And, as I have said, I hope, it's sunk in a bit is that the review process is focused, not just on science, but on the product that will eventually come out.

296

00:50:32.670 --> 00:50:42.600

Allen Richon: And each of each of the applications by the three reviewers will be given a preliminary overall impact score and that will be loaded into the IAR system.

297

00:50:43.440 --> 00:50:56.610

Allen Richon: Once we have all the scores for all the applications, these are rank ordered and the top 50% of those scores will be discussed at a face to face or Zoom meeting, as the case may be, at the current time.

298

00:50:57.180 --> 00:51:09.030

Allen Richon: So top 50% of scores, accounting for anytime so if there are six applications a score of 4.3 and the cutoff lines 4.3 all six of those applications will be discussed.

299

00:51:10.650 --> 00:51:12.090

Allen Richon: Next slide please.

300

00:51:17.010 --> 00:51:27.030

Allen Richon: Okay um once about a week before the meeting all of these are uploaded into the system and we try and put the order of review together.

301

00:51:28.350 --> 00:51:37.320

Allen Richon: We will - the SRO will check for missing information for errors on mismatch scores and comments and it's not unusual

302

00:51:37.710 --> 00:51:53.280

Allen Richon: that you're reading the comments and they're glowing and the scores are, eight, nine and you know the mistake has been made and that the reviewer has reversed the scoring scale so you'll get in touch with them and say there seems to be a problem here. We'll fix it and go on from there.

303

00:51:54.690 --> 00:52:05.220

Allen Richon: Applications in the SBIRworld are divided into two clusters: the Phase I applications are in one group and the Phase II, Fast-Track, Direct-to-Phase IIs are in a second cluster.

304

00:52:05.880 --> 00:52:18.420

Allen Richon: The top scoring applications are within each cluster so Phase Is are clustered top 50% are discussed, we then moved the Phase II, Fast-Tracks. Fifty percent of those are discussed.

305

00:52:20.670 --> 00:52:28.620

Allen Richon: All right, when we do the actual meeting, though, we will randomize the score order for discussion, so people don't get in a rough.

306

00:52:29.580 --> 00:52:36.360

Allen Richon: One of the things that we found is that if you have all the really good ones, the beginning and all the mediocre ones in the middle.

307

00:52:37.110 --> 00:52:56.610

Allen Richon: The review criteria subtly changes so we try and mix and match, so that everyone is looking at each application fresh and the chair and the SRO will listen for changes in discussion tenor and make sure that that the consistency is is maintained throughout the entire discussion.

308

00:52:57.690 --> 00:52:58.860

Allen Richon: Next slide please.

309

00:53:04.380 --> 00:53:06.930

Allen Richon: So, how does this work at the meeting?

310

00:53:08.010 --> 00:53:13.680

Allen Richon: I'm, the Chair will announce the title and PI for the application that’s going to be looked at.

311

00:53:15.090 --> 00:53:25.170

Allen Richon: They will announce the conflicts. We will get them out of the room either virtually or physically and then the reviewer names are announced, and they will provide their initial scores.

312

00:53:25.650 --> 00:53:41.040

Allen Richon: Now there are three stages of scoring within application review. There is the preliminary overall impact score that the reviewer puts down, based on their read of the application, without any outside influence.

313

00:53:42.720 --> 00:53:51.450

Allen Richon: The next point is, at the meeting they have had a week to read their colleagues’ comments and those comments may or may not make a difference in how they view the application.

314

00:53:51.930 --> 00:53:59.250

Allen Richon: So at the point where the Chair asks for the scores, they are given the option of changing their score.

315

00:54:00.030 --> 00:54:03.780

Allen Richon: So second time, the third time is the final score and that's down at the bottom here.

316

00:54:04.230 --> 00:54:10.830

Allen Richon: So then reviewer one will summarize the application in a couple of sentences, list of major strengths and weaknesses that drove their score.

317

00:54:11.250 --> 00:54:21.030

Allen Richon: On talk about human subjects inclusions, vertebrate animals and so on reviewer to will then provide any new points or disagreements that are not covered by reviewer one.

318

00:54:21.480 --> 00:54:29.070

Allen Richon: If the rating is better, they focus on the strengths. If the rating is worse, they'll highlight differences in terms of weaknesses. Reviewer three does the same thing.

319

00:54:29.610 --> 00:54:39.300

Allen Richon: Once that discussion has been presented, that application is opened to the panel to ask questions, make comments and discuss it.

320

00:54:40.830 --> 00:54:49.800

Allen Richon: After that discussion, the Chair will summarize, and all of the panel is asked to score the application, based on the discussion now.

321

00:54:50.820 --> 00:55:01.020

Allen Richon: Let me restate that every panel Member will score every application that they're not in conflict with and every application that's discussed so.

322

00:55:01.830 --> 00:55:13.260

Allen Richon: that's what comes out. Although the assigned reviewers will restate their scores, um, the Chair at the time when the scoring is opened up to the panel will ask if anyone

323

00:55:14.100 --> 00:55:19.920

Allen Richon: disagrees with the way the discussion went. So, let's say we have an application that scored two through five.

324

00:55:20.640 --> 00:55:27.210

Allen Richon: It might be that a reviewer has listened to the conversation and feels that the application is not as

325

00:55:28.050 --> 00:55:38.160

Allen Richon: bad as presented or not as good as presented, they may feel that the scientific issues that were discussed are more important or less important, and for that reason they can score out of range.

326

00:55:38.970 --> 00:55:46.800

Allen Richon: We only ask that they state that they're scoring out of range, so we know who it is and that the reason that they're doing so has been discussed.

327

00:55:47.220 --> 00:56:01.950

Allen Richon: The reason for that is that if a reviewer has information that is pertinent to the review that changes what the review is they should bring it up at the discussion and not keep it secret to themselves and score, for that reason.

328

00:56:03.570 --> 00:56:06.780

Allen Richon: Okay next slide please I think we're just about at the end on these.

329

00:56:10.800 --> 00:56:34.200

Allen Richon: Okay, so we have gone through what happens with the CSR’s scientific review, how it is the study section gets the applications, what it is that we do. The final take home on the last slide is I want everyone to understand that this is a process that, next slide please, um that has been

330

00:56:35.340 --> 00:56:46.620

Allen Richon: put together over a very long period of time, has been worked on to make sure the applications are screened by several groups of people to ensure the best fit that the policies and procedures and federal laws

331

00:56:47.250 --> 00:56:52.710

Allen Richon: are followed, and they are dividing the process. Reviewers are selected, vetted, and trained.

332

00:56:53.820 --> 00:56:59.100

Allen Richon: For the folks that don't do well at a study section they won't be invited back. Conflicts are checked.

333

00:56:59.730 --> 00:57:11.160

Allen Richon: We make sure that confidentiality is done and we want to make sure that every application receives the same level of review with a uniformly supplied set of rules.

334

00:57:11.550 --> 00:57:28.230

Allen Richon: Our uniformly set of expectations and that we have several levels of checks and balances before the information goes to program for them to make their decision on where they're going and how they best fit their particular areas, and with that I will be happy to answer questions.

335

00:57:30.540 --> 00:57:32.430

Allen Richon: I'm sure we have a couple on the chat session.

336

00:57:32.640 --> 00:57:43.350

Monique LaRocque: Yes, we do. Thank you so much for that thorough review. We have gotten some questions coming through. Some that relate specifically to the CSR process and some that relate to

337

00:57:43.950 --> 00:57:55.800

Monique LaRocque: general SBIR applications and STTR as well, so I'm going to focus first on the review process question. Is there an application process to become a reviewer?

338

00:57:57.060 --> 00:57:58.530

Allen Richon: There is not a process.

339

00:57:59.640 --> 00:58:09.450

Allen Richon: It is more if you're interested contact me, I will initiate a phone call or Zoom call with you and let you know what it is you're getting into.

340

00:58:10.170 --> 00:58:11.520

Allen Richon: Because it does take time. I mean,

341

00:58:11.520 --> 00:58:21.330

Allen Richon: these things for Phase II, you're looking at four or five hours of your time to look at an application, figure out what they're doing and make comments on it and you're going to be given somewhere between

342

00:58:22.080 --> 00:58:31.590

Allen Richon: anywhere between six and nine applications, so you know multiply that you've got a commitment of time and we really appreciate it that that you need to understand.

343

00:58:32.820 --> 00:58:42.000

Allen Richon: Once you express interest, I will be happy to send you the slide deck in terms of what it is that reviewers look for or I mean that's always looked for from reviewers.

344

00:58:42.420 --> 00:58:56.910

Allen Richon: And then you can also sign up for the early career reviewer database to volunteer to do a preliminary dive into a study section where you'll get a limited number of assignments. You'll see what it's all about you can decide if you want to continue.

345

00:58:58.470 --> 00:58:58.950

Monique LaRocque: Thank you.

346

00:59:00.180 --> 00:59:07.290

Monique LaRocque: So, we had someone who asked about how do we determine, you know, which reviewers in the study roster are most appropriate to review a particular grant application.

347

00:59:07.590 --> 00:59:22.920

Monique LaRocque: I think you covered that but just to dig a little further if someone feels like the reviewers identified may not be a right fit, is there a way that they can find that out, or can they make a specific request when they submit an application of what kind of review with it like to include?

348

00:59:23.220 --> 00:59:35.850

Allen Richon: You can submit in the assignment request form, or you can request particular disciplines or expertise. There's a space in there to do that.

349

00:59:36.180 --> 00:59:50.550

Allen Richon: And that will help the SRO guide the selection of their reviewers. You cannot suggest a specific person, so you can't ask for your brother Tom to be here the reviewer on your application. Sorry.

350

00:59:51.240 --> 01:00:01.620

Monique LaRocque: Thank you for that clarification. Much appreciate it. So, how can someone find the roster of members reviewing the application? Can you just give another review of that?

351

01:00:01.920 --> 01:00:11.700

Allen Richon: Yeah, the federal government publishes it in the Federal Registry, the list of all of the scientific of all the peer review meetings that are going on.

352

01:00:12.120 --> 01:00:20.880

Allen Richon: And 30 days before the meeting, they will also publish the list that's on the roster roster list so you can go and look at that it's on the federal government site.

353

01:00:22.350 --> 01:00:38.880

Allen Richon: If you just do a search in Google for, for example, I run the CRP review. Commercialization Readiness Program that's IMST (19). So, you know that your application is in that list, do a search in Google and request informational line IMST (19).

354

01:00:41.700 --> 01:00:45.780

Monique LaRocque: Reviewers have a discussion to generate the preliminary overall impact score.

355

01:00:46.470 --> 01:00:53.550

Allen Richon: Know that is based on their review of the application. They are doing it on in a vacuum, if you will.

356

01:00:53.970 --> 01:01:02.220

Allen Richon: And we get the three reviewers, which is why we try and give a week before the actual meeting so they can look and see what each other has said.

357

01:01:02.700 --> 01:01:17.400

Allen Richon: And that can then provide a means of modifying some of the first step as an independent review, so your expertise match to that application and what you think of it, based on your experience and your training.

358

01:01:20.430 --> 01:01:27.900

Monique LaRocque: How is that final in impact score is is determined? You're saying that they do that by themselves, and do you average them out

359

01:01:32.010 --> 01:01:33.240

Monique LaRocque: looking across the reviewers?

360

01:01:42.420 --> 01:01:43.620

Monique LaRocque: Dr. Richon, you're on mute.

361

01:01:47.130 --> 01:01:53.190

Allen Richon: Not sure how that happened I'm okay. So, the first there three types of

362

01:01:54.660 --> 01:02:03.570

Allen Richon: three points in time, where the review scores are done the first is the reviewer who reads the application.

363

01:02:04.080 --> 01:02:08.280

Allen Richon: on their own and that's the preliminary overland all impact so that's score one.

364

01:02:08.940 --> 01:02:15.690

Allen Richon: Those get uploaded to the system, and you can see, the three scores, you can see what other reviewers have said, you can read their comments.

365

01:02:16.110 --> 01:02:22.080

Allen Richon: You can decide that, based on their comments, you maybe overlooked something or you thought something was important, but it wasn't,

366

01:02:22.500 --> 01:02:35.310

Allen Richon: You know, based on your read of theirs, you can add the meeting when scores are asked for the initial start of the discussion, you can change your score. So let's say you had a score of five when you did it by yourself.

367

01:02:35.910 --> 01:02:44.130

Allen Richon: After reading the other two critiques you look at it and say ‘Oh I didn't understand that it was doing this, this is my view of this application now is that it's a three.’

368

01:02:44.760 --> 01:02:47.940

Allen Richon: And so that started the discussion your score will be a three.

369

01:02:48.690 --> 01:02:56.310

Allen Richon: Now, when the meetings going on, you have input from the three reviewers, but you also have input from the entire panel.

370

01:02:56.670 --> 01:03:03.660

Allen Richon: So, there will be people on that panel that have expertise in that particular area. They just weren't assigned to the application.

371

01:03:04.200 --> 01:03:14.370

Allen Richon: And they may have comments questions and critiques that will change the score again, and that is the final overall impact score, so the score that's reported back to

372

01:03:14.730 --> 01:03:26.940

Allen Richon: The API and to program the final overall impact score is the score of every person in the room during that discussion averaged and multiplied by 10.

373

01:03:28.980 --> 01:03:34.230

Monique LaRocque: You, there are a number of questions that I'll just summarize that relate to concerns about

374

01:03:35.640 --> 01:03:39.120

Monique LaRocque: IP and I know you did talk about that,

375

01:03:40.620 --> 01:03:53.400

Monique LaRocque: you know, in in your discussion. Has there ever been an issue that in because we're seeing some questions about you know, has this ever happened? And if it does what, what do you do when there's an IP breach?

376

01:03:54.120 --> 01:03:54.540

Of.

377

01:03:55.770 --> 01:04:09.780

Allen Richon: It I all right I’ve been at NIH for 12 years and I was in small business for 20 some years before that, both submitting applications reviewing applications, I have not heard of

378

01:04:10.590 --> 01:04:20.160

Allen Richon: a significant IP breach that resulted in a product being stolen or an area of research being stolen. Um.

379

01:04:20.820 --> 01:04:29.550

Allen Richon: I have heard of minor issues where someone comes back and says, ‘Wow this statistical technique that was used in this particular application

380

01:04:29.850 --> 01:04:41.670

Allen Richon: looks really interesting and it might work for the kinds of data we're dealing with.’ Um so you know that type of thing, yes, but for a major breach of intellectual property, no.

381

01:04:43.950 --> 01:04:57.750

Allen Richon: As I said, the problem that you run into is that if you as a reviewer are looking at an application and can see that there's a major over overlap.

382

01:04:58.740 --> 01:05:09.510

Allen Richon: The people that are submitted the application do have legal recourse to come after you, and so, by and large reviewers are very careful about what it is that they will look at.

383

01:05:12.060 --> 01:05:12.600

Monique LaRocque: Wonderful.

384

01:05:15.660 --> 01:05:23.550

Monique LaRocque: So what happened to the bottom 50% of the applications? Are they only read or seen by those three viewers and do they receive summary statements, based on these?

385

01:05:24.180 --> 01:05:27.990

Allen Richon: They are only seen by the three reviewers. Smmary statements are.

386

01:05:28.440 --> 01:05:42.390

Allen Richon: put together by full by the SRO for all of the application submitted, so the the applicants will see the three comments from the reviewers, the only thing that they will not see is the summary of the discussion because they weren't discussed.

387

01:05:44.910 --> 01:05:51.900

Monique LaRocque: Thank you, and can you discuss the submission process or any tips that you have for folks on that.

388

01:05:52.260 --> 01:05:54.690

Monique LaRocque: One particular question, we also have is,

389

01:05:55.350 --> 01:06:02.670

Monique LaRocque: you know, if you are resubmitting do you get the same reviewers so that they can see the changes that are made, or would they be different?

390

01:06:03.450 --> 01:06:19.800

Allen Richon: Um that's one of the problems or issues or features, if you will, of having a SEP you're not guaranteed to see the same three reviewers because they may not be on the panel, um ,so it's, it is the mixture of

391

01:06:20.970 --> 01:06:31.980

Allen Richon: who's available and the expertise that they have. We also don't retain assignments, so if you know, for example, you submitted something back in the May round of 2018,

392

01:06:33.030 --> 01:06:45.960

Allen Richon: and you're now submitting it in the November round of 2020, we have no clue who was on that review panel, and we have no clue who was assigned to that application so no we can't guarantee you that the same people are going to see it.

393

01:06:48.270 --> 01:06:56.130

Allen Richon: By and large, a review panel is going to look at how well you addressed the comments.

394

01:06:57.060 --> 01:07:16.890

Allen Richon: One thing that really gets a panel is if an applicant comes in, with a recent submission, and while it's okay to differ and disagree; Some of the responses we get are really snarky, and those don't fly, so I know I can't guarantee the best thing to do is to reply

395

01:07:19.020 --> 01:07:26.220

Allen Richon: with the NIH re submission policy once you have an application that comes in, especially in the Phase Is.

396

01:07:27.000 --> 01:07:31.920

Allen Richon: You don't necessarily have to do a recent submission. You can take the feedback

397

01:07:32.490 --> 01:07:46.110

Allen Richon: that is given to you and apply as a new application as long as you don't refer to any previous application and the previous scores, and so on. So, you can take the feedback, re-craft your application and send it in as a new doc.

398

01:07:47.850 --> 01:07:48.360

Monique LaRocque: Thank you.

399

01:07:49.380 --> 01:07:54.750

Monique LaRocque: So we have a few more questions we'll go to 2:15 Eastern because I do see

400

01:07:55.890 --> 01:07:57.780

Monique LaRocque: some good amount of folks who are weighing in.

401

01:07:59.220 --> 01:08:09.450

Monique LaRocque: Next question is can you clarify that timeline for when and how we can contact the referral officer, if there are questions and study section assignment after the application is submitted and prior to review?

402

01:08:09.930 --> 01:08:22.620

Allen Richon: Um the best bet is to contact the SRO. They will contact the referral officer and we'll hash things out like I said, your main contact, from the time that application comes in, until the.

403

01:08:23.820 --> 01:08:35.370

Allen Richon: summary statement is released is the SRO. They're going to know who to talk to. They're going to be the most efficient way to find things and it'll save you a lot of time from calling in to a place of not knowing who to talk to.

404

01:08:38.190 --> 01:08:38.580

Monique LaRocque: Thank you.

405

01:08:39.630 --> 01:08:44.460

Monique LaRocque: Considering that an applicant may want to submit more than one SBIR Phase II Direct proposal,

406

01:08:45.120 --> 01:08:58.890

Monique LaRocque: Both leveraging an underlying proprietary proprietary technology, but for different applications, one for a particular disease state and another for different disease state are they likely to get the same study section for both submitted grants?

407

01:08:59.730 --> 01:09:00.510

Allen Richon: That is -

408

01:09:01.530 --> 01:09:07.350

Allen Richon: okay, okay that's kind of a tough question because it's going to depend if the underlying technology is the same.

409

01:09:08.460 --> 01:09:16.470

Allen Richon: That technology will probably have been reviewed in one study section if the disease focus is totally different.

410

01:09:16.950 --> 01:09:28.020

Allen Richon: Then the likelihood is that it will go to a study section that has that focus so, for example, if you have a genomics approach and in one area you're looking at cardiovascular disease.

411

01:09:28.380 --> 01:09:36.780

Allen Richon: And another you're looking at neurodegenerative disease Those are two totally different study sections, and so it would likely go to two different places.

412

01:09:37.620 --> 01:09:47.190

Allen Richon: But if the if the focus of the application is more on the underlying technology and it's going to go to the technology-oriented study section so that's a long way of saying it depends.

413

01:09:48.030 --> 01:09:54.990

Monique LaRocque: Okay, thank you, the next set of questions will crossover potentially between you and perhaps Meena, to give you a heads up Meena.

414

01:09:55.680 --> 01:10:05.040

Monique LaRocque: And so, if a platform technology has applications for multiple NIH Institutes does it makes sense to apply for SBIR funding to NCATS instead of the disease-specific Institute?

415

01:10:07.410 --> 01:10:12.270

Meena Rajagopal: I think it depends, so you definitely want to talk to the program officer and.

416

01:10:13.650 --> 01:10:19.830

Meena Rajagopal: And also make sure that you don't duplicate your Specific Aims. You know I would encourage them to talk to the program officers.

417

01:10:21.180 --> 01:10:26.550

Allen Richon: Is this question that they want to send one application in or they have multiple applications?

418

01:10:27.660 --> 01:10:28.200

Meena Rajagopal: But this is.

419

01:10:28.230 --> 01:10:30.000

Monique LaRocque: Someone who has one application.

420

01:10:30.030 --> 01:10:36.420

Monique LaRocque: But it could potentially apply to more than one Institute, so you may want to speak to also how you designate primary and secondary?

421

01:10:37.380 --> 01:10:44.550

Allen Richon: That's one of the things that the DRR is really good at. Um they will take a look at it, if there are multiple places.

422

01:10:45.030 --> 01:10:53.910

Allen Richon: They will recommend a primary, secondary, tertiary and even fourth level Institute for funding, and so what that means to the applicant is that

423

01:10:54.450 --> 01:11:07.740

Allen Richon: if one group runs out of money and we're can't fund it then it can be referred to the second arm and, in some cases, they can horse trade and two Institutes may find that it just it really goes all over the board.

424

01:11:09.330 --> 01:11:21.420

Monique LaRocque: Thank you. What additional information components or details are expected during the review of a Phase II application in comparison to a Phase I application? Is it simply a matter of stronger preliminary data?

425

01:11:22.530 --> 01:11:36.480

Allen Richon: No, not at all. A Phase I is like I said basically a feasibility study and you don't need to worry that much about how you're going to get it to market you don't need really specific plans. You've only got six pages so

426

01:11:37.230 --> 01:11:41.910

Allen Richon: you want to focus everything you can on why am I doing this and how are we going to do it.

427

01:11:42.690 --> 01:11:55.140

Allen Richon: For a Phase II, a Fast-Track, a Direct-to-Phase II, you have 12 pages of research plan, but you've also got 12 pages of commercialization plan and, in that you need to explain how it is that this thing's going to become product.

428

01:11:56.490 --> 01:12:10.710

Allen Richon: What is it that makes it unique, why are you the group to do it, what market are you going after? So, those are the kinds of things that the reviewers look for in Phase IIs, Fast-Tracks, and Direct-to-Phase IIs. It’s not just the science.

429

01:12:12.690 --> 01:12:23.340

Monique LaRocque: Thank you. If a company speaks with one Institute and gets confirmation for a budgetary waiver and the proposal submitted, but then suggested for the most relevant studies second.

430

01:12:24.090 --> 01:12:32.160

Monique LaRocque: question: How did the company navigate if the proposal is formally assigned to a different study section and Institute and the budget waiver for that Institute has not been discussed?

431

01:12:35.220 --> 01:12:42.120

Allen Richon: Okay we've got different different things to worry about here Institutes and studies sections are totally separate.

432

01:12:43.590 --> 01:12:54.270

Allen Richon: Institutes are going to be doing the funding discussions, they are going to decide how well an application matches what their objectives are. The study section is purely looking at

433

01:12:54.780 --> 01:13:02.910

Allen Richon: what it is is contained in that application as in terms of science, in terms of the quality of the the arguments being made, and so on.

434

01:13:03.930 --> 01:13:05.940

Allen Richon: So totally different arenas.

435

01:13:09.420 --> 01:13:09.870

Monique LaRocque: Thank you.

436

01:13:12.210 --> 01:13:20.130

Monique LaRocque: For Phase II Direct grant proposal is it important to have both academic institute letters of support, as well as some from industry?

437

01:13:21.750 --> 01:13:23.310

Allen Richon: Depends on what it is trying to do.

438

01:13:24.570 --> 01:13:31.860

Allen Richon: Who's your market? What is it that you're trying to accomplish? Are you developing underlying science and therefore you need

439

01:13:32.940 --> 01:13:37.170

Allen Richon: leaders in the field to comment that this is the direction to go? Um.

440

01:13:38.250 --> 01:13:46.890

Allen Richon: You know, those are the kinds of things you look at. I mean one of the things that that will help the most people in putting their applications together.

441

01:13:47.880 --> 01:13:56.220

Allen Richon: They unfortunately are so close to what it is that they're doing that they have a whole lot of implicit answers to questions that would normally be asked.

442

01:13:56.580 --> 01:14:02.130

Allen Richon: So, they'll write things down and they think they understand what it is they're saying when in fact they're not clear at all.

443

01:14:02.610 --> 01:14:11.010

Allen Richon: So, when you do your application give it to someone that doesn't have a vested interest that can look at it and point to you and say.

444

01:14:11.400 --> 01:14:18.330

Allen Richon: I don't understand what you're doing here. I don't understand what point you're trying to make. where is this going to go? How's it going to help? And so on.

445

01:14:20.190 --> 01:14:28.830

Monique LaRocque: You we're coming up on time, I have one more question to ask, but before that I wanted to encourage everyone to please open the link for the feedback form

446

01:14:29.400 --> 01:14:42.990

Monique LaRocque: and tell us how we did, and what you'd like to hear about in the future, and please connect with us online. We will include some of the contact information for our speakers today, as well as links to reach us if you'd like to get more information.

447

01:14:44.100 --> 01:14:52.620

Monique LaRocque: Now we have the last question how do, how do we improve the score and the approach section? I know that's a general question, but if you have any quick tips.

448

01:14:54.420 --> 01:14:55.080

Allen Richon: On.

449

01:14:56.250 --> 01:15:10.140

Allen Richon: Look at your critiques and figure out what the overriding theme of the issues are so you know you've got three people that make comments and if it was discussed there's something in the discussion that was done. Two,

450

01:15:11.790 --> 01:15:22.860

Allen Richon: look at is there any consistent theme throughout all three. If there is that's generally what it is that you should concentrate on and you should look at how you go about improving that.

451

01:15:24.420 --> 01:15:29.910

Monique LaRocque: Wonderful Thank you very much, everyone for joining us today, and thank you to our speakers.

452

01:15:30.240 --> 01:15:38.550

Monique LaRocque: For all of the insights you've applied, as I mentioned, this is a touch point you are welcome to stay in touch with us, we are including emails for our speakers.

453

01:15:39.030 --> 01:15:50.520

Monique LaRocque: And if you want to learn more about specifics on what NCATS SBIR and STTR funds if you're interested in applying we do encourage you to set up a one-on one meeting. Again, we'll put that email in chat.

454

01:15:51.030 --> 01:15:58.260

Monique LaRocque: Thank you again this presentation will be made available if you have any questions, please reach out to us. Thank you everyone.