



JCATI Review Policy and Reviewer Instructions

This guide provides an overview of the review process and information about reviewer tasks and responsibilities.

Reviewer Instructions

- Log onto the JCATI review website to find your review assignments. If you perceive a conflict of interest or have questions regarding a conflict, contact the Program Manager (PM) immediately.
- Examine your review assignments, review materials (including the Request for Proposal Announcements) and instructions.
- Review the JCATI Conflict of Interest Policy and the JCATI Confidentiality Policy.
- Complete, sign and send to the PM the Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Certification.
- Read and evaluate each of your assigned applications. Each section of the form has two required elements: a pull down menu for numerical scores and a text box for comments. There is a final section to add comments for improvement. Many researchers have asked for input on how their proposal could be made stronger in addition to the numerical scores.
- Enter your scores and comments directly into the web form and submit.

Review Process

- The PM will tabulate all preliminary scores and rank the proposals. The Executive Director (ED) will review the results, noting if scoring by individual reviewers is skewed. If applicable, scores might be adjusted to compensate for overly harsh or lenient scoring by a reviewer.
- Only the more meritorious applications (based on preliminary scores) will move on for review by a second smaller study section.
- Based on review scores and discussion, the ED will provide a recommended group of proposals to be funded to the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors is responsible for making all final funding decisions.

Ethical Conduct of Reviewers

Confidentiality

- Respect for the privacy of investigators' ideas is important; all applications and related materials are privileged communications that cannot be shown to or discussed with unauthorized individuals.

- In signing the confidentiality certification, each reviewer certifies that he/she fully understands the confidential nature of the review process and agrees to the confidentiality and non-disclosure.

Research Misconduct

- Research misconduct is defined as fabrication, falsification or plagiarism in proposing, performing or reviewing research, or in reporting research results, but not honest error or differences of opinion.
- It is vital that you do not make allegations of potential misconduct in the critique; instead, such concerns must be brought to the attention of the PM in a confidential manner.