Peer Review Management Services of PCORI-Funded Research
Information

Request for Information (RFI) Questions

In building our final Request for Proposals (RFP), PCORI will incorporate elements from our current peer review process, as well as our knowledge and the evolution of how we have managed this program, to build the appropriate business requirements. To this end, we do not anticipate a wholesale rebuild of our operations. Rather, we seek proposals to build upon what has worked to gain greater efficiency while maintaining rigor.

Peer review guarantees to the public that they can trust the results and the conclusions from our studies; as such, there is no alternative option to the process of peer review involving patients, stakeholders, experts in the topic, and statisticians.

Additional details regarding PCORI’s peer review process can be found on the PCORI website.

1. The RFI asked to comment on our engagement with scientific experts. Is PCORI looking to have the vendor to build a group of editors to assist in the process?

   Yes. PCORI expects offerors to identify a group of experts in research to manage the peer review process and summarize the comments of external reviewers in a letter that contains the requirements for a revision of the report. An important part of any offeror submission will be a list of strong, scientifically-qualified editors to manage the review process.

   To that end, PCORI seeks to better understand the current marketplace for peer review services. PCORI welcomes information on the breadth and depth of editorial boards retained by potential offerors.

2. Does PCORI envision a process whereby an editorial stipend is granted for editorial and/or peer review? Will PCORI assign a budget to pay for editors and dedicated peer reviewers?

   Yes. In the past, PCORI has covered the expenses of editorial staff and provided a small stipend or honorarium to peer reviewers. Offerors may include these costs as part of the proposal budget in response to the forthcoming RFP.

   To help PCORI better understand the current marketplace, we welcome additional information on the components of editor and reviewer compensation and recognition.

3. Does PCORI currently have a software system to support peer review (e.g., Editorial Manager, ScholarOne, etc.)?

   Yes, PCORI uses Editorial Manager but is open to alternatives if the offeror suggests a better model. PCORI welcomes further information on systems that may serve the purposes of our peer review process and offerors may propose alternative systems as part of a plan to address the requirements of the RFP.
4. Does PCORI have any interest in using a preprinting service to make the peer review process more transparent to the public?

PCORI would need to confirm if this is feasible/possible and will take this under consideration. This suggestion, however, represents the type of recommendation PCORI seeks through the issuance of this RFI. PCORI seeks new ideas to improve the process; improve communication to the public; and identify efficiencies.

5. Does PCORI intend to expand the eventual peer review statement of work (SOW) to include post-production and publishing services, such as editing and the conversion of reports to XML?

PCORI is interested in considering proposals to provide such post-production services. Currently, PCORI secures these services in other ways. While the RFI states high-level information about program features, the RFI should not be construed as a final SOW or RFP (which are forthcoming and to be released).

PCORI seeks further information on the extent to which such “full-suite” capabilities are available in the marketplace and organizational structure underpinning them. In other words, we are interested in learning those post-production and publishing services vendors commonly offer, to whom reports are delivered, and whether such resources are in-house or contract to the offeror.