

SUMMARY STATEMENT
(Privileged Communication)

Release Date: 10/31/2012

PROGRAM CONTACT:
Brett Miller
(301) 496-9849
millerbre@mail.nih.gov

Application Number: 1 R21 HD076112-01

Principal Investigators (Listed Alphabetically):
ALLEN, JONT BRANDON PHD
JOHNSON, CYNTHIA (Contact)

Applicant Organization: UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Review Group: LCOM
Language and Communication Study Section

Meeting Date: 10/15/2012
Council: JAN 2013
Requested Start: 04/01/2013

RFA/PA: PA11-261
PCC: CDB -BM

Project Title: Aural Confusions of Consonants and Vowels in Children with Reading Disabilities

SRG Action: ++

Next Steps: Visit http://grants.nih.gov/grants/next_steps.htm

Human Subjects: 30-Human subjects involved - Certified, no SRG concerns

Animal Subjects: 10-No live vertebrate animals involved for competing appl.

Project Year	Direct Costs Requested
1	125,000
2	150,000
<hr/> TOTAL	<hr/> 275,000

++NOTE TO APPLICANT: Members of the Scientific Review Group (SRG) were asked to identify those applications with the highest scientific merit, generally the top half. Written comments, criterion scores, and preliminary impact scores were submitted by the assigned reviewers prior to the SRG meeting. At the meeting, the more meritorious applications were discussed and given final impact scores; by concurrence of the full SRG, the remaining applications, including this application, were not discussed or scored. The reviewers' comments (largely unedited by NIH staff) and criterion scores for this application are provided below. Because applications deemed by the SRG to have the highest scientific merit generally are considered for funding first, it is highly unlikely that an application with an ND recommendation will be funded. Each applicant should read the written critiques carefully and, if there are questions about the review or future options for the project, discuss them with the Program Contact listed above.

1R21HD076112-01 Johnson, Cynthia

DESCRIPTION (provided by applicant)

For not discussed applications, descriptions may not be included.

CRITIQUE 1:

Significance: 7

Investigator(s): 3

Innovation: 8

Approach: 7

Environment: 3

Overall Impact: The Principal Investigators propose to test whether reading disabled 8-12 year old children experience difficulties with poor auditory perception of speech sounds, rather than phonological awareness per se. They propose to test whether auditory deficits for speech sounds and short term auditory memory problems are important components of reading disability. Although issues surrounding reading disabilities are significant in general, the impact of this research is diminished due to a lack of innovation in the theoretical ideas that are proposed, and the fact that this approach has been taken in quite a bit of previous research. There also appear to be issues with the approach itself, and the manner in which the studies line up with the main hypothesis.

1. Significance:

Strengths

- Understanding the mechanisms underlying poor performance in reading disabled children is an important area of study in general.
- It is important to understand the reasons why phonological awareness is a strong predictor of reading performance.

Weaknesses

- The significance of the proposed research is undercut by the fact that the hypotheses have been described and tested in previous research in much the same way as is proposed here.
- The main goal of the proposed research is stated as investigating abilities that are less central and less linguistic than phonological awareness. However, all of the tasks are quite linguistic in nature in that they focus on perception of spoken syllables, or matching spoken and written syllables, and they appear to be quite central to reading.

2. Investigator(s):

Strengths

- Principal Investigator Johnson has a great deal of experience with language disorders research. She has published a number of articles on various aspects of children with language disorders.
- Principal Investigator Allen is an expert in acoustics and speech perception, and is highly prolific.
- The two Principal Investigators have collaborated and are capable of conducting the proposed research.

Weaknesses

- No major weaknesses noted.

3. Innovation:

Strengths

- The use of real speech from professionally-recorded talkers is an innovative aspect of this application.

Weaknesses

- The application generally lacks in innovation and novelty. In terms of R21 criteria, the proposed research does not appear to break new ground or to be exploratory in nature.
- The ideas put forth in the application have been discussed in quite a bit of previous research. The tasks have also been used by a number of researchers. For example, Cornelissen, Hansen, Bradley, and Stein (1996, Cognition) measured confusions in dyslexics and controls on the basis of the same underlying logic. Others such as Brady have used these (e.g., repetition of syllables) and similar tasks with reading disabled children to address the same hypotheses.

4. Approach:

Strengths

- The studies as a set are capable of providing interesting information regarding the perception of speech sounds.

Weaknesses

- It seems somewhat odd to state that consonant or vowel perception is being uniquely studied when CVs or VC are the stimuli. For example, when presented with “da da fa” and a subject selects the second “da” as the oddball, that could be due to poor perception of the consonant in “fa”, or confusion caused by hearing 3 different CVs due to misperception of the vowel in one of the two “da”s. It is unclear how these possibilities would be disentangled.
- Other tasks (NSCM) mix perception and production, so that it may be difficult to disentangle the two in these studies.
- In addition, it is also unclear whether the auditory-visual integration task is solely about speech sound perception, given that the children have to read stimuli and match what they read to the sounds that they hear.
- It is not entirely apparent whether CVCV patterns are actually sufficient to strain memory. At times, the Principal Investigators use the term “memory” which typically means longer term memory, and this is presumably not what they are talking about. Sometimes it sounds like working memory, although the short stimuli would not seem to be an issue for working memory. In general, this is somewhat unclear.
- The Principal Investigators focus on reading disability, rather than dyslexia or specific language impairment. Given an assumed mixture of children at The Reading Group, a clear plan for distinguishing among these populations should be included.
- The training component consists of telling a subject what they did wrong following an error. This does not appear to be particularly sophisticated or novel.
- There appears to be an issue regarding whether the experiments have sufficient power to detect effects. The studies include a total of only 39 reading disabled and 30 control subjects, and with the current overall design, there will be only 13 reading disabled and 10 controls per experiment.

- The Principal Investigators should explain why they plan from the outset to test unequal numbers of reading disordered and control subjects.

5. Environment:

Strengths

- The environment at the Beckman Institute provides all of the necessary facilities to conduct the proposed research.

Weaknesses

- No letter of support from The Reading Group is included in the application.

Protections for Human Subjects:

Acceptable Risks and/or Adequate Protections

- Risks to human subjects are minimal, and all consent and data protections are in place.

Data and Safety Monitoring Plan (Applicable for Clinical Trials Only):

Not Applicable (No Clinical Trials)

Inclusion of Women, Minorities and Children:

G1A - Both Genders, Acceptable

M1A - Minority and Non-minority, Acceptable

C2A - Only Children, Acceptable

- Subjects will be equally split between genders, which are appropriate.
- A substantial number of minority subjects are expected based on past experience, and this is acceptable.
- Subjects will consist of children 8-12 years old. Given that the application deals specifically with the development of phonological abilities in children, this is scientifically acceptable.

Vertebrate Animals:

Not Applicable (No Vertebrate Animals)

Biohazards:

Not Applicable (No Biohazards)

Budget and Period of Support:

Recommend as Requested

CRITIQUE 2:

Significance: 3

Investigator(s): 3

Innovation: 4
Approach: 6
Environment: 2

Overall Impact: This application focuses on measuring phonetic perception and plasticity in children 8-12 years old with and without RD. Given that the underlying processes of phonological awareness are still not well understood, understanding more about a potential role for phonetic perceptual deficits in RD is important. Ascertaining a more refined profile of phonetic perceptual errors, especially one that is individualized, is an interesting idea, and has the potential for more tailored intervention, should impaired phonetic perception prove to be a driving factor in phonological awareness development. Weaknesses include a lack of clarity in terms of which aspects of and how the application adds to the current literature, as well as recruitment, definition of dyslexia, and questions about the relationship between the experiments and the regular intervention the children receive at the clinic.

1. Significance:

Strengths

- Reading disability is debilitating and can result in life-long barriers to education and employment. Phonological awareness is known to be a cause of RD, and understanding the underlying processes that contribute to phonological awareness is therefore important. Phonetic perception/categorical discrimination in RD and dyslexia has long been an area of interest but findings are inconsistent, so understanding more about how deficits in this area contribute to phonological awareness could contribute important knowledge about our understanding of how to develop better interventions for RD.

Weaknesses

- No major weaknesses noted.

2. Investigator(s):

Strengths

- Together the investigative team of Allen and Johnson has the expertise and knowledge to carry out the proposed experiments.

Weaknesses

- Although Dr. Allen brings great expertise to the application, and Dr. Johnson has clinical and research expertise for the proposed set of experiments, either the expertise in reading disabilities of the current investigative team needs to be made more explicit in the application, or a consultant with expertise in this area should be considered. These comments are particularly related to the issue of classification/definition of RD (see below).

3. Innovation:

Strengths

- Ascertaining a more refined profile of phonetic perceptual errors, especially one that is individualized, is an interesting idea, and has the potential for more tailored intervention, should impaired phonetic perception prove to be a driving factor in phonological awareness development.

Weaknesses

- It is not entirely clear which aspects of the application are new. For example, short-term auditory memory difficulties for speech sounds has long been known to be an area of difficulty for those with RD, and the literature on phonetic perception in RD is substantial (and results are mixed). Aside from the more refined individual profile of phonetic perceptual errors, how would this expand the literature more? How is the measurement more refined? The current proposed set of studies is not fully articulated within the context of existing literature.

4. Approach:

Strengths

- Developing a more refined way to measure phonetic perceptual errors, especially related to developing individual phonetic perceptual profiles as related to RD is potentially an important contribution, and may clarify how the weaknesses in this area contribute to RD.
- Documenting past and concurrent intervention, which RD studies generally do not do, is important.

Weaknesses

- It is not entirely clear how this builds upon, expands, and refines current approaches and findings of previous categorical perception studies in RD/dyslexia. For example, what are the methodological weaknesses of the past studies in terms of how they measured phonetic perception, and how do the proposed experiments directly address these weaknesses and build upon previous literature?
- Group criteria are unclear. There is no definition of RD and control beyond parent questionnaires and history. Are the investigators going to use the tests they administer to confirm classifications? If so, what are the criteria? What will they do about co-morbid SLI? Some studies have suggested that difficulties with phonetic perception in RD are only present when there is co-morbid SLI.
- It is not clear how feasible recruitment is. Recruiting 17 participants over three years for the pilot data is low compared to what they propose to do over 2 years. Although the investigators will pay for tutoring for the participants, which should yield a higher rate of response, more information or evidence is needed in terms of how they will get to their proposed sample size of 39 in the RD group.
- The intervention component is not clear. Is regular intervention at the clinic occurring the same time as data collection for their experiments, or are the experiments in H4 in lieu of their regular intervention? If participants will be doing their regular intervention on top of the proposed studies, what type of intervention is it? Will it be controlled for in terms of scope and fidelity, and timing of the auditory plasticity experiments (H4)? Overall, the timing and details of participant recruitment, classification, intervention and participation in experiments need to be clarified.

5. Environment:

Strengths

- The environment appears conducive to the proposed set of studies.

Weaknesses

- No major weaknesses noted.

Protections for Human Subjects:

Acceptable Risks and/or Adequate Protections

- The research is at an acceptable level of risk, and there are adequate protections in place to mitigate any risks.

Data and Safety Monitoring Plan (Applicable for Clinical Trials Only):

Not Applicable (No Clinical Trials)

Inclusion of Women, Minorities and Children:

G1A - Both Genders, Acceptable

M1A - Minority and Non-minority, Acceptable

C2A - Only Children, Acceptable

- The inclusion of women, minorities, and children is acceptable; focus on children is needed for the focus of the application, which is on reading development. Although the investigators state that the study is open to all participants regardless of minority status, the enrollment table makes no attempt to include those who are Asian, Native American, or Pacific Islander; some statement addressing this should be made.

Vertebrate Animals:

Not Applicable (No Vertebrate Animals)

Biohazards:

Not Applicable (No Biohazards)

Budget and Period of Support:

Recommend as Requested

CRITIQUE 3:

Significance: 5

Investigator(s): 4

Innovation: 6

Approach: 3

Environment: 1

Overall Impact: There is already overwhelming evidence that speech perception and phonological awareness are related to reading difficulties. Additionally, with only a very few exceptions, given early and intensive effective interventions, children with RD can learn to decode although there are likely to be residual problems in fluency and comprehension. Therefore, it is not clear what the proposed studies will really add to our understanding of reading disabilities. Non-word repetition tasks have been used extensively in the reading literature and some recognition of this work would inform the investigation. Additionally, although the Principal Investigators have some relevant conference presentations, there are few relevant journal articles listed in the biosketch.

Protections for Human Subjects:

Acceptable Risks and/or Adequate Protections

Data and Safety Monitoring Plan (Applicable for Clinical Trials Only):

Inclusion of Women, Minorities and Children:

G1A - Both Genders, Acceptable

M1A - Minority and Non-minority, Acceptable

C2A - Only Children, Acceptable

Vertebrate Animals:

Not Applicable (No Vertebrate Animals)

Biohazards:

Not Applicable (No Biohazards)

Budget and Period of Support:

Recommend as Requested

NIH has modified its policy regarding the receipt of resubmissions (amended applications). See Guide Notice NOT-OD-10-080 at <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-10-080.html>. The impact/priority score is calculated after discussion of an application by averaging the overall scores (1-9) given by all voting reviewers on the committee and multiplying by 10. The criterion scores are submitted prior to the meeting by the individual reviewers assigned to an application, and are not discussed specifically at the review meeting or calculated into the overall impact score. For details on the review process, see http://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer_review_process.htm#scoring.

MEETING ROSTER

**Language and Communication Study Section
Biobehavioral and Behavioral Processes Integrated Review Group
CENTER FOR SCIENTIFIC REVIEW
LCOM
October 15, 2012**

CHAIRPERSON

TOMBLIN, JAMES BRUCE, PHD
DC SPRIESTERSBACH DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENTS OF OTOLARYNGOLOGY
AND SPEECH PATHOLOGY & AUDIOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
IOWA CITY, IA 52242

MEMBERS

BOCK, KATHRYN , PHD
PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, URBANA-CAMPAIGN
CHAMPAIGN, IL 61820

BRADLOW, ANN R, PHD
PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY
EVANSTON, IL 60208

COLUNGA, ELIANA , PHD
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT BOULDER
BOULDER, CO 80309

CONNOR, CAROL MCDONALD, PHD
PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY
TEMPE, AZ 85287

CUTTING, LAURIE E, PHD
PATRICIA AND RHODES HART ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
KENNEDY CENTER
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY
NASHVILLE, TN 37203

DUSSIAS, PAOLA E, PHD
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF SPANISH, ITALIAN, AND PORTUGUESE
PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY PARK, PA 16802

FIEZ, JULIE A, PHD
PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH
PITTSBURGH, PA 15260

FLETCHER, JACK M, PHD
DISTINGUISHED UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
HOUSTON, TX 77204

FRIDRIKSSON, JULIUS , PHD
HEALTH SCIENCES DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION SCIENCES
AND DISORDERS
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA, SC 29208

GORAL, MIRA , PHD *
PROFESSOR
SPEECH-LANGUAGE-HEARING SCIENCES
LEHMAN COLLEGE
BRONX, NY 10468

GORNO TEMPINI, MARIA LUISA , MD, PHD
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF NEUROLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94143

LEONARD, LAURENCE BAKER, PHD
RACHEL E. STARK DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH, LANGUAGE
AND HEARING SCIENCES
PURDUE UNIVERSITY
WEST LAFAYETTE, IN 47907

MCRAE, KEN , PHD
PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
SOCIAL SCIENCE CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO
LONDON, ON N6A 5C2
CANADA

MUNSON, BENJAMIN R, PHD *
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH-LANGUAGE-HEARING
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55455

NEWPORT, ELISSA L, PHD
PROFESSOR & DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF NEUROLOGY
CENTER FOR BRAIN PLASTICITY AND RECOVERY
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

PHILLIPS, COLIN , PHD *
PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742

PLANTE, ELENA M, PHD
PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH, LANGUAGE
AND HEARING SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
TUCSON, AZ 85721

SCHLAGGAR, BRADLEY L, MD, PHD
A. ERNEST AND JANE G. STEIN ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENTS OF NEUROLOGY, RADIOLOGY AND
PEDIATRICS
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
ST. LOUIS, MO 63110

SWINGLEY, DANIEL , PHD
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104

TRAXLER, MATTHEW J, PHD *
PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DAVIS
DAVIS, CA 95616

MAIL REVIEWER(S)

MORGAN, GARY , PHD
PROFESSOR
DEAFNESS COGNITION AND LANGUAGE RESEARCH
CENTRE
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON
LONDON, WC1E 6BT
UNITED KINGDOM

SCIENTIFIC REVIEW ADMINISTRATOR

NI, WEIJIA , PHD
SCIENTIFIC REVIEW OFFICER
CENTER FOR SCIENTIFIC REVIEW
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH
BETHESDA, MD 20892

GRANTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANT

SANDERS, MARION
EXTRAMURAL SUPPORT ASSISTANT
CENTER FOR SCIENTIFIC REVIEW
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH
BETHESDA, MD 20892

* Temporary Member. For grant applications, temporary members may participate in the entire meeting or may review only selected applications as needed.

Consultants are required to absent themselves from the room during the review of any application if their presence would constitute or appear to constitute a conflict of interest.