

2024 Current Fiscal Year Report: Neurological Sciences Training Initial Review Group

Report Run Date: 04/19/2024 05:18:02 PM

1. Department or Agency

Department of Health and Human
Services

2. Fiscal Year

2024

3. Committee or Subcommittee

Neurological Sciences Training Initial
Review Group

3b. GSA

Committee No.

1037

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

5. Current Charter	6. Expected Renewal Date	7. Expected Term Date
--------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------

No 02/18/1999

8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?

No

8b. Specific Termination Authority

8c. Actual Term Date

9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year

Continue

10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?

Not Applicable

10b. Legislation Pending?

Not Applicable

11. Establishment Authority Authorized by Law

12. Specific Establishment Authority

42 U.S.C. 282(b)(16)

13. Effective Date

11/20/1985

14. Committee Type

Continuing

14c. Presidential?

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

Current Next
FY FY

18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18d. Total	\$0.00	\$0.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.00	0.00

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of (A) applications and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts. The committee provides advice and recommendations on funding applications and proposals, including but not limited to the scientific and technical merit of applications for grants-in-aid for research, research training and career development, or research-related grants and cooperative agreements, or contract proposals relating to scientific areas relevant to neurological disorders and stroke. During this reporting period the committee reviewed 326 applications requesting

\$222,109,675 in total direct costs.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

The members of this committee are outstanding medical or scientific authorities knowledgeable in the various disciplines and fields relating to training and career development programs and activities in the areas of neurological disorders and stroke.

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

The Neurological Sciences Training Initial Review Group held eight 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. 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 Neurological Sciences Training Initial Review Group 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. This committee does not have a public website. The DFO and Committee Decision Maker positions are both held by W. Ernest Lyons, Ph.D. He is the Chief, Scientific Review Branch, Division of Extramural Activities, NINDS. As Branch Chief, he is responsible for overseeing the Scientific Review Officers who administer the Initial Review Group meetings. Members: J. Mink's term ended early and his term end dates have been updated to reflect this. D. Willis, C. Robinson, and B. Ford was reappointed and their term end dates have been updated to reflect this. Due to the large number of members serving on this committee, NIH staff are unable to provide additional information on Occupation or Affiliation. Additional information on an individual's affiliation may be obtained by contacting staff listed in this report. Meetings: Four meetings were advertised in the Federal Register as either "virtual" or "in-person" but were held as mixed, a combination of virtual and in person, and have been identified as mixed in this report.

Designated Federal Officer

W. ERNEST LYONS CHIEF, SCIENTIFIC
REVIEW BRANCH

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
Aouizerat, Bradley	01/13/2022	06/30/2024	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member

Augustus-Wallace, Allison	03/22/2023	06/30/2026	Associate Professor-Research & Director	Peer Review Consultant Member
Benitez, Andreana	07/25/2022	06/30/2026	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Bloodgood, Brenda	03/22/2023	06/30/2026	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Boada, Fernando	03/22/2023	06/30/2025	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Bolanos, Carlos	03/22/2023	06/30/2025	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Canavier, Carmen	09/14/2020	06/30/2026	Professor and Chair	Peer Review Consultant Member
Carlson, Erik	09/08/2021	06/30/2025	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Chalak, Lina	11/28/2021	06/30/2027	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Chang, Anne-Marie	12/02/2021	06/30/2027	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Christian, Kimberly	03/22/2023	06/30/2025	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Cummings, Brian	11/01/2019	06/30/2025	Associate Dean for Faculty Development (SOM Senate)	Peer Review Consultant Member
Cummins, Theodore	07/01/2023	06/30/2027	Professor and Chair	Peer Review Consultant Member
Deniz, Ashok	09/07/2021	06/30/2027	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Downes, Gerald	03/23/2023	06/30/2026	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Dulla, Chris	08/22/2018	06/30/2024	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Dutta, Ranjan	07/01/2023	06/30/2027	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Etgen, Anne	03/22/2023	06/30/2025	Professor Emerita	Peer Review Consultant Member
Ezeamama, Amara	03/22/2023	06/30/2027	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member

Ford, Byron	05/01/2023	06/30/2027	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Fox, Michael	03/22/2023	06/30/2024	Professor and Director	Peer Review Consultant Member
Furie, Karen	01/13/2022	06/30/2025	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Garden, Gwenn	09/22/2020	06/30/2026	Professor and Chair	Peer Review Consultant Member
Ghetti, Simona	03/25/2023	06/30/2024	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Gomez-Ramirez, Manuel	05/01/2023	06/30/2025	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Gong, Qizhi	09/07/2021	06/30/2027	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Goodman, Miriam	05/01/2023	06/30/2024	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Goyal, Manu	08/03/2022	06/30/2026	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Gray, Michelle	09/08/2021	06/30/2027	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Griffin, Amy	09/08/2021	06/30/2025	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Guerrero-Cazares, Hugo	05/02/2019	06/30/2024	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Henry, Roland	09/07/2022	06/30/2024	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Jackson, Darrell	03/22/2023	06/30/2027	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Kornblum, Harley	11/23/2021	06/30/2027	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
LIPTON, JACK	08/22/2018	06/30/2024	PROFESSOR AND CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
Lane, Michael	09/22/2020	06/30/2026	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Lega, Bradley	10/24/2022	06/30/2027	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member

Levine, Steven	11/25/2021	06/30/2024	SUNY Distinguished Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Lhatoo, Samden	07/27/2022	06/30/2026	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
Litvan, Irene	11/24/2021	06/30/2025	Distinguished Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Lorenzo, Damaris	09/14/2020	06/30/2026	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Lyons, Lisa	09/07/2021	06/30/2025	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
MANI, SHAILAJA	08/22/2018	06/30/2024	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Mack, William	11/29/2021	06/30/2025	Professor of Neurological Surgery	Peer Review Consultant Member
Magnuson, David	09/12/2021	06/30/2025	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Medin, Jeffrey	09/22/2020	06/30/2026	MACC Fund Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Paul, Robert	07/25/2022	06/30/2028	Professor and Director	Peer Review Consultant Member
Peixoto, Lucia	07/01/2023	06/30/2029	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Pleasure, Samuel	11/22/2021	06/30/2024	Professor and Glenn W. Johnson, Jr. Memorial Endowed Chair	Peer Review Consultant Member
Rho, Jong	01/13/2022	06/30/2025	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Robinson-Papp, Jessica	11/23/2021	06/30/2025	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Robinson, Catrina	03/22/2023	06/30/2027	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Sansing, Lauren	11/23/2021	06/30/2024	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Schilling, Birgit	09/22/2020	06/30/2026	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
Schuele, Birgitt	09/14/2020	06/30/2026	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member

Schwarz, Thomas	11/12/2019	06/30/2025	Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Siegenthaler, Julie	07/25/2022	06/30/2026	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Smith, Nathan	03/22/2023	06/30/2026	Assistant Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Timmons, Shelly	01/17/2022	06/30/2024	Professor & Chair	Peer Review Consultant Member
Tranel, Daniel	11/29/2021	06/30/2027	Professor of Neurology	Peer Review Consultant Member
Tudor, Jennifer	03/22/2023	06/30/2026	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Vannest, Jennifer	03/22/2023	06/30/2024	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Willis, Allison	01/26/2022	06/30/2025	Associate Professor	Peer Review Consultant Member
Willis, Dianna	09/14/2020	06/30/2024	Assistant Professor of Neuroscience	Peer Review Consultant Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 64

Narrative Description

NIH's mission is to seek fundamental knowledge about the nature and behavior of living systems and the application of that knowledge to enhance health, lengthen life, and reduce illness and disability. NIH works toward that mission by supporting the research of non-Federal scientists in universities, medical schools, hospitals, and research institutions throughout the country and abroad. Section 492 of the PHS Act states that The Secretary ...shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of -- (A) applications...; and (B) biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts...

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

Checked if
Applies

Improvements to health or safety



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 type="checkbox"/>

Outcome Comments

The recommendations of this committee are the major basis for NINDS decisions about how to select a subset of highly qualified grant applications for funding.

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

None	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unable to Determine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Under \$100,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$100,000 - \$500,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$500,001 - \$1,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Over \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cost Savings Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Cost Savings Comments

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

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

6,264

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

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 recommended for funding.

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

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 recommended for funding.

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

The recommendations of this committee are the major basis for NINDS decisions about how to select a subset of highly qualified grant applications for funding.

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

Yes

What is the estimated Number of grants reviewed for approval 326

What is the estimated Number of grants recommended for approval 326

What is the estimated Dollar Value of grants recommended for approval \$222,109,675

Grant Review Comments

These numbers reflect the total number of applications considered (both scored and not discussed) and the dollar amount requested. The committee also provides numerical ratings to indicate the relative merit of the applications that are discussed.

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

Checked if Applies

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Contact DFO | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Online Agency Web Site | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Online Committee Web Site | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Online GSA FACA Web Site | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Publications | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Access Comments

N/A