

**US ARMY MEDICAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND (USAMRDC)
 CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED MEDICAL RESEARCH PROGRAMS
 FISCAL YEAR 2024 (FY24) PARKINSON'S RESEARCH PROGRAM (PRP)**

DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW PROCEDURES

The FY24 PRP called for applications in response to program announcements (PAs) for two award mechanisms released in May 2024:

- Early Investigator Research Award (EIRA)
- Investigator-Initiated Research Award (IIRA)

For the EIRA and IIRA, Principal Investigators were asked to submit a letter of intent to submit a full application. Applications were received for these two PAs in July 2024 and peer reviewed in October 2024. Programmatic Review was conducted in January 2025.

In response to the Early Investigator Research Award PA, the PRP received 41 pre-applications, including 29 compliant applications, and recommended funding 1 (3.45%) for a total of \$0.2 million (M).

In response to the Investigator-Initiated Research Award PA, the PRP received 136 pre-applications, including 104 compliant applications, and recommended funding 7 (6.73%) for a total of \$13.88M.

Table 1 shows submission and award data summarized for the FY24 PRP.

Table 1. Submission/Award Data for the FY24 PRP*

Mechanism	Compliant Applications Received	Applications Recommended for Funding (%)	Total Funds
Early Investigator Research Award	29	1(3.45%)	\$0.20M
Investigator-Initiated Research Award	104	7(6.73%)	\$13.88M
Totals	133	8(6.02%)	\$14.08M

*These data reflect funding recommendations only. Pending FY24 award negotiations, final numbers will be available after September 30, 2030.

THE TWO-TIER REVIEW SYSTEM

The USAMRDC developed a review model based on recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences report *Strategies for Managing the Breast Cancer Research Program: A Report to the Army Medical Research and Development Command*. The report recommended a two-tier review process that reflects not only the traditional strengths of existing peer review systems but is also tailored to accommodate program goals. The Command adheres to this proven approach for evaluating competitive applications. An application must be favorably reviewed by both levels of the two-tier review system to be funded.

THE FIRST TIER—Scientific Peer Review

Early Investigator Research Award and Investigator-Initiated Research Award applications were peer reviewed in October 2024 utilizing nine panel(s) of researchers, clinicians and consumer advocates. The panel members based their evaluations on the criteria specified in the PAs.

Each peer review panel included a Chair, an average of eight scientific reviewers, an average of two consumer reviewers, and a nonvoting Scientific Review Officer. The panelists' primary responsibility was to review the technical merit of each application based upon the evaluation criteria specified in the relevant PA.

Individual Peer Review Panels

The Chair for each panel presided over the deliberations. The panels discussed each individual application. The Chair called on the assigned reviewers for an assessment of the merits of each application using the evaluation criteria published in the appropriate PA. Following a panel discussion, the Chair summarized the strengths and weaknesses of each application, and the panel members then rated the applications confidentially.

Application Scoring

Evaluation Criteria Scores: Panel members rated each application based on the peer review evaluation criteria published in the appropriate PA. The panel members used a scale of 10 to 1, with 10 representing the highest merit and 1 the lowest merit, using whole numbers only. The purpose of obtaining the criteria ratings was to (1) place emphasis on the published evaluation criteria and provide guidance to reviewers in determining an appropriate overall score and (2) provide the applicant, the Programmatic Panel and the Command with an informed measure of the quality regarding the strengths and weaknesses of each application. The evaluation criteria scores were not averaged or mathematically manipulated in any manner to connect them to the global or percentile scores.

Overall Score: To obtain an overall score, panel members used a range of 1.0 to 5.0 (1.0 representing the highest merit and 5.0 the lowest merit), with scoring permitted in 0.1 increments. The PRP averaged the panel member scores and rounded them to arrive at a two-digit number (1.2, 1.9, 2.7, etc.) that corresponds to the following adjectival equivalents used to guide reviewers: Outstanding (1.0–1.5), Excellent (1.6–2.0), Good (2.1–2.5), Fair (2.6–3.5) and Deficient (3.6–5.0).

Summary Statements: The Scientific Review Officer on each panel was responsible for preparing a Summary Statement reporting the results of the peer review for each application. The Summary Statements included the evaluation criteria and overall scores, peer reviewers' written comments, and the essence of panel discussions. The PRP staff used this document to report the peer review results to the Programmatic Panel. In accordance with USAMRDC policy, Summary Statements are available to each applicant after completion of the review process.

THE SECOND TIER—Programmatic Review

The FY24 Programmatic Panel conducted programmatic review in January 2025. The panel included a diverse group of basic and clinical scientists and consumer advocates, each of whom contributed special expertise or interest in Parkinson's disease research. Programmatic review is a comparison-based process that considers scientific evaluations across all disciplines and specialty areas. Programmatic Panel members do not automatically recommend funding applications that received high scores in the technical merit review process; rather, they closely examine the eligible applications to allocate as wisely as possible the limited funds available. The programmatic review criteria published in the PAs were as follows: ratings and evaluations of the scientific peer review panels, programmatic relevance, relative impact, program portfolio composition and adherence to the intent of the award mechanism. After programmatic review, the PRP sent the applications recommended for funding to the Commanding General, USAMRDC, for approval.