

#	Requirement	Task Order Decision	Comments
1	<p>IAR Demo:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General Requirement that all items in current production release must also be in IAR Demo facility. 2. Add ability to view Grant Images. This can already be done via Commons Demo, so IAR Demo must just mimic production IAR in terms of viewing Grant Images. <p>NOTE: Create bogus Grant Image for all applications.</p>	Commons Expansion	Added to Commons Expansion Task
2	Commons IAR reviewers with foreign telephone numbers have a problem entering the foreign phone number.		Added to Maintenance Task for Commons
3	Under Investigation—I have heard from several reviewers that they are unable to see the scores that have been submitted for applications on which they are discussant. When IAR first came out and Discussants were blocked from reading other critiques unless they submitted something, we all agreed that was in error and the programming was fixed to correct that. It seems however, that they continue to be blocked from seeing the scores.	Maintenance Defect:CQ15285	Add to Maintenance
4	Need a Score Matrix Report in Excel.	Maintenance CQ15355	Added to Maintenance TO
5	SYSTEM GENERATED E-MAIL TO REVIEWERS: The e-mail asks the reviewers to activate their accounts at least a week before the meeting. Should be changed to at least 2 weeks before the meeting.	Maintenance	Added to Commons Maintenance TO
6	<p>When enabling, if reviewer has commons username but account is NOT active and request_status_code is V (status in control center is pending NIH) send a new email that you have an username and as soon as NIH data quality approves your account you'll get an email with your username and confirming that your account is active. (Right now, we send them their username and assume their account is active).</p> <p>When enabling, if reviewer has commons username but account is NOT active and request_status_code is I (status in control center is pending reviewrr) resend the registration url so the user will be prompted to complete what they missed (right now we send them their username and assume their account is active).</p> <p>-----</p> <p>If a user tries to login with a commons account that is in V status, not active yet - the error should tell them that their account isn't active yet and they'll get an email when it becomes active but until then they can't login. Right now the error they get is that account is locked and that's not correct.</p> <p>If a user tries to login with a commons account that is in I status, they should get an error that tells them they need to complete their account registration request before they can proceed and we should take them to the registration url or verify NIH support so they can complete the request.</p>	Commons Expansion	<p>Added to Commons Expansion Task</p> <p>Note: Both Commons and IAR Use Cases will be modified</p>
7	<p>The old active accounts created before recent modifications to Commons to store account statuses in person_Assoc_fields_t table do not show as active on Control Center.</p> <p>Need to modify IAR to make sure that if account is active regardless of table entry in person_assoc_fields_t (use old accounts_t.status_code) then show 'Active' in the account status column on the Control Center.</p>	Maintenance 15286	Add to Maintenance
8	For column headings, add the word "Preliminary" on score matrix and anywhere the "Score" column is shown so it says "Preliminary Score" instead of just "Score".	Maintenance CQ15283	Add to Maintenance Task

#	Requirement	Task Order Decision	Comments
9	<p>Search Meeting Capabilities for SRA/GTA and NCAA:</p> <p>For SRAs, in addition to search capabilities, show list of all meetings they normally see. When searching, only show meetings to which SRA/GTA has IRG Cluster access. This alleviates the need for SRA or GTA to be on meeting roster, any SRA or GTA in IRG cluster can see the meeting (same security used by Peer Review).</p> <p>If NCAA on List of Meetings screen then show Search screen and nothing else when first on the screen. Search Fields will be Meeting Identifiers and SRA Name. Once search button is pressed, list of meetings will be displayed and Search Option will remain on the top of the screen. Remove Restriction to show meetings only when meeting phase dates is set.</p> <p>Show Display All (or Reset) Button to reset the list of meetings after the search back to the original state.</p> <p>Allow meeting sorting: By Council, SRG/Flex, SRA/Flex.</p>	Commons Expansion	Added to Commons Expansion Task
10	Filter old meetings from list of meetings. Meetings older than 6 months should not appear...or if meeting start date has passed and no phases were setup, meeting shouldn't show.	Maintenance CQ15282	Add to Maintenance Task
11	When Prelim. Summary Statement is created, subproject critiques are pulled into the preliminary summary statement for the parent application. If subproject application is not in the same meeting as a parent application, then critiques for these subprojects are not pulled into the preliminary summary statement for parent application. This is a defect. The system must pull critiques for subprojects into a parent application prelim. Summary statements even if subprojects are in different meeting than the parent.	Maintenance Defect:CQ15287	Add to Maintenance
12	<p>Roberta Binder (SRA) reported that several of her reviewers submitted critiques during the Read phase (they were blocked and had not submitted previously) and when she viewed their critiques (through the view link for the application or View PDF or View Meeting Critiques) the reviewer showed as Unassigned in the critique header.</p> <p>The pre-ss correctly showed reviewer role instead of unassigned but the other viewable critique options must be corrected.</p> <p>The requirement is that whenever a reviewer submits a critique it should show their correct role in the header.</p>	Maintenance Defect: CQ6014	Add to Maintenance
13	<p>Add a meeting-wide option for including or not including discussant and reader critiques in the pre-summary statement bodies.</p> <p>DFOX Note: If changing this option in post Submit phase, all pre-sses in the meeting will have to be deleted and regenerated.</p>	Maintenance CQ15352	Added to Maintenance
14	Add a sort on Avg Score on the List of Applications for SRA/GTA (by Application). A sort by Average Score should have a secondary sort on PI name.	Maintenance CQ15281	Added to Maintenance Task

#	Requirement	Task Order Decision	Comments
15	<p>IAR Control Center must allow SRA/GTA to send custom batch emails to selected (including Select ALL option) reviewers in the meeting.</p> <p><u>Details:</u></p> <p>(Reviewers' email addresses should be BCC so Reviewers cannot see other recipients).</p> <p>IAR Control Center must allow SRA/GTA to specify the "From" addressee in the custom batch email to all Reviewers. IAR Control Center must send the Carbon Copy emails to SRA/GTA when batch emails are sent to all Reviewers.</p> <p>IAR Control Center must return undeliverable emails to the SRA/GTA when batch emails are sent to Reviewers.</p>	Commons Expansion	Added to Commons Expansion Task
16	<p>The system must provide the ability for SRA/GTAs to submit unassigned critiques for Reviewers.</p>	Maintenance CQ15353	Added to Maintenance TO
17	<p>The IAR should include the ability for the SRA/GTA to identify hyperlinks to documents for display within their meeting in IAR.</p> <p>For documents not available on the Web, the IAR Control Center should allow the SRA/GTA to upload documents for display within IAR.</p> <p>This could meet needs previously voiced for a reviewer folder.</p> <p>The system could allow the SRAs/GTAs to post the application abstract themselves (for reviewers to read or that can be used to auto assemble the summary statement). Could be done manually by SRA/GTA with new feature for uploading documents/urls.</p>	Commons Expansion	Meeting Materials Added to Commons Expansion Task
18	<p>3/4/2003 suggestion. It would be very helpful to see Lower Half data reflected on the List of Applications screen. It could go somewhere on the same line as the Average. That is, the label "Lower Half" could appear just to the left of Average with an X appearing for those so designated.</p>	Maintenance CQ15279	Add to Maintenance Task
19	<p>List of Applications screen should indicate the date and time of Pre-Summary Statement creation.</p>	Maintenance CQ15354	Added to Maintenance TO
20	<p>The List of Applications screen for Reviewer's should allow reviewer to sort their list of applications by these column headings: application number (activity code/IC/serial), PI name (secondary sort on application number), assignment role (secondary sort on PI name), score (ascending 1-5), and critique submitted date (show blanks on top and do secondary sort on application number, sort most recent date first).</p>	Maintenance CQ15280	Add to Maintenance Task Crossed over items already implemented in production. Clarify that this is for Submit Phase only.
21	<p>Add meeting wide option to toggle the ability to submit non-numeric scores. Default is Allow.</p>	Maintenance CQ 15637	Add to Maintenance task
22	<p>Modify the boilerplate on the Critique/Score confirmation screen to remind reviewers about score entry.</p>	Maintenance CQ 15638	Add to Maintenance task
23	<p>The system should provide virus protection from any viruses that may exist in critique files. (10/16/02 This is dependent on Framework and may or may not be completed for version 1, phase 1.)</p>		
24	<p>Reviewers get a lot of different emails from NIH and it is likely that an email with a soft indistinct subject line, such as invitation is getting ignored.</p>		
25	<p>Unlike Regular Reviewers who have not submitted their critiques in SUBMIT phase and are blocked, Discussants cannot upload their critiques.</p> <p>This is due to the rule that allows Discussant to view other critiques in READ phase even if they did not submit their own.</p>		

#	Requirement	Task Order Decision	Comments
26	The List of Applications screen should provide SRA/GTAs with the ability to toggle the ability to show/hide Discussants, Mail Reviewers and Readers.		
27	Request for chairman of the meeting/committee to have additional privileges in IAR. What privileges are needed?		
28	SUMMARY STATEMENTS OF MULTI-PROJECT APPLICATIONS: Need capability to create preliminary SS of subprojects.		
29	<p>Creating Pre-SS for multiproject applications</p> <p>There does not need to be a separate SS for a subproject, but the problem is that IAR doesn't create a preliminary summary statement for the parent grant unless the parent grant has critiques.</p> <p>We usually do not have a critique for the parent project since the overall opinion on the application cannot be written until all of the subprojects are discussed at the meeting. There are always a number of different expertise areas that need to be heard from for a program project. The final "resume" or opinion is then written from the notes of the discussion at the meeting and the SRA is the one that does that.</p>		
30	SRA needs ability to post multiple critiques for a reviewer.		
31	<p>Brian Wojcik NCI</p> <p>1) There is a need to shut off the adjectival scoring (DF, UN/NC, etc.) as this interferes with lower half designations.</p> <p>2) There is a delay in branching over names as they are added to the roster. When new names are added to the roster, sometimes the names appear in IAR within hours, other times it has taken as long as 3 days. This causes problems at the time of the mailout.</p> <p>3) Apparently, the IAR pulls in information from Edison. This has been causing some problems.</p> <p>4) Reviewers have been appearing twice in IAR, but only once on the roster.</p> <p>5) Administrator at Institution/University has established an account for a reviewer, but hasn't informed the reviewer.</p> <p>6) Links to IMPAC are problematic.</p> <p>7) I would like to the double appearance of the screen from Adobe asking if I want to open or save the critique, when I click on view, to go away. It should just open the critique, then the SRA/GTA can go to file/save if they want to save it elsewhere.</p>		
32	Contract SRAs cannot get access to IAR (because their names are never on the roster). In order to work in IAR, they need to use someone else's user name and password.		
33	Telephone reviewers cannot be blocked from their unassigned applications. I understand the explanation for why we can't automatically block them. However, we could give them the option to opt out of access to all unassigned applications, if they're not interested in seeing them. This way, they wouldn't have to receive a very long COI list for applications which they have no interest in.		
34	When making their account, many reviewers overlook that they have to click SUBMIT on 2 different pages. Thus, their account sits as "pending reviewer" and they do not know that it did not go through. They should either highlight this aspect further, or, if a reviewer only clicks SUBMIT once, they should get an "error" message when they try to leave asking if they think they are done or are they going to come back to this page.		

#	Requirement	Task Order Decision	Comments
35	<p>The IAR Control Center should allow SRA/GTA to toggle show/hide preliminary scores from all (meeting wide option) Reviewers in IAR. If Scores are hidden, Reviewer would only see scores they've entered.</p> <p>If scores are not visible (as designated by SRA/GTA in Control Center) Reviewer will not see score portion of score matrix—they will only see lower half.</p>		
36	<p>The system could include online, completely electronic, conflict of interest forms.</p>		
37	<p>When changes occur (i.e., any change in the assignment matrix, COI, application added, withdrawn, or deferred), Reviewers and Discussants associated with the affected application (EXCLUDING those in conflict and mail reviewers) should receive email notification of the changes. This requirement may be met by another upcoming eRA system—Notification.</p> <p>When an application is deferred (901 change)/moved to another meeting, if critiques were already submitted the SRA/GTA should have the option of whether to keep or delete the critiques.</p> <p>When changes in conflicts are added or deleted, the affected reviewer should receive email notification of the changes. This requirement may be met by another upcoming eRA system—Notification. This requirement needs more discussion because “On the one hand, it is important that a reviewer be notified when a conflict has been removed, so (s)he will know of the need to be prepared for discussion of the application. On the other hand, if an SRA “enables” the meeting in IAR and THEN does a conflict check on all reviewers, there could be multiple messages about conflicts that were already known to the reviewer as well as both the addition and the “ignoring” of non-conflicts. Reviewers would NOT want that kind of bombardment.”</p>		
38	<p>Some SRA/GTAs read critiques as they are added to the ER Web site allowing them to be better prepared for meeting and to spot potential problems. A useful feature would be the ability to mark an application as read and approved by the SRA/GTA to help streamline the assembly of triaged summary statements in particular. If a critique is updated then the check mark will be removed automatically.</p>		
39	<p>Allow users to choose certain applications to merge associated critiques into a PDF file.</p>		
40	<p>It would be useful for SRA/GTAs to control the numeric score assigned to applications that the reviewers have designated as “UN” or “LH.” ER assigns a score of 0 to unscored applications when computing averages. Thus, an application with the following scores: LH, LH, 2.0 is assigned an average of 2.0, whereas an application with scores of 2.1, 2.2, 2.0 is given an average of 2.1. This reduces the utility of using the score matrix to monitor spreading of scores and could lead to confusion on the part of reviewers. If SRA/GTAs are not given control over the handling of LHs, then it might be reasonable to assign a 4.0 to all LH nominations.</p>		
41	<p>UN/LH voting. Reviewers could have the ability to post streamlining votes. The Reviewers would pull up their assigned applications and have the ability to select applications for lower half.</p>		
42	<p>Streamline voting: The SRA/GTA needs to define ineligible reviewers—Mail Reviewers are generally not eligible to vote for streamlining an application; however, others on the committee may wish to see the opinion of the Mail Reviewer. Thus, a screen with the list of reviewers and three columns is needed so as to exclude</p>		

#	Requirement	Task Order Decision	Comments
	access, include but display only (i.e., don't count toward the criteria of two UN votes), or include fully. All regular reviewers should default to "include fully" while Mail Reviewers should default to "display only."		
43	The SRA/GTA needs to monitor votes—A display building on the 1500–50 (Tally) screen would be useful, with the number of UN votes (or scores) displaying next to that utilizing the same set of columns headings. This would allow the SRA/GTA to know who hasn't voted at all, who might have forgotten to vote on discussant assignments, or who has such a light load that the lack of UN votes may not be a concern.		
44	The SRA/GTA needs to be able to exclude applications from streamlining based on activity code criteria.		
45	There should be a separate date for streamlining to be set and for display. A bold display of the Deadline for Posting (set by the SRA/GTA) information should appear when reviewers logon to the web. Any UN votes submitted after the deadline would register as "late votes" and would not count toward preliminary streamlining. They need to be confirmed at the meeting.		
46	Export to Order of Review—Some SRA/GTAs like to manipulate the Order of Review so as to push all the UN applications to the bottom of the list. Such an Export button would transfer the existing streamlining information to the Order of Review screen, causing all UN applications to migrate down (but keeping the same order while doing so) and then be Resequenced.		
47	Update & Transfer to Score Entry screen—After the meeting, the SRA/GTA or GTA could update UN results (add UN's or change to D), then transfer these results to the Master Sheet for score entry.		
48	(At the push of a button) The system should provide the ability for the SRA to determine which applications had two or more lower half votes ("tentative lower half"). The results should display for Reviewers and SRA/GTAs on the list of applications screen. Reviewers not in conflict should have the ability to register objections to the lower half designations. This will help SRAs and Reviewers prepare for the meeting and schedule reviews.		
49	Using scores, the system should determine which applications have two votes of 3.0 or worse.		
50	SRA/GTA needs the ability to establish "Floating Cutoff"—If scores or percentile votes are registered, pushing the Floating Cutoff button would perform an iterative procedure whereby a score or percentile is found for which at least 50% of the applications have two or more scores as bad or worse than the cutoff. A window should open indicating, for instance, "A cutoff of <u>2.6</u> resulted in <u>55</u> percent of the applications falling into the "floating lower half" (two or more votes of <u>2.6</u> or worse)." An "Accept" button would establish that as the cutoff, while "Step Back" and "Step Forward" buttons would move the floating cutoff to worse or better scores. SRA/GTA should have Cancel button to abort.		
51	One additional column should be added to the Viewing Streamlining Votes screen to allow reviewers to add a late vote (only assigned reviewers/discussants). The system should allow "me too" (late) votes to be registered. This will help SRAs and Reviewers prepare for the meeting and schedule reviews.		

#	Requirement	Task Order Decision	Comments
52	<p>The Critique Upload screen should allow SRA/GTA to submit user-defined alphanumeric preliminary scores.</p> <p>If an SRA/GTA submits an alphanumeric score, the Critique Upload screen should limit the entry to 3 characters.</p> <p>The Critique Upload Screen should verify that the alphanumeric score submitted by the SRA/GTA exists on the score list of values (acceptable values need to be determined by group).</p>		
53	<p>If it is possible to come up with standard text and placement inside the pre-Summary Statement body across all ICs for Human Subject Concerns—the Text should be included in the document if there are Human Subject Concerns.</p>		
54	<p>The main post-meeting report is the assembled critiques in a pre-summary statement draft. Critiques would begin with the heading "Critique" (a nice touch would allow SRA/GTAs to rearrange the order of critiques; the default order should be by role). [Although many reviewers add the heading "critique," they can be asked not to do this.] The description would be added if available. A further nice touch would create an output with as many template headings as possible. So, for example, if there are human subjects codes, the appropriate headings can be created in the output. The bolded statement proposed by OER for separating reviewer and SRA/GTA remarks can be added. If biohazard of foreign are checked, these headings can be added, etc. If such an option is provided, it will be important to be able to toggle off the template.</p>		
55	<p>Export to Summary Statement Module. This option would formally associate each file for the designated application to allow access through the summary statement module. Until the button is pushed, the files should remain in a temporary file. There would need to be an "update" button that would bring in the most recent posting, and there should be a warning when a newer version has been posted. The advantage of this scheme would be in knowing which version you are working with so that an update would not be posted without your knowing.</p>		
56	<p>Direct Storage in the Summary Statement Module. Submitted critiques would be available to the SRA/GTA through the IMPAC II Peer Review Summary Statement Module as soon as posted. The difficulty would be in keeping track of when a review has been modified. A log could show the SRA/GTA when updates have been posted, but it might be difficult to keep track of those changes when working offline on a draft in Word or Plain text.</p>		
57	<p>Automated Assembly. The IAR and/or the summary statement module should have a display of which reviews are in and which are missing. When all expected reviews are there, an Export Raw Reviews button should assemble the reviews in a prescribed order (e.g., Primary, Secondary, Tertiary, Mail, Discussant) and allow the SRA/GTA to save the assembled document on the c: drive with the prescribed file name format needed for later upload.</p> <p>PROBLEM: How to deal with files created in different word processing programs. As noted above, we'd like to retain special characters. If the SRA/GTA specifies that the downloaded document should be in Word, for instance, are there conversion programs to handle a WordPerfect document on the fly?</p>		
58	<p>The summary statement contains a "Description" submitted on the grant application. Since applications are scanned and bookmarked, this "Description" section should be evaluated for feasibility of automatically incorporating it into the summary statement during</p>		

#	Requirement	Task Order Decision	Comments
	generation/combination of critiques.		
59	A feature can be provided to use the text to assemble the IMPAC II PDF draft summary statement avoiding an intermediary Word file. Often streamlined summary statements will need no editing and they can be rapidly released. However, such a function should be built to avoid inadvertent release of unread critiques. It could be combined with a check box indicating that the SRA/GTA has approved the critique. The check box would only be visible on the SRA/GTA's screen similar to the private check box on the Review module 1500 screen.		
60	System should allow the ability to create a streamlining report to include PI name, application number, LH (lower half, no objection), D (Discuss-Objection), single votes, late votes. This report can be distributed to Reviewers at the start of the meeting. It can also be adapted as, or used to guide setting up, the actual order of review.		
61	System should allow the ability to create a significant difference report. Identification of significant difference could occur one of two ways: SRA scans the list of scores and checks to indicate applications with major differences of opinions; or, allow SRA to set their own definition of what would indicate a significant difference. Reviewer should have the ability to sort by Lower Half or Significant Difference.		
62	The format would need to be SRA/GTA controlled—either "Assignment List and Conflicts by Reviewer" (full assignment information on only those applications assigned to the reviewer) or "Assignment List and Conflicts by Reviewer (Restricted Version)" (no information on co-reviewers).		
63	SRA/GTA should have a Meeting Report 2—For reference, a copy of the master assignment list with reviewers who voted to streamline a particular application printing in bold. Sample: 1 1 R01 HL072472-01 ANNAPRAGADA, ANANTH V (P1) Tsuda, A Hsia, C CFD Simulation of the human respiratory system (S1) Loring, S Mitzner, W CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY 2 1 R01 HL069030-01A1 BISSONNETTE, JOHN M (P1) Mifflin, S Donnelly, D Calcium-Activated K+ Channels and Respiratory Control (S1) Gozal, D Bonham, A OREGON HEALTH & SCIENCE UNIVERSITY Where Tsuda and Mitzner had voted LH for Annapragada		
64	SRA/GTA will need a printable report of a list of applications that have been nominated by one reviewer for streamlining.		
65	SRA/GTA will need a printable report of the significant difference list and their associated combined critiques.		
66	When meeting is released or assignments are purged manually, the Peer Review system should check that the assignment purge date is on or later than the Edit Phase End Date. If this is not the case—the user of the system should get an error message preventing them from doing the task and instructing them to change the Edit Phase end date if there is a need to release a meeting or purge assignments. Purge Date cannot be earlier than Edit Phase End Date.		

#	Requirement	Task Order Decision	Comments
	(10/17/02 This requirement cannot be met in Phase 1 because of a replication issue.)		
67	<p>One suggestion was to allow "percentile voting." This may be a method peculiar to my group, but I find it works for us. That is, instead of voting 1.6 or 2.4, which are rather arbitrary numbers, my group votes 15% or 25% to indicate that an application is in the top 15 or 25% of applications that they are used to seeing. Then, when we get to the meeting, I give them the raw score equivalent to write on their score sheet.</p> <p>Whether I've made that clear or not, the request would be for a second score box to allow that kind of voting (0 - 100%). I don't really expect the idea to fly unless there are others who make a similar request, but you never know unless you ask, right?</p>		
68	<p>My personal preference would be to have the ability to have the Word document with all of the reviews in there just like the PDF one. I was able to convert the PDF using the T for text in PDF because I do that a lot, there may be some inexperienced GTAs, who wouldn't know how to do this and I think the Word capability would be the simplest way for people to download them all at once without too many problems.</p> <p>DFOX Note: This requirement will add a toll on the system to now to create Word documents (with all the maintenance, such as deleting later, etc.). What if instead of a request, we provide a ZIP file of all critiques in Word, each critique file name marked with PI Name and Grant Number?</p>		
69	<p>It used to be that you could cut and paste the review in sections. Now it just grabs your whole file, and you can't edit portions of it on line, without starting all over again.</p> <p>For future consideration it would be helpful if one could enter some of the information separately such as Human Subjects Concerns.</p>		
70	THE SRA-GTA SHOULD BE CCD on the system-generated e-mail.		
71	HELPDESK INFO: Help Desk contact information should be displayed more prominently and clearly.		
72	ABILITY TO SEE OTHER CRITIQUES AS SOON AS YOU SUBMIT YOUR OWN: The "Control Center" should have an additional option such that the SRA can enable reviewers to see all other critiques AS SOON AS a reviewer submits his/her critique—even before the READ phase has started.		
73	Multiproject applications—1. The Word document that is generated for the entire summary statement does not separate the projects and cores. The GTA has to go through the document and figure out where one project ends and the next begins. 2. Sometimes there is no generation of Word and pdf documents for the entire project.		
74	If the reviewers forget their password, NIH will send a temporary password that must be CUT AND PASTED into the appropriate place. Apparently if you try to type in it, it fails, and if it fails twice, you have to get a new password. This has caused delays with some reviewers.		
75	<p>The Critique Upload screen should allow Reviewers to submit user-defined alphanumeric preliminary scores.</p> <p>If a Reviewer submits an alphanumeric score, the Critique Upload screen should limit the entry to 3 characters.</p> <p>The Critique Upload Screen should verify that the alphanumeric score submitted by the Reviewer exists on the score list of values (acceptable values need to be determined by group).</p>		

#	Requirement	Task Order Decision	Comments
76	<p>There should be a Control Center option that would allow SRAs to force Discussants to submit a critique in order to view other critiques on that application. While NIH/CSR policy does not require this (and that is why we had you change the programming of the first release), there are some IRG that feel that it is important that Discussants post a review with at least a few bullets before they are allowed to see the other critiques. This forces them to put some independent thought into the applications strengths and weaknesses so that they are not entirely swayed by the opinions of the assigned reviewers.</p>		
77	<p>On the List of Meetings screen, I am now finding that there is a lot of information displayed, most of which I don't really care about. My intent when visiting that screen is to find the meeting of current interest and then to click something in the Action column. So the problem is in making a quick ID of the proper meeting. Two suggestions: First, put the acronym in bold (e.g., ZRG1 RES D (02)). Second, near the Action column, include a narrow column with the # of apps. Most often, SRAs can pick out their meeting based on the number of apps as quickly as by looking for the acronym.</p>		
78	<p>When sorting on Reviewer in the List of Applications screen, there should be an option for a Word download on a critique by critique basis</p>		
79	<p>Word versions of individual critiques also be made available on the regular listing. The rationale was based on the fact that summaries are updated at random times, so if a presummary is already downloaded and a new critique appears, it would be more efficient to simply download the single critique and replace it.</p>		
80	<p>Periodically email Reviewers when they have started but have not completed their registration</p>		
81	<p>Can SRAs/GTAs see the screenshot of the last page of the registration process (account reconciliation)?</p>		
82	<p>SRAs need to see Commons User IDs of potential Reviewers—could be an addition to the Person Admin.</p>		
83	<p>SRAs/GTAs need to see sample meeting invitation emails that go out to the Reviewers</p>		
84	<p>System for tracking progress thru the queue—Apparent problems with accounts being in pending NIH status for many days, even weeks, while others move quickly. Should work on a "first in, first out" methodology. Problem Profiles cannot be on hold for so long.</p> <p>If pending NIH for 4 days, alert to QA staff</p> <p>Address problem of new passwords forgotten—Part of the problem may stem from the restrictions on creating passwords. While these almost certainly can't be changed, perhaps the screens could make them more clear, maybe by using examples. Also need to explore other possible causes of problems—use of Netscape? Cookie settings?</p>		
85	<p>Methods to reduce problems at reviewer end:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Redesign registration screens b) Mark in bold—"screen 1 of 4" c) Use "Next" and "Finish" buttons d) If acct stat = pndng revr, send revr email e) If acct stat = pndng revr, send SRA email—may want a two-day delay on this to allow reviewers to get things done on their own. 		

#	Requirement	Task Order Decision	Comments
86	Explain why online editing is not allowed—This is basically a suggestion for something to add to an FAQ reviewer site. Since such editing was allowed in ER, some have asked why it is not allowed in IAR. I believe the rationale was that by storing and showing the critiques in PDF, they avoided all the platform and browser issues. Aside from that, there is an advantage to us in requiring that they upload another copy of the file. By forcing them to do that, we know that they will always have a copy that matches what's on IAR, in case we have a need to ask them to check on something (e.g., a formula or Greek characters).		
87	Exclude Mail Reviewer score from avg—scores by mail reviewers may be informative to other reviewers and should be allowed. However, those reviewers generally do not take in "the big picture" of the application and therefore, their votes should not be utilized in coming up with the average score.		
88	On Control Center, include (Mail) next to mail reviewers (like (Phone))		
89	Reviewers need access to prior summary statements. There is a suggestion to hide score and % on these prior summaries (DFOX Note: Cannot edit prior Summary Statements). Meeting Wide option of allowing seeing prior summary statements?		
90	Alert SRA if NR entered, for follow up w reviewer—if it IS allowed and is used, SRA might want to check—was this a mistake, or did the reviewer see some ethical problem.		
91	Reviewers who submit a critique but not a score who look at the submit critique and score screen see an empty field next to "Critique File". Many find this confusing, feeling that they need to resubmit their critique. For those reviewers who HAVE already submitted a critique, it would be helpful to have a prominent flag such as, "Critique submitted February 17, 2004, 6:16 PM." Also a note such as, "You may enter/change your score without resubmitting your (unaltered) critique" would be useful.		
92	Option to force reviewers to enter score—for some meetings, streamlining not used; also, pilot being run to provide scores for applications that end up streamlined		
93	Address problem of new passwords forgotten—Part of the problem may stem from the restrictions on creating passwords. While these almost certainly can't be changed, perhaps the screens could make them more clear, maybe by using examples.		
94	Prelim Summary Statements a) Fully format per ss needs (caps, bold) b) Insert New, Foreign... Flag human subj c) Prep for electronic abstracts—by the time the new IAR comes out, electronic abstracts will be coming in in increasing numbers. The ability to plug them into the draft summary should be planned for.		
95	Improve design of IAR pages—Reviewers should be able to use them without help just like we do for amazon.com. Mostly the pages are intuitive except for a few items like do not use Netscape , locating IAR on the title bar (a big arrow needed - click here), fixing addresses, bigger hints for MAC users with better placement		
96	Read phase chat room/bulletin board		

#	Requirement	Task Order Decision	Comments
97	<p>Score Matrix & Streamlining</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Popup of revr names, assgnmts, scores—by clicking on appl—would allow SRA to assess where the scores came from, who might be missing b) Floating cutoff for streamlining to >> % "UN"—While an averaged score could be used to determine the "true lower half" (to include all with two UN votes plus enough scores to reach half the total # at the meeting), a floating cutoff would more closely follow the spirit of streamlining by looking for applications with two scores at or worse than a specified level. For example, input "2.5" and the program would identify all applications with two prelim scores of 2.5 or worse. If that did not net enough applications, let the cutoff float to a better score, maybe 2.3, etc. c) Mail revr votes—show, but flag—some SRAs use the floating cutoff concept now but do it manually. However, scores/votes from Mail reviewers need to be flagged so that they can be ignored in determining the lower half. d) Ability to release prelim stream info to program—would need to tie in with program module e) Extra column for apps with one UN vote—many SRAs like to keep track of applications which received one, but not two lower half votes, since these are potential candidates for streamlining at the meeting. Enhancing the score matrix display to include both a streamline column and a "one-vote" column would convey more information to the reviewers. f) Update UN post mtg, push to REV score entry sc—At virtually every meeting, there are a few UN applications that are scored, and some others that are added to the UN list. However, the bulk remain UN. By allowing the SRA/GTA to update those few, they would then have a complete UN list. By exporting those to the Master Score sheet in the Review module, there would be a time savings in setting up that sheet. g) Significant Difference list—A report to show applications with scores reflecting a significant difference of opinion. [Need to determine whether the SRA would select manually or input a delta. A delta of 1.0 would usually be significant if it were 1.5 vs 2.5, but 3.0 vs 4.0 would not.] 		
98	<p>In the Read phase, when a reviewer goes to check out the score matrix, they are given a notice on all their Discussant assignments that "you are blocked from seeing scores." I know this came up earlier, and the workaround is for them to go back to their own assignment list which DOES show the scores, but it is inconvenient when they want to take in "the big picture."</p>		