

Response Form for the Final Performance Review– PHMC 2008F*

1. Name of Grantee: Public Health Management Corporation
2. Year of Grant: 2008 Formula Grant

A. For the overall grant, briefly describe your grant oversight process. How will you ensure that future health research grants and projects are completed and required reports (Annual Reports, Final Progress Reports, Audit Reports, etc.) are submitted to the Department in accordance with Grant Agreements? If any of the research projects contained in the grant received an “unfavorable” rating, please describe how you will ensure the Principal Investigator is more closely monitored (or not funded) when conducting future formula funded health research.

Grant oversight is the responsibility of the Principal Investigator/Project Director.

For each research project contained in the grant, please provide a response to items B-D as listed on the following page(s). When submitting your response please include the responses for all projects in one document. The report cannot be submitted as a ZIP file, because the Department’s exchange server will remove it from the email. If the report exceeds 2MB, please contact the Health Research Program for transmittal procedures: 717-783-2548.

* Please note that for grants ending on or after July 1, 2007, grantees’ Final Performance Review Reports, Response Forms, and Final Progress Reports ***will be made publicly available on the CURE Program’s Web site.***

Project Number: 0864901

Project Title: The Association of Drug Use and Sexual Risk for HIV Infection Among Black Men Who Have Sex with Men

Investigator: Bond, Lisa

B. Briefly describe your plans to address each specific weakness and recommendation in Section B using the following format. As you prepare your response please be aware that the Final Performance Review Report, this Response Form, and the Final Progress Report will be made publicly available on the CURE Program's Web site.

Reviewer Comment on Specific Weakness and Recommendation (*Copy and paste from the report the reviewers' comments listed under Section B - Specific Weaknesses and Recommendations*):

Reviewer 1:

1. Theoretical Framing: The relations between drug use and sexual risk taking must be examined with a more holistic theoretical frame.
2. Methodological: More sophisticated statistical analyses need to be undertaken to explore relations between various drugs used and how these combinations manifest across various person factors and relate to sexual risk taking.
3. Innovation: The overall work is not particularly innovative, nor does it advance our knowledge. More nuanced investigations, framed in a more conceptual manner (e.g., syndemics theory) could help advance knowledge in the field.

Reviewer 2:

1. It is unclear whether this research, while clearly novel, is needed given the number of papers found in the literature on associations between other drugs and sexual risk behavior; however, this may be obvious to someone more familiar with the field. Perhaps all that is needed is better defense of the objectives in order for this project to receive an outstanding rating.

Reviewer 3:

1. The investigator should ask for more funding and time for this excellent proposal and should continue with the analysis of Aim 2. This would be of value and build on this valuable initial effort. The investigator is to be commended for the work to date.
2. To better understand the situation within the black sample, the investigator should compare to the Hispanic cohort as well. This would also require more funding and time.

Response (*Describe your plan to address each specific weakness and recommendation to ensure the feedback provided is utilized to improve ongoing or future research efforts*):

Thanks to each reviewer for their comments. It is striking how different the critique of Reviewer 1 is relative to the critiques of Reviewers 2 and 3. I am largely in agreement with the critiques offered by Reviewers 2 and 3, and appreciate their helpful comments for strengthening my work. I will utilize the feedback from all reviewers to strengthen the analytical work conducted. Work continues on a manuscript. Many of the concerns/issues raised by reviewers are or have been addressed in additional analyses. I respectfully disagree with Reviewer 1 about the need for additional research on the link between crack cocaine use and sexual risk among Black MSM. I have spent hours researching the literature and know that there are significant gaps surrounding this drug and its role in driving risk behavior and HIV transmission in Black MSM (including both at-risk and infected Black MSM).

C. If the research project received an “unfavorable” rating, please indicate the steps that you intend to take to address the criteria that the project failed to meet and to modify research project oversight so that future projects will not receive “unfavorable” ratings.

Response:

This project received a favorable rating.

D. Additional comments in response to the Final Performance Review Report (OPTIONAL):

Response:

This review highlights the importance of providing the perspectives of multiple reviewers, who often hold disparate points of view – as is evident in this performance summary report.