Defense Health Agency
Research and Development
Medical Research and Development Command
Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs

Directive

June 11, 2025

DHA R&D CDMRP

SUBJECT: Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs Directive on Research Duplication

References: See Enclosure 1

1. PURPOSE. This Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs (CDMRP) directive establishes procedures to prevent research duplication in all CDMRP-funded research and to maximize the impact of research investments.

2. APPLICABILITY. This CDMRP Directive applies to all applicants for CDMRP-funded research awards.

3. IMPLEMENTATION. Implementation is directed from the Defense Health Agency (DHA) Administrative instruction (6025.20), pursuant to References (b) through (i), to identify, mitigate, and prevent applicants from accepting funding from more than one source for the same research. The CDMRP identifies, mitigates, and prevents funding duplication through its science management model at application submission, peer and programmatic review, award negotiation, and active management of funded awards.

4. CANCELLED DOCUMENTS. This directive replaces the "CDMRP Position on Research Duplication" dated March 20, 2014.

5. RESPONSIBILITIES. See Enclosure 2.

6. PROCEDURES. See Enclosure 3.

7. PROPONENT AND WAIVERS. The proponent for this directive is the Director, CDMRP. When applicants are unable to comply with this directive, the applicant's rationale will be evaluated by CDMRP staff.

8. RELEASABILITY. Cleared for public release. This directive is available on the Internet from the CDMRP website at: https://cdmrp.health.mil/ and is also available on the Electronic Biomedical Research Application Portal (eBRAP) at: https://ebrap.org.

9. EFFECTIVE DATE. This CDMRP directive:

a. Is effective upon signature.

b. Should be reviewed by the 5th anniversary of the original publication date or when higher-level guidance is updated or canceled.

c. Will expire 10 years from the date of signature if it has not been reissued or canceled before this date in accordance with Reference (a).

HARTELL.MARK.G.1242502317
Digitally signed by HARTELL.MARK.G.1242502317
Date: 2025.06.11 12:17:02 -04'00'

Mark G. Hartell
Colonel, USA
Director, Congressionally Directed Medial Research Programs

Enclosures
1. References
2. Responsibilities
3. Procedures

Glossary

ENCLOSURE 1

REFERENCES

(a) DHA-Procedural Instruction 5025.01, "Publication System," April 1, 2022
(b) GAO report 11-318SP, "Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue," March 2011
(c) General Application Instructions for the Department of Defense, Defense Health Program, Version CD2501. https://ebrap.org/eBRAP/public/gai.htm?version=CD25_01
(d) Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs Funding Process, https://cdmrp.health.mil/about/fundingprocess
(e) Electronic Biomedical Research Application Portal, https://ebrap.org
(f) National Institutes of Health, electronic Research Administration Commons, https://www.era.nih.gov/
(g) National Institutes of Health RePORT, https://reporter.nih.gov/
(h) International Cancer Research Partnership, https://www.icrpartnership.org/
(i) Medical Research and Development Command Technical Reporting Requirements, https://mrdc.health.mil/index.cfm/resources/researcher_resources/reporting/technical

ENCLOSURE 2

RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Director, CDMRP. The Director, CDMRP will ensure compliance and implementation of this CDMRP directive.

2. Applicants and Institutions. Applicants and institutions will:

a. provide the required information to identify and disclose duplicative research at application submission, during award negotiation, or at any time during the period of performance and any extension of the period of performance of the award.

b. comply with general financial regulations for applicant institutions in the Administrative and Cost Principles section of Reference (c).

3. Peer Reviewers. Peer reviewers will:

a. review if proposed research has already been published or is the subject of an application to another funding organization.

b. review if the level of effort for the applicant and all key personnel is appropriate.

4. Programmatic Reviewers. Programmatic reviewers will provide additional feedback as to whether the proposed research has been published or has been funded by another funding organization.

5. CDMRP Staff. CDMRP staff will:

a. review the current and pending research support documents, as well as notes from peer and programmatic review, for potential scientific overlap or key research personnel over-commitment.

b. use the CDMRP internal grants management database, References (e) (f) (g), and other program-specific resources to investigate potential overlap.

c. resolve any potential level of over-commitment and/or research duplication and overlap prior to award execution by the DHA contracting activity.

d. monitor and resolve potential duplication and overlap during the review of progress reports throughout the award's period of performance and any extension granted.

ENCLOSURE 3

PROCEDURES

1. BACKGROUND.

a. Unnecessary duplication of funding or accepting funding from more than one source for the same research, is prohibited.

b. Reference (b) defines unnecessary duplication as "duplicative research funding that is not necessary to corroborate or replicate prior research results for scientific purpose."

c. Applicants may apply for funding for the same research from different funding organizations; however, they may not accept funding from more than one source.

d. The CDMRP uses multiple standard processes and communications to minimize the likelihood of duplicating research funded by other organizations.

e. The CDMRP funding opportunity announcements include general financial regulations for applicant institutions in the Administrative and Cost Principles section of Reference (c).

2. PROCEDURES TO PREVENT RESEARCH DUPLICATION.

a. APPLICATION SUBMISSION.

(1) The applicant must submit a comprehensive list of current and pending funding support for the applicant and all key personnel in accordance with Reference (c).

(2) The applicant must provide the title, time commitments, funding organization, name and address of the funding organization's procuring Contracting/Grants Officer, performance period, level of funding, brief description of the project's goals, and list of the specific aims.

(3) The applicant must identify where the proposed research overlaps with other existing and pending research projects, or state that there is no overlap.

b. PEER REVIEW.

(1) The peer reviewers will utilize the current and pending support documentation included in the application to review whether the proposed research has already been published, submitted to another funding organization, or has an appropriate level of effort of the applicant and all key personnel.

(2) The peer reviewers will submit feedback in the peer review summary statement and in the administrative notes.

c. PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW.

The programmatic reviewers will utilize the administrative notes from the peer review and/or research being funded in related areas by their own organizations to provide additional feedback on whether the research proposed has been previously published or funded by another source.

d. AWARD NEGOTIATION.

(1) When an application is recommended for funding, the applicant and institutional Business Official will receive a funding status notification letter.

(2) The institution's Business Official must submit an updated current and pending research support document addressing any scientific or financial overlap in eBRAP.

(3) The CDMRP Science Officer (SO) will use an internal SOP to determine if there is overlap and will document the findings with a memorandum. The SO will conduct a thorough review of the updated research support document, feedback from peer and programmatic reviewers, CDMRP's internal awards management database, References (e), (f), and (g), and other program-specific resources to identify potential scientific or financial overlap or over-commitment of effort.

(4) The institution's Business Official must resolve any potential scientific or financial overlap or over-commitment of effort before the award is made.

(5) The CDMRP SO will coordinate with the CDMRP Program Manager and DHA contracting activity staff and, subsequently, the applicant to eliminate or modify duplicative tasks and reduce funding as appropriate.

(6) If the proposed research is entirely duplicative with another funded research project or has overlap or duplication that cannot be resolved, the applicant must withdraw the application from the DOD or relinquish the other source of funding.

e. FUNDED RESEARCH AWARD MONITORING

(1) The applicant and institutional Business Official must inform the CDMRP if, at any point during the award’s period of performance, any portion of the research funded by the CDMRP award becomes duplicative due to additional funding.

(2) The CDMRP will monitor for potential duplication and overlap by reviewing progress reports (annual, final and, for some awards, quarterly, or monthly), internal and external award databases, and support acknowledged in publications or other outcomes resulting from the award throughout the award's period of performance and any extension granted.

(3) The applicant and institutional Business Official are required to disclose any changes to Active Other Support of the applicant and key personnel since the last reporting period in the Participants & Other Collaborating Organizations section of Reference (i).

(4) The CDMRP SO will notify DHA contracting activity staff of any identified overlap or duplication.

(5) The DHA contracting activity will issue a stop payment order until the suspected overlap is resolved. If the issue cannot be resolved, the DHA contracting activity will terminate the award, and the funds will be returned to the government.

GLOSSARY

PART I. ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CDC	Centers of Disease Control and Prevention
CDMRP	Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs
DHA	Defense Health Agency
eBRAP	Electronic Biomedical Research Application Portal
NIH	National Institutes of Health
SO	Science Officer
VA	Department of Veterans Affairs

PART II. DEFINITIONS

peer review. Peer review, the first tier of review, is a criterion-based process in which applications are evaluated on their individual scientific and technical merits based on review criteria set forth in the funding opportunity announcement.

programmatic review. Programmatic review, the second tier of review, is conducted by the Programmatic Panel of each program, which typically includes representatives from other relevant federal funding agencies, such as the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the Centers of Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and/or the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). Programmatic review is a comparison-based process to balance the scientific merit, programmatic intent, and portfolio balance. The outcome of the review is to recommend research projects for funding.