View the event recording. Here are the markers by question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording marker</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 3:45</td>
<td>Tell us a little bit about what your experience has been, either as a study section reviewer or as a successful NIH applicant, and how it might have informed or influenced how you feel about and view successful applications through the NIH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 14:56</td>
<td>What are your recommendations for how to pick a program announcement and institute or study section?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 18:23</td>
<td>Is there a point in time during the process where you recommend making that first contact? (with a program officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 28:00</td>
<td>What could you tell us specifically about how NIH treats the review process as opposed to, for instance, NSF and then even further, with regard to Social Sciences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 33:15:00</td>
<td>Have you heard of any situations where you get contradictory comments from reviewers? How do you recommend handling them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 50:01:00</td>
<td>If the R01(proposal) is initially assigned to a specific study section that a PI requests, but it's subsequently moved to a different one (maybe one with a less successful track record), what advice do you have for that person?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 52:11:00</td>
<td>Could you share some tips for organizing and developing the narrative to ensure that the most important components are emphasized?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 N/A (after recording stopped)</td>
<td>Final Words of Wisdom (see below)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final Words of Wisdom from our Panelists:

Formatting matters:
Include enough white space. Even a figure that has colors in it lightens the page for a reviewer. When I see a grant that has 100% writing, it’s arduous to read. So, break it up to give your reviewer a break too!

Set realistic objectives:
Never ever promise more that you can/will deliver. Stay away from an increasing tendency for hyperbole and rodomontade in grant applications. Reviewers evaluate the proposal and potential outcomes, not the exaggerated claims.

Exercise due diligence:
RePORTER is a great way to find potential consultants but to also see what is getting funded in terms of the Institute, and how consistently those topics are being funded, etc.

Network, network, network. Find the conferences and organizations most relevant to your area of research and attend them (even if virtually). Get to know members. Hold an office visit, if possible. This way, in addition to your good work and impressive publications, study section members will know you and your reputation.

There are new considerations for study section members almost each round, so stay in touch with those as best you can (for example, the change from using the language “premise” of the study to “rigor and reproducibility”). Reviewers are instructed to use specific terms in reviews so if you stay current and use the correct terminology it is a plus. You can do that by talking with current NIH reviewers (just not on the study section to which your proposal is assigned if it has been submitted).

Show that you are passionate about your work:
An applicant needs to convey that they would do the proposed research even if the grant was not funded. (Even if this is not the case, the proposals should have that sense of urgency).

You have to write what you’re truly passionate about. If there isn’t a RFA for what you’re truly excited about, you can always go for a “parent” R03/R21/R01. They are just generic calls and you can submit for anything that fits the priorities of the Institute.

Don’t give up. You have to keep trying to submit if the grant has favorable reviews, but even if your grant is not discussed, don’t let this discourage you. It is hard to get a fundable score but persistence matters, as long as the reviewers feel your proposal is significant and has a strong approach with addressable critiques (i.e. no fatal flaws). Sometimes all these must coalesce: having an impactful idea, a well-written grant and also getting the right reviewers.

Don’t let the scary stories about how few NIH proposals get reviewed and funded deter you. Someone is going to be funded (in fact, many “someones;” this may as well be you!}

Liza Scarborough, Director of Faculty Development, Office of the VP for Research
How to “Write to the Review”
NIH Insights

July 16, 2020
Zoom Webinar
Resources for Researchers

- Research Restart
- Research Support Units
- Research Computing and Data Management
- Funding Opportunities
- PI Book
- OSP Concierge Services

We are interested, globally, in promoting research knowledge transfer throughout campus to benefit our research community.

People who are trying to secure specific research $$ (e.g., NIH R01)

People with insight specific to the funding agency or program

Questions/Suggestions? Send them to me at liza@austin.utexas.edu
The NIH Review Process
(What happens once your grant is received by NIH)

The Center for Scientific Review (CSR) handles the receipt and review of ~70% of the grant applications that NIH receives. NIH separates the review process from funding decisions.

First Level of Review - Scientific Review Groups (Center for Scientific Review-CSR)
• Review criteria and scoring

Second Level Of Review - Advisory Council/Board
• Grant funding plan
NIH Study Sections (Center for Scientific Review)

**Assisted Referral Tool:** enter your Abstract and Scientific Aims to get a list of relevant Study Sections match.

Applications are assigned first to an **Integrated Review Group (IRG),** then to a specific study section within an IRG.

- **Chartered Study Sections:** most investigator-initiated applications: R01, R03, R21, R15 and Ks.
- **Small Business Innovation Research and Technology Transfer Research Study Sections:** recurring special emphasis panels review (SEPs): SBIRs, STTRs.
- **Fellowship Study Sections:** SEPs review: F30, F31, F32, F33.
- **All Other CSR Study Sections:** SEPs review special topics and members conflict applications.
Exploring the Research Lifecycle of an NIH Grant with UT Library Research Support

Do you have questions about BioSketch profiles and making the most of your myNCBI account? Would your work benefit from a more detailed Data Management Plan? Would you like to better understand the requirements around data and publication sharing for NIH funded projects? We’ll review helpful tools and resources to answer these questions and more.

Register in advance for this webinar

Aug 12, 2020
2:00 pm - 3:00 pm
Meet our Distinguished Panelists

**Susan De Luca, Ph.D.,** Assistant Professor, Steve Hicks School of Social Work

**Howard Ochman, Ph.D.,** Professor, Dept. of Integrative Biology, College of Natural Sciences

**Theresa Jones, Ph.D.,** Professor, Dept. of Psychology, College of Liberal Arts

**Keryn Pasch, Ph.D.,** Associate Professor, Dept. of Kinesiology and Health Education, College of Education

**Kyle Miller, Ph.D.,** Associate Professor, Dept. of Molecular Biosciences, College of Natural Sciences

**Mary Velasquez, Ph.D.,** Professor, Steve Hicks School of Social Work