



American Society of Human Genetics

6120 Executive Boulevard | Suite 500 | Rockville, MD 20852

Lyric Jorgenson, PhD
Associate Director for Science Policy
Director, Office of Science Policy
National Institutes of Health
6705 Rockledge Drive, Suite 630
Bethesda, Maryland 20892
Email: SciencePolicy@od.nih.gov

Submitted electronically

August 19, 2026

Re: NOT-OD-26-087 – Request for Information on Measuring and Rewarding Scientific Impact

Dear Dr. Jorgenson,

The American Society of Human Genetics (ASHG) appreciates the opportunity to respond to NIH's Request for Information on Measuring and Rewarding Scientific Impact ([NOT-OD-26-087](#)). We offer these comments in our capacity as the world's largest professional organization for human genetics research. Our membership includes researchers, academics, physicians, technicians, genetic counselors, students, and others with an interest in human genetics and genomics.

Human genetics and genomics provide a strong example of how rigorous research and team science work together to produce impactful discoveries. Advances in our field often result from contributions by large multi-institutional teams, longitudinal data generation and stewardship, engagement with research participants and patient communities, and translation of discoveries into clinical care. ASHG welcomes NIH's efforts to develop scientific assessment frameworks that better recognize and incentivize the collaborative, rigorous, and mission-driven nature of modern biomedical research.

At the same time, ASHG encourages NIH to consider changes to indicators and incentives through a coordinated framework that benefits from the expertise of NIH's advisory councils and advisory committees. Because research evaluation policies influence funding decisions, workforce development, institutional investments, and scientific culture, they should be developed holistically rather than through a series of discrete policy changes that may create unintended or conflicting incentives. Engagement with NIH peer advisory groups can help ensure that proposed updates are evaluated in the broader context of the agency's mission and the long-term health of the biomedical research enterprise.

We also emphasize the importance of transparent peer review and peer advice in assessing scientific quality and impact. While alternative indicators can complement traditional evaluation methods, they

should not replace expert scientific judgment. Maintaining the integrity, independence, and credibility of peer review is essential to ensuring public trust in federally funded research and to maximizing the value and impact of research investments.

ASHG appreciates NIH's consideration of these comments and looks forward to ongoing dialogue as NIH continues this work. For additional information, please contact Karina Miller, PhD, (kmiller@ashg.org) at ASHG.

Sincerely,



Susan A. Slaugenhaupt, PhD
ASHG President