

---

## 42 C.F.R. § 67.15

---

### Peer review of applications.

---

(a) *General procedures for peer review.* (1) All applications for support under this subpart will be submitted by the Administrator for review to a peer review group, in accordance with section 922(a) of the PHS Act, except that applications eligible for review under section 922(d)(2) of the PHS Act (“small grants”) may be reviewed under adjusted procedures in accordance with paragraph (b) of this section.

(2) Members of the peer review group will be selected based upon their training and experience in relevant scientific and technical fields, taking into account, among other factors:

(i) The level of formal education (e.g., M.A., Ph.D., M.D., D.N.Sc.) completed by the individual and/or the individual's pertinent experience and expertise;

(ii) The extent to which the individual has engaged in relevant research, the capacities (e.g., principal investigator, assistant) in which the individual has done so, and the quality of such research;

(iii) The extent of the professional recognition received by the individual as reflected by awards and other honors received from scientific and professional organizations outside the Department of Health and Human Services;

(iv) The need of the peer review group to include within its membership experts representing various areas of specialization within relevant scientific and technical fields, or specific health care issues; and

(v) Appropriate representation based on gender, racial/ethnic origin, and geography.

(3) Review by the peer review group under paragraph (a) of this section is conducted by using the criteria set out in paragraph (c) of this section.

(4) The peer review group to which an application has been submitted under paragraph (a) of this section shall make a written report to the Administrator on each application, which shall contain the following parts:

(i) The first part of the report shall consist of a factual summary of the proposed project, including a description of its purpose, scientific approach, location, and total budget.

(ii) The second part of the report shall address the scientific and technical merit of the proposed project with a critique of the proposed project with regard to the factors described in paragraphs (c)(1)(i) through (c)(1)(x) or (c)(2)(i) through (c)(2)(vii) of this section as applicable. This portion of the report shall include a set of recommendations to the Administrator with respect to the disposition of the application based upon its scientific and technical merit. The peer review panel may recommend to the Administrator that an application:

This document is only available to subscribers. Please [log in](#) or [purchase access](#).

[Purchase Login](#)

---