Strengthening NIH Research Standards

A Framework for Scientific Integrity, Transparency and Stakeholder Engagement

Submitted to:

Jay Bhattacharya, M.D., Ph.D., Director

National Institutes of Health

Submitted by:

Bruce Alan Fries, President

Patient Centered Care Advocacy Group

March 16, 2026

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) is the nation's premier biomedical research agency, entrusted with advancing scientific knowledge, improving patient outcomes, and stewarding tens of billions of taxpayer dollars annually. Despite NIH's commitment to scientific rigor across its research programs, multiple federal oversight reviews have documented structural weaknesses in NIH's scientific integrity framework, including inconsistent conflict-of-interest oversight, variable transparency, decentralized enforcement, and uneven leadership and review practices across Institutes and Centers.

Recent findings by the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Inspector General (OIG) and the Government Accountability Office (GAO) identify gaps in NIH's oversight of both intramural research programs and extramural grant review processes. These gaps persist despite existing policies and have been compounded by the rescission of NIH's agency-specific Scientific Integrity Policy in March 2025. As a result, NIH currently lacks a stable, uniform, NIH-wide framework governing scientific integrity and associated accountability mechanisms.

These structural weaknesses result in tangible waste of taxpayer resources. Federal audits document that inconsistent oversight and inadequate conflict-of-interest management enable continuation of research programs providing minimal benefit relative to cost. The standards recommended in this proposal directly address this waste, advancing the President's Management Agenda priority to eliminate waste and hold grant recipients accountable for results.

This proposal recommends ten specific standards—five for intramural Special Studies Units and five for extramural grant review processes—that create comprehensive, uniform scientific integrity requirements applicable across all NIH research programs to address these documented weaknesses. The standards are designed to be practical, achievable, and implementable by the NIH Director using existing authority, without requiring new legislation. They build on current NIH mechanisms while introducing uniform requirements that reduce variability, prevent entrenchment, and strengthen oversight across the agency.

These ten standards divide into two complementary categories:

Intramural Special Studies Units (Standards 1-5): Patient engagement in research priority-setting; leadership appointment through open recruitment with term limits; enhanced conflict-of-interest disclosure and management; regular external scientific review; and comprehensive transparency in research activities and findings.

Extramural Grant Review Processes (Standards 6-10): Term limits and open recruitment for Scientific Review Officers and study section leadership; patient and stakeholder engagement in research priorities; centralized conflict-of-interest monitoring; independent external oversight of peer review processes; and enhanced transparency linking funding allocations to disease burden.

These standards directly support NIH Director Bhattacharya's vision for a "replication revolution" in biomedical research. By establishing transparent reporting requirements, diverse scientific perspectives through term limits and external review, and systematic tracking of research outcomes, this framework creates infrastructure for shifting success metrics from publication volume to reproducibility of findings. Together, these measures—annual replication reporting, enhanced research transparency, and reduced conflicts of interest—advance Gold Standard Science grounded in independently verifiable evidence rather than authority.

By incorporating systematic stakeholder input—including patient advisory panels, advocacy organizations, and regular public engagement opportunities—these standards ensure that research priorities remain responsive to patient needs and emerging evidence. Together, these standards address federal oversight concerns while preserving scientific excellence and institutional expertise, ensuring all patients benefit from consistent safeguards across all disease areas.

The patient health benefits are substantial. Research portfolios aligned with patient priorities will accelerate development of improved diagnostics, expand treatment options for all disease stages, address comorbidities and complex cases, and investigate mechanisms underlying persistent symptoms. Earlier diagnosis and more effective treatments will directly improve patient health outcomes, reduce suffering, restore function, and enhance quality of life for millions of Americans.

The economic returns far exceed implementation costs. When patients receive earlier diagnosis and more effective treatments, healthcare costs decline through reduced hospitalizations, fewer emergency interventions, and decreased need for long-term care. Disability payments decrease as patients regain function and return to productive activities. Workforce participation increases as effective treatments enable patients to resume employment, generating substantial economic benefits through increased tax revenue, reduced benefit expenditures, and enhanced productivity. These economic gains—combined with prevention of wasteful research expenditures identified in federal audits—create returns many times greater than the modest investment required.

Implementation is envisioned as a phased process with Federal Register public comment periods, pilot programs, and annual Scientific Integrity and Transparency Reports. Strategic deployment of AI technologies consistent with the HHS AI Strategy will enhance implementation efficiency by reducing administrative burden for routine compliance tasks while enabling more systematic oversight. While modest new resources would be required—primarily to support centralized conflict-of-interest monitoring and independent audits—these investments are small relative to NIH's overall budget and are justified by substantial improvements in research integrity, efficiency, trust, patient outcomes, and economic returns.

II. Introduction

The National Institutes of Health serves as the nation's premier biomedical research agency, conducting and funding research that advances our understanding of diseases and improves patient outcomes. The integrity and effectiveness of NIH's research enterprise depends on robust safeguards ensuring that both intramural research programs and extramural funding decisions are based on scientific merit, free from conflicts of interest, transparent in operation, and responsive to patient needs.

This proposal addresses the need for comprehensive, uniform standards governing both intramural Special Studies Units and extramural grant review processes. The absence of consistent standards across all research programs creates vulnerabilities that could undermine scientific integrity, enable bias, and erode public confidence in NIH.

Additionally, these standards support NIH Director Bhattacharya's articulated vision for a "replication revolution" that shifts scientific success metrics from publication volume to reproducibility of findings.

The recommendations presented here emerge from patient advocacy organizations' documented concerns across multiple disease areas, recent national discussions about conflicts of interest in federally funded research, and calls for greater patient involvement in research priority-setting.

III. The Case for Enhanced Standards

NIH's research enterprise includes both intramural programs—such as Special Studies Units focused on specific diseases—and extramural programs governed by peer review and advisory councils. Despite maintaining high standards of scientific excellence, NIH lacks comprehensive, uniform standards for leadership selection, conflict-of-interest management, external oversight, patient engagement, and transparency across all programs.

Multiple independent reviews and audits document this variability:

Fragmented Scientific Integrity Policies

NIH adopted a Scientific Integrity Policy in late 2024 that aimed to establish agency-wide standards for transparency, oversight, and integrity.[1] However, this NIH-specific policy was rescinded in March 2025,[2] leaving NIH to follow the broader Department of Health and Human Services scientific integrity policy instead. This rescission highlights that NIH does not currently have a stable, uniform policy framework governing scientific integrity and associated oversight practices across all research programs.

Inconsistent Conflict-of-Interest Management

A 2019 HHS Office of Inspector General report[3] and subsequent follow-up reviews found that NIH's conflict-of-interest oversight varies across Institutes and Centers, with staff applying different levels of scrutiny and no systematic quality-assurance process to ensure consistent review. A related audit[4] found limited NIH policies, procedures, and controls to ensure that institutions consistently report all sources of research support and financial interests.

Gaps in Consistent Oversight

A 2025 Government Accountability Office review[5] found shortcomings in NIH's external research monitoring, including inconsistent reporting and close-out of awards across Institutes and Centers, partly due to decentralized policy implementation. Earlier GAO testimony[6] to the House Science, Space, and Technology Subcommittee on

1. National Institutes of Health. NOT-OD-24-178, September 30, 2024. RESCINDED Final Scientific Integrity Policy of the National Institutes of Health. Federal Register, Vol. 89, No. 203, 84166-84180.

2. National Institutes of Health. NOT-OD-25-080, March 28, 2025. Rescission of the Final Scientific Integrity Policy of the National Institutes of Health.

3. HHS/OIG Report OEI-03-19-00150, 09/25/2019 NIH Has Made Strides in Reviewing Financial Conflicts of Interest in Extramural Research, But Could Do More.

4. HHS/OIG Report A-03-19-03003. 09/25/2019. The National Institutes of Health Has Limited Policies, Procedures, and Controls in Place for Helping to Ensure That Institutions Report All Sources of Research Support, Financial Interests, and Affiliations.

5. U.S. Government Accountability Office. GAO-25-107362, April 2025. National Institutes of Health: Monitoring of External Research Can Be Improved.

6. U.S. Government Accountability Office. GAO-22-105434, October 5, 2021. Testimony before the Subcommittees on Investigations and Oversight and Research and Technology, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology

Investigations and Oversight found that NIH's conflict-of-interest policy focuses narrowly on financial interests and does not address non-financial conflicts—such as professional affiliations—in a uniform agency-wide manner, suggesting uneven coverage of key integrity issues.

Although NIH's Boards of Scientific Counselors (BSCs) have provided external review of intramural research since 1956—with review made mandatory by federal law in 1985—no uniform standards govern BSC composition, conflict-of-interest management, or public reporting across all Institutes and Centers.

Variable Leadership Selection Standards

Leadership selection practices vary widely across NIH's Institutes, Centers, and research programs. Although statutory requirements provide a framework, individual NIH offices have broad discretion in applying these standards, resulting in inconsistent criteria for selecting research leaders. Without uniform requirements, leadership positions may be filled through processes that lack transparency, limit competition, or favor continuity over fresh perspectives—perpetuating the entrenchment that undermines scientific innovation and independent oversight.

Non-Uniform Patient Engagement

Patient and community engagement practices vary significantly across NIH's Institutes, Centers, and research programs. While some NIH components have established mechanisms for incorporating patient perspectives, there are no agency-wide requirements specifying when and how patient representatives should participate in research planning, protocol development, oversight activities, or leadership selection, resulting in highly variable patient engagement quality across the agency.

Patient engagement is essential to research quality, not merely procedural courtesy. Patients provide firsthand knowledge of disease burden, symptom variability, treatment tolerability, and quality-of-life priorities that clinical observation alone cannot capture. Research designed without meaningful patient input risks pursuing questions of limited practical value and overlooking outcomes that matter most to affected communities.

Resulting Vulnerabilities

This absence of standardized safeguards creates significant risks:

- Long-tenured intramural leadership and entrenched peer review authority without term limits, potentially leading to consolidation of scientific authority and resistance to innovative approaches;
- Potential conflicts of interest involving patent holdings, consulting arrangements, or professional affiliations that could bias both intramural research directions and extramural funding decisions;
- Insufficient external oversight mechanisms to ensure research quality, diversity of scientific perspectives, and adherence to scientific integrity standards;
- Absence of uniform requirements results in variable review quality, inconsistent scrutiny of research programs, and limited public transparency regarding review findings;

- Limited transparency in research prioritization, peer review processes, and the relationship between disease burden and funding allocations;
- Inadequate or inconsistent patient engagement in research priority-setting for both intramural units and extramural portfolio development;
- Insufficient focus on diagnostics, treatment trials, complex cases, comorbidities, and understudied conditions across NIH's research portfolio.

Patient advocacy organizations across multiple disease areas have raised concerns about these issues, noting that the absence of uniform standards leaves the system vulnerable to potential abuses. All patients should benefit from the same rigorous safeguards regardless of which research programs study their conditions.

IV. Recommended Standards for NIH Research Programs

This proposal recommends the following standards addressing intramural Special Studies Units and extramural grant review processes. These standards work together to create a unified framework ensuring consistent scientific integrity across all NIH research programs.

Part A: Standards for Intramural Special Studies Units

1. Leadership Appointment and Term Limits

Institute and Center Directors should appoint Special Studies Unit Chiefs through open, competitive recruitment processes that solicit nominations from scientific and medical communities and patient advocacy organizations. Chiefs should serve renewable terms not to exceed 10 years total, ensuring regular infusion of fresh perspectives while preventing entrenchment of particular research paradigms and maintaining institutional knowledge through appropriate transitions.

Rationale: Term limits ensure that leadership remains responsive to evolving science, prevent accumulation of unchecked authority, and create opportunities for diverse voices to shape research directions. Soliciting nominations from patient communities ensures that leadership candidates understand patient priorities and real-world research needs. This practice balances the benefits of experienced leadership with the need for regular renewal and fresh perspectives.

2. Patient-Centered Research Priorities

Each unit should prioritize research addressing critical knowledge gaps with clear patient benefits, including:

a) Development and validation of improved diagnostic tests for designated diseases and related conditions;
b) Clinical trials of treatment approaches for all disease stages including persistent or chronic manifestations;
c) Studies on comorbidities, related conditions, and complicated cases;
d) Investigation of mechanisms underlying disease progression and persistent symptoms;
e) Studies on the full spectrum of disease manifestations, including neurological, psychiatric, and systemic effects;
f) Cross-disease and multi-systemic research needed to make progress on chronic illness prevention and treatment;
g) Studies on the impact of environmental factors on disease development and progression, including air and water quality, industrial pollutants, and other environmental health determinants;
h) Research on infection-associated chronic conditions and illnesses (IACCIs), including post-infectious syndromes, persistent symptoms following acute infections, and investigation of infectious agents as potential triggers or contributing factors in chronic disease.

Each unit should establish a transparent process for identifying and prioritizing additional research areas based on emerging science, patient input, available disease burden data, and scientific opportunity—including research on emerging conditions and epidemiologically under-characterized diseases. This process should include regular consultation with patient advisory panels and public opportunities for stakeholder input on research priorities.

Rationale: Clear, patient-centered research priorities help ensure that federally funded research addresses the full range of scientific questions and patient needs rather than becoming narrowly focused on single perspectives or academic interests. Federal research should explore diverse hypotheses and approaches, particularly in areas where current understanding is incomplete or where patients report experiences not fully explained by existing research. Including priorities for drug repurposing, cross-disease research, and environmental health factors ensures that NIH research addresses the complex, multi-factorial nature of many chronic illnesses. A structured priority-setting process ensures research remains responsive to evolving evidence and patient needs.

3. Conflict of Interest Management and Public Disclosure

Chiefs and senior research staff should manage financial conflicts of interest related to their designated disease areas consistent with NIH conflict-of-interest requirements, with enhanced transparency and accountability. Specifically:

a) Patent and licensing management: Chiefs and senior investigators should manage any patents related to their unit's designated diseases consistent with NIH requirements, including mandatory recusal from decisions directly affecting the commercial value of those patents;

b) Consulting restrictions: No individual should receive consulting fees from pharmaceutical, diagnostic, or insurance companies with direct financial interests in research or policy decisions under their authority while serving in that role. Consulting relationships in related but non-overlapping areas may be permitted with appropriate disclosure and management;

c) Comprehensive disclosure: All potential conflicts—including patents, consulting arrangements, stock holdings, and industry relationships—should be publicly disclosed and managed appropriately;

d) Annual public disclosure reports: Public reports should list all financial relationships of unit leadership and senior staff related to their designated diseases and related conditions, including managed conflicts and documented recusals.

Rationale: Patent holdings, consulting arrangements, and industry relationships can create conflicts when individuals in these positions oversee federal research funding and policy in the same disease areas. However, such relationships may also drive innovation when properly managed. This standard builds on existing NIH conflict-of-interest management frameworks while adding transparency and accountability through public disclosure and documented recusals. The approach allows researchers to maintain innovation incentives while ensuring that decisions affecting research directions, funding allocations, and policy positions are protected from bias. Public

disclosure of managed conflicts and documented recusals enables stakeholders to assess whether conflict management is effective. This balanced approach recognizes that outright prohibitions may discourage talented physician-scientists from federal service, while unmanaged conflicts undermine public confidence in research integrity.

4. External Review and Scientific Oversight

Each Special Studies Unit should undergo comprehensive external review at least every five years by panels of qualified scientists representing diverse research perspectives, methodologies, and institutional affiliations, with findings made publicly available. Units should establish mechanisms to obtain regular scientific input from external experts representing diverse viewpoints. Formal mechanisms should exist for patient and stakeholder input regarding research priorities and patient needs.

Rationale: Regular external review by diverse scientific panels provides essential accountability and ensures consideration of alternative scientific hypotheses. Scientific progress requires examining diverse research approaches rather than becoming entrenched in single paradigms. Patient and stakeholder input ensures that research priorities reflect real-world needs rather than purely academic interests.

NIH has maintained Boards of Scientific Counselors (BSCs) since 1956, with independent review made mandatory by Public Law 99-158 (1985). However, BSC processes vary across Institutes and Centers without uniform standards for composition, frequency, conflict-of-interest management, or public reporting—resulting in inconsistent scrutin**y documented by federal audits.**

5. Transparency and Public Communication

Each unit should maintain transparent operations with:

a) Annual public reports on research activities, ongoing clinical trials, research findings and progress toward research objectives;

b) Publication of research findings in peer-reviewed journals with timely public dissemination;

c) Regular updates to dedicated public-facing websites describing research portfolios, ongoing studies, and opportunities for patient participation;

d) Periodic public symposia or webinars to present findings and facilitate stakeholder dialogue.

e) Units should maintain and publicly report data on replication attempts of their major findings, including independent replication studies conducted by other researchers, availability of data and materials to enable replication, and responses to replication attempts that yield different results.

Rationale: Transparency strengthens research quality and public trust. When research activities, funding decisions, and findings are publicly available, stakeholders can monitor research directions, identify concerns, and contribute to improved approaches. Public reporting of replication attempts—both successful and unsuccessful—is critical for scientific integrity: it prevents selective reporting of positive findings, enables

assessment of research robustness, identifies methodological issues, and builds cumulative knowledge based on validated results. Transparency ensures accountability for public funds, facilitates collaboration, and demonstrates NIH's commitment to the public interest—particularly important for diseases where patient communities have experienced research controversies.

Part B: Standards for Extramural Grant Review Processes

Maintaining the integrity of NIH's peer review and advisory council processes ensures that extramural funding decisions are based on scientific merit and patient benefit. The following standards should be implemented across all extramural programs:

6. Scientific Review Officer and Study Section Leadership

NIH should establish open recruitment processes and term limits for Scientific Review Officers and Study Section Chairs. Peer review membership should be regularly rotated to avoid entrenchment and reduce potential bias, while maintaining sufficient expertise for diseases with limited specialist pools. Review panels should include patient representatives with relevant expertise to ensure patient perspectives inform funding decisions. These positions should be filled through competitive processes that prioritize scientific excellence, methodological diversity, and absence of conflicts of interest.

Rationale: Regular rotation and open recruitment prevent consolidation of review authority in the hands of a limited group of reviewers, ensure consideration of diverse scientific approaches, and reduce the risk of bias in funding decisions. For diseases with small specialist communities, rotation policies should balance the need for fresh perspectives with the requirement for requisite scientific expertise. Including patient representatives on review panels—rather than limiting patient input to advisory roles without decision-making authority—ensures that patient priorities and real-world impact directly influence funding decisions.

7. Patient and Stakeholder Engagement

NIH should establish disease-area patient advisory panels with authority to influence research priorities. NIH should solicit at least 30 days of public comment for major research initiatives, strategic plans, or portfolio realignments, and include a summary of stakeholder input and how it influenced decisions in its public reporting. Patient perspectives should inform research priorities and funding decisions through direct representation on review panels and through formal advisory mechanisms.

Rationale: Patients and caregivers possess invaluable knowledge about disease impact, research priorities, and practical needs that scientific experts may not fully appreciate. Formal mechanisms for patient input ensure research addresses real-world concerns and maintains focus on patient benefit. The 21st Century Cures Act's requirement for patient representation on the HHS Tick-Borne Disease Working Group provides precedent for such engagement. Extending this principle across NIH research programs would ensure consistent incorporation of patient perspectives in research priority-setting.

8. Conflict of Interest Monitoring and Public Disclosure

NIH should establish a Conflict of Interest Monitoring Unit to address documented gaps identified by the HHS Office of Inspector General and ensure consistent disclosure, public transparency, and enforcement across all Institutes and Centers. This unit should:

a) Require public disclosure of reviewer and advisory council member conflicts of interest relevant to research under review;
b) Monitor and publicly report conflicts of interest disclosures and any violations;
c) Ensure uniform standards and enforcement across all NIH programs, addressing OIG findings of inconsistent scrutiny and lack of systematic quality-assurance;
d) Conduct regular audits of conflict management processes and report findings to the NIH Director, HHS Secretary, and Congressional oversight committees.

External reviews should include assessment of the unit's contribution to research reproducibility, examining rates at which findings are independently replicated, and transparency of methods enabling replication attempts.

Rationale: The 2019 HHS Office of Inspector General report and subsequent audits documented that NIH's conflict-of-interest oversight varies across Institutes and Centers, with staff applying different levels of scrutiny and no systematic quality-assurance process to ensure consistent review. A centralized monitoring unit directly addresses these documented federal audit findings by ensuring consistent application of conflict-of-interest policies across NIH and providing public transparency about potential conflicts that could influence funding decisions. This approach reduces administrative burden through standardized processes while strengthening accountability through regular reporting.

9. Independent External Oversight of Review Processes

NIH should conduct independent, NIH-wide audits of extramural review processes at least every five years. These audits should assess: fairness and consistency of review procedures; effectiveness of conflict-of-interest management; diversity of scientific perspectives represented among reviewers; and alignment of funding decisions with disease burden and research priorities.

Rationale: Regular independent audits provide accountability, identify systemic problems before they become entrenched, and reassure the public that peer review processes are fair and scientifically sound. External audits by qualified reviewers with no stake in NIH operations would provide credible assessment of whether peer review processes are functioning as intended and identify opportunities for improvement.

Conflicts of interest pose particular risks to research reproducibility, as financial interests may bias responses to replication attempts. The "replication revolution" requires openness to independent verification—objectives undermined when conflicts create incentives to defend findings regardless of replication evidence.

10. Enhanced Transparency in Funding Allocation

NIH should enhance transparency regarding funding decisions and their relationship to disease burden, research priorities, and scientific opportunity:

a) Publish available disease burden data and explain how disease burden, along with other factors including emerging diseases, research-neglected conditions, scientific opportunity, and potential for breakthrough discoveries, inform funding allocations;
b) Provide public access to summary statements and score rationales for all funded applications;
c) Ensure robust investment in diagnostics, treatment trials, comorbidities, complex cases, and understudied diseases;
d) Require full compliance with clinical trial registration and reporting requirements.

Rationale: Transparency about funding decisions and their relationship to multiple factors—including disease burden, scientific opportunity, and research gaps—enables public understanding of NIH priorities and facilitates accountability. Publishing available disease burden data alongside funding allocations allows stakeholders to assess research priorities, while acknowledging that many important areas including emerging diseases, rare conditions, and research-neglected diseases lack comprehensive epidemiological characterization.

V. Expected Benefits and Impact

For millions of Americans living with chronic and complex conditions, these standards translate directly into better health outcomes. Implementation would accelerate development of improved diagnostics, expand treatment options, and ensure research addresses the full spectrum of patient needs—from comorbidities to understudied manifestations. Beyond individual patient benefits, the standards generate substantial economic returns through reduced healthcare costs and increased workforce participation while strengthening the scientific foundations that underpin all NIH research. By creating infrastructure for reproducible, transparent, patient-centered science, these reforms benefit researchers, patients, taxpayers, and public health broadly.

Research Quality and Integrity

The proposed standards will substantially improve research quality through diverse perspectives, term-limited leadership, and regular external review. Clear conflict-of-interest prohibitions, centralized monitoring, and public disclosure ensure that research and funding decisions are based on scientific merit and benefits to patients across all disease areas. Regular rotation of review authority ensures consideration of innovative approaches while preventing entrenchment of particular research paradigms. Uniform standards across all disease areas ensure equitable treatment of all patient populations regardless of their condition.

Advancing the Replication Revolution

These standards create essential infrastructure for Director Bhattacharya's vision of a "replication revolution" in biomedical research. Term limits and diverse review panels reduce entrenchment that can discourage independent validation of research findings. Enhanced transparency requirements make data and methods available for independent verification. Conflict-of-interest management reduces financial incentives to defend non-replicable findings. External audits assess reproducibility rates and funding for replication studies. Annual reporting tracks progress toward reproducibility as the primary success metric.

The shift from publication volume to reproducibility as the measure of scientific success addresses fundamental challenges in biomedical research: the replication crisis documented across many fields, the pressure to publish novel findings over verified knowledge, and resistance to constructive scientific disagreement that could advance understanding. By making reproducibility trackable, transparent, and rewarded, these standards enable the cultural transformation Director Bhattacharya envisions.

Patient Health Outcomes

The standards prioritize research with clear patient benefits: improved diagnostics, clinical trials for all disease stages, studies on comorbidities and complex cases, investigation of disease mechanisms, and prevention strategies. Research portfolios aligned with patient priorities will accelerate development of diagnostic tools that enable earlier detection, expand treatment options beyond acute-phase interventions, address the complex realities of patients with multiple conditions, and investigate

persistent symptoms that current research often overlooks. These advances translate directly into measurable improvements: reduced time to diagnosis, more effective treatments across disease stages, better management of comorbidities, restoration of function, and enhanced quality of life for millions of Americans across all disease areas.

Economic Returns

The economic benefits extend far beyond the modest implementation costs. Earlier diagnosis and more effective treatments reduce long-term healthcare expenditures through decreased hospitalizations, fewer emergency interventions, reduced need for long-term care, and prevention of costly disease progression. As patients regain function and return to productive activities, disability payments decrease while workforce participation increases, generating substantial returns through increased tax revenue, reduced benefit expenditures, and enhanced economic productivity. Conservative estimates suggest that even modest improvements in diagnosis and treatment across major chronic conditions would generate economic returns many times greater than the investment required to implement comprehensive scientific integrity standards. These economic gains—combined with prevention of wasteful research expenditures identified in federal audits—create a compelling return on investment for taxpayers.

Public Trust and Transparency

Transparency about research activities, funding decisions, conflicts of interest, and the relationship between disease burden and research investments demonstrates NIH's commitment to operating in the public interest. When patients and the public can see how research priorities are established and how conflicts are managed, trust in scientific institutions strengthens. Public reporting and meaningful patient engagement throughout research planning validate patient experiences, ensure diverse perspectives inform research directions, and create accountability for how taxpayer resources are stewarded.

This transparency is particularly critical for disease communities that have experienced research controversies, felt excluded from priority-setting, or questioned whether research investments reflect patient needs. By establishing uniform standards across all disease areas, the framework ensures that every patient community receives the same rigorous safeguards, transparent reporting, and meaningful engagement opportunities—regardless of their condition or the politics surrounding their disease. This equity in treatment reinforces public confidence that NIH operates based on scientific merit and patient benefit rather than institutional inertia or conflicts of interest.

VI. Implementation Approach and Timeline

These standards can be implemented through NIH Director action without requiring new legislation. They build on existing NIH mechanisms, such as Boards of Scientific Counselors and peer review processes, while adding important safeguards that current processes lack.

While implementation across all intramural Special Studies Units and extramural review processes will require significant resources and time, these costs are justified by substantial benefits: enhanced research quality, prevention of conflicts of interest, protection of scientific integrity, improved patient outcomes, and strengthened public trust in NIH.

Many aspects of these standards already exist in various forms across NIH; the key is establishing uniform, consistent requirements that apply to all programs. This standardization ensures equitable treatment of patients across all disease areas and creates clear expectations for all unit leadership and review processes.

AI-Enhanced Implementation

Implementation efficiency will be significantly enhanced through strategic deployment of Artificial Intelligence technologies. AI-enabled automated monitoring can reduce administrative burden for routine compliance tasks such as conflict-of-interest tracking, term limit monitoring, and annual reporting, while providing more comprehensive oversight than manual processes. This approach directly addresses federal audit findings of inconsistent oversight quality while minimizing the resource requirements for implementation.

Implementation Timeline

To ensure effective implementation with appropriate public input and oversight, the following phased approach will ensure systematic, sustainable implementation while minimizing disruption to ongoing research.

Phase 1: Policy Development and Public Comment

NIH Director establishes an Implementation Working Group, designates responsible offices, and develops draft policies for all ten standards. Within 180 days: NIH publishes draft policies in the Federal Register with a minimum 60-day public comment period, soliciting input from scientific community, patient advocacy organizations, professional societies, and other stakeholders.

Phase 2: Policy Finalization and Planning

NIH reviews public comments, finalizes policies, and publishes a comprehensive implementation plan. The plan should include timelines, pilot program designations, resource needs, compliance mechanisms, and ongoing accountability.

Phase 3: Pilot Implementation

NIH launches pilot programs in selected units and review sections, collects implementation data, makes necessary adjustments.

Phase 4: Full Implementation

NIH expands implementation to all units and programs, establishes the Conflict-of-Interest Monitoring Unit at full capacity, and launches initial external audits.

Phase 5: Ongoing Compliance

NIH publishes annual Scientific Integrity and Transparency Reports, conducts regular five-year external reviews, performs annual audits on a rotating basis, and maintains stakeholder engagement.

VII. Ongoing Accountability and Transparency

To ensure sustained commitment to these principles, NIH should publish an annual NIH-Wide Scientific Integrity and Transparency Report documenting:

(a) Conflicts-of-interest disclosures and any violations identified across both intramural and extramural programs;

(b) Results of extramural and intramural oversight reviews, including findings from external audits and five-year comprehensive reviews;

(c) Compliance with ClinicalTrials.gov reporting requirements across all NIH-funded research;

(d) Portfolio investments relative to disease burden data and other factors including emerging diseases, research-neglected conditions, and scientific opportunity, with explanation of funding allocation decisions;

(e) Steps taken to enhance diversity of scientific perspectives in intramural and extramural review processes;

(f) Summary of patient and stakeholder input received and how such input influenced research priorities;

(g) Contribution to research reproducibility across NIH's research enterprise, including: replication rates for major findings from intramural programs and extramural funded research.

This annual reporting would provide ongoing transparency, enable public monitoring of progress, demonstrate NIH's commitment to scientific integrity and accountability, and identify areas requiring continued attention.

VIII. AI-Enabled Efficiency and Oversight

Implementation of these comprehensive research standards will be enhanced through strategic deployment of Artificial Intelligence technologies. AI can automate routine compliance monitoring, data analysis, and reporting tasks, reducing administrative burden while strengthening oversight and accountability. This approach aligns with the Department of Health and Human Services Artificial Intelligence Strategy's vision of making "AI a practical layer of value to improve public health, health care delivery, biomedical research, human services, and agency operations."

AI-Enabled Implementation Benefits

Enhanced Efficiency: AI technologies can reduce administrative workload for routine compliance tasks such as: monitoring conflict-of-interest disclosures across all NIH Institutes and Centers; tracking leadership term limits and generating succession planning alerts; processing and analyzing public comments and patient input; generating annual transparency reports; and monitoring reporting compliance.

Improved Consistency: AI systems can apply uniform standards across all NIH research programs, directly addressing federal audit findings of inconsistent oversight. Automated monitoring eliminates human variability in conflict assessment and ensures systematic quality-assurance that the 2019 HHS Office of Inspector General report found lacking in current processes.

Comprehensive Oversight: AI enables real-time rather than periodic monitoring, facilitating continuous conflict-of-interest surveillance and identification of potential issues requiring human assessment.

Enhanced Transparency: AI-powered automated reporting provides: Real-time public dashboards showing compliance with research standards; Comprehensive analysis of research portfolios relative to disease burden; Accessible summaries of complex research activities for patient audiences; Detailed audit trails documenting oversight activities.

AI Applications for Research Standards

Standards 1 & 6 (Leadership and Review Authority): Automated tracking of leadership terms and review assignments; Diversity analysis identifying potential consolidation of authority; Nomination processing and qualification screening.

Standards 2 & 7 (Patient Priorities and Stakeholder Engagement): Natural language processing of patient input and public comments; Automated synthesis of stakeholder perspectives; Accessible translation of technical research for patient audiences.

Standards 3 & 8 (Conflict-of-interest Management): Continuous monitoring of disclosed financial relationships against research activities; Pattern analysis identifying systematic conflicts requiring investigation; Automated generation of public disclosure reports; Risk scoring prioritizing cases for human review.

Standards 4 & 9 (External Review and Oversight): Automated compilation of research portfolio data for external reviews; Peer review process analysis identifying potential fairness concerns; Benchmarking analysis comparing programs to similar research efforts.

Standards 5 & 10 (Transparency and Reporting): Automated annual report generation; Disease burden and funding allocation analysis; Publication impact tracking; Clinical trial compliance monitoring.

IX. Conclusion

The standards recommended in this proposal—covering both intramural Special Studies Units and extramural grant review processes—represent achievable, practical reforms that would significantly strengthen scientific integrity across all NIH research programs. They align with current federal priorities, build on existing NIH mechanisms, and can be implemented in a phased, practical manner that minimizes disruption while maximizing benefits.

Critically, these standards create the infrastructure necessary for Director Bhattacharya's vision of a "replication revolution" in biomedical research. By establishing transparent reporting, diverse oversight, systematic conflict management, and explicit tracking of reproducibility metrics, the framework enables the fundamental shift from publication volume to reproducibility as the primary measure of scientific success.

By incorporating systematic stakeholder input—including patient advisory panels, advocacy organizations, and regular public engagement opportunities—these standards ensure that research priorities remain responsive to patient needs and emerging evidence. This ongoing dialogue between researchers and the communities they serve strengthens both research quality and public trust while ensuring that NIH investments address real-world health challenges.

The patient health benefits are substantial and measurable. Research portfolios aligned with patient priorities will accelerate development of improved diagnostics, expand treatment options for all disease stages, address comorbidities and complex cases, and investigate mechanisms underlying persistent symptoms. Earlier diagnosis and more effective treatments will directly improve patient health outcomes, reduce suffering, restore function, and enhance quality of life for millions of Americans across all disease areas.

The economic returns extend far beyond the modest implementation costs. When patients receive earlier diagnosis and more effective treatments, healthcare costs decline through reduced hospitalizations, fewer emergency interventions, and decreased need for long-term care. Disability payments decrease as patients regain function and return to productive activities. Workforce participation increases as effective treatments enable patients to resume employment, generating substantial economic benefits through increased tax revenue, reduced benefit expenditures, and enhanced productivity. These economic gains—combined with the prevention of wasteful research expenditures on low-quality studies—create returns that far exceed the investment in comprehensive oversight.

These standards represent an investment in the future of NIH research—ensuring that the agency continues to serve as the world's premier biomedical research institution while demonstrating unwavering commitment to scientific integrity, transparency, patient benefit, and efficient use of taxpayer resources. Strategic deployment of Artificial Intelligence technologies to support implementation demonstrates how the federal government can harness emerging technologies to strengthen oversight, eliminate waste, and improve accountability while reducing administrative burden.