

Strength in Numbers: Using group peer-review for grant review

Shari Whicker, MEd, EdD¹, Mariah Rudd, BS¹, Alisa Nagler, JD, EdD², David Musick, PhD¹
Virginia Tech Carilion School of Medicine¹, American College of Surgeons²

Background

- Expertise of multiple reviewers is often sought for manuscript, grant, and other scholarly submissions
- The peer-review process, a traditionally independently-driven activity, has recently been flipped with the advent of Group Peer-Review (GPR).
- GPR relies on the complementary expertise of a small team, requires the active exchange of ideas, and necessitates ongoing collaboration.
- A team of health professions educators recently deployed the GPR process for the review of a national grant submission.

Results

- Review team feedback illustrated the value of participating in a group peer-review exercise.
- Contributions from all members of the group resulted in an aggregate score for each proposal as well as robust feedback.
- The process served as a meaningful faculty development exercise for all reviewers who ranged in levels of experience with the peer-review process.

REVIEW CRITERION	SCORING RUBRIC	YOUR SCORE
1. Is there a statement of the problem and rationale for the study?	No: 0 points Somewhat: 1 point Yes: 2 points	
COMMENT:		
2. Is a review of pertinent literature provided?	No: 0 points Somewhat: 1 point Yes: 2 points	
COMMENT:		
3. Is there a meaningful reference to a conceptual framework that informs the research?	No: 0 points Somewhat: 1-4 point Yes: 5 points	
COMMENT:		
4. Is the research question clear, interesting and does it flow logically from the problem statement?	No: 0 points Somewhat: 1-4 points Yes: 5 points	
COMMENT:		
5. Is the overall study design explained and appropriate in light of the research question?	No: 0 points Somewhat: 1-2 points Yes: 3 points	
COMMENT:		
6. Is the collection method or instrumentation well described and adequate?	No: 0 points Somewhat: 1-2 points Yes: 3 points	
COMMENT:		
7. Is the sampling strategy adequate (both for qualitative and quantitative studies)?	No: 0 points Somewhat: 1-2 points Yes: 3 points	
COMMENT:		
8. Is an analytic method described and appropriate in light of the research question and the nature of the data?	No: 0 points Somewhat: 1-2 points Yes: 3 points	
COMMENT:		
9. Is the budget appropriate, realistic?	No: 0 points Somewhat: 1-4 points Yes: 5 points	
COMMENT:		
10. Is the proposal clearly written?	No: 0 points Somewhat: 1-2 Yes: 3 point	
COMMENT:		
11. Does this study bridge (1 point each for maximum of 5 points): GEA sections, regions, professions, institutions, or intra-institutional departments?	No: 0 points Yes: 5 points	
COMMENT:		
12. Does this study target one of the priority content areas **?	No: 0 points Yes: 3 points	
COMMENT:		
13. Does the PI and research team seem qualified to carry out the research?	No: 0 points Somewhat: 1-2 points Yes: 3 points	
COMMENT:		
TOTAL SCORE (0-45)		

Group Peer-Review Process for Grants

Methods

- A study team member (DM) was asked to review a group of proposals for a national grant.
- We recruited a group of several experts to provide a score and comments for each grant proposal.
- Individual scores were averaged and comments from each reviewer were distributed amongst the group.
- The group convened to summarize, discuss, dissect, and share thoughts on each proposal.
- The group reached a scoring consensus.



Recruit a Review Team



Develop a Grant-Specific Rubric



GPR Process

- Independent Reviews
- Collate Review Scores and Comments
- Convene as Group to discuss – come to scoring consensus



Finalize and Submit

Discussion

- Peer-review is commonly an independently-driven activity.
- GPR relies on the complementary expertise of a small team, the active exchange of ideas, and ongoing collaboration.
- Instead of performing independent reviews for a national grant review process, a group of several experts reviewed and then convened to discuss and reach a scoring consensus for recommendation for each proposal.
- The GPR process brings together individuals with different levels of experience and unique but complementary areas of expertise.
- The review process results in a more holistic faculty development opportunity with the end result of a more thorough, quality review.

References

Dumenco, L., Engle, D. L., Goodell, K., Nagler, A., Ovitsh, R. K., & Whicker, S. A. (2017). Expanding group peer review: a proposal for medical education scholarship. *Academic Medicine*, 92(2), 147-149.