
Comments for **Principal Investigators**

B4b Additional Reasons for Implementing Modular Grants

- Simplifies the process
- Reduce admin burden for NIH and burden for PIs if not awarded
- To reduce the influence of budgetary considerations during the peer review (study section) process
- Simplify discussion of budget matters at NIH study section
- Also reduce administrative burden for NIH administration not only the PIs.
- It saves an incredible amount of time during the study section review. We used to spend more time talking about budget minutiae rather than the science.
- A good-faith modular budget is derived from a categorical budget. The modular format does save document production time and helps focus the review process on the science.
- Compared to other agencies (NSF, USDA), this is a very straightforward and user-friendly way to do budgeting.
- marked change in review process; there used to be a huge amount of time spent in discussing budgets of grants there weren't going to be funded
- Detailed budgets are required by my institution for modular grants so no benefit accrues
- Help reviewers focus on the significance of the science vs. dissecting budgets.
- It must save NIH time and money also
- To minimize budget considerations by study sections
- It facilitates the review and processing of applications
- I don't know if this is included in the previous topics, but this modular approach saves a huge amount of time for the Study Section. A tremendous amount of time used to be spent in cutting the budgets.
- Make the efforts of study sections easier when considering applications
- easier for program staff to budget
- It greatly reduces administrative burden for support staff (pre-award grant specialists) also.
- Reduce administrative burden for grant reviewers
- places a cap on total amount of award
- Keep salary information more confidential from reviewer pool.
- Streamline review process. Focus reviewers' attention on scientific soundness rather than proposed budget.

B4b Additional Reasons for Implementing Modular Grants

- The modular format makes it a bit easier for the PI to fill in forms, but there are some restrictions to the format: 1) you can not escalate in future years to meet changing aspects of the research; 2) the PI still has to fill out full budget forms for the institution, therefore not saving any time. As a reviewer, the modular format takes some pressure off the reviewer, but makes it difficult to evaluate the estimated budget of the PI. It really is a best guess.
- Prevent study section members from focusing on budget issues.
- To facilitate timely evaluation of proposals
- To make things more complicated
- It helps department chairs in terms of 10 modules being the norm - helps reduce unrealistic budgets.
- Simplification of the process
- Facilitates approval through the applicant's institution
- Reduce paperwork and easy budgeting. Help grant review process in recommending budget (e.g.: eliminate 2 modules in year 3 etc)
- I think there may be some incentive to keep overall budgets within the modular limit of \$250K, so that investigators who might have a proposal that might otherwise be slightly higher than the upper limit think of ways to be more efficient.
- Yes, but the problem is that our institutional grants office still requires a detailed budget, so it doesn't save the PI any time at all.
- The biggest problem is institutional request. Somehow institution still request PI do detailed budgeting. What even worse is it request PI increase personnel's salary yearly and decrease other expense yearly. This make budgeting very frustrating. Some people just ignore NIH's great intention. Especially, institutional administrative people who just try to avoid responsibility and don't care PI's time and effort. This kind of attitude transform NIH's great intention into a burden for the PI.
- Ease--grants management Reduce tediousness
- It is often that the reviewers are focusing their discussions on the budget rather than the science.
- reduced NIH administrative burden and therefore cost savings--this is not a criticism.
- No effort is lost preparing budgets for projects that are not funded.
- It saves the Scientific Review Panels considerable time and allows the discussion to focus primarily on scientific content.
- Allow reviewers to focus on an application's content, rather than its budget
- increase the volume of grants that can be reviewed and reduce costs to NIH incurred by time devoted to extensive discussions of budget during study section meetings.

B4b Additional Reasons for Implementing Modular Grants

- Prevent the NIH Study Section panels from having to evaluate a detailed budget for making recommendations to Funding Council.
- Focus study section review on science. Unfortunately in study sections we are asked to comment on budget, and modular budgets do not offer sufficient information to adequately assess the budget.
- reduce paperwork
- I think that all NIH grants should be modular with a capping of \$250,000.
- Reduce administrative burden for the NIH
- Makes the task of panel members more focused and efficient.
- Reduce time spent in study section for discussion of application budgets
- save paper
- Just a comment in this section, these goals of the modular application cannot be fully achieved if institutions continue to require a priori specific budgeting locally. What needs to be communicated is a desire that Institutions move to "Just in Time" concepts for any local specific budget preparation.
- Reduce paper work on the NIH side of the process; facilitate budgeting plans at NIH.
- to help the new investigators to be able to get established
- Simplify the efforts of grant reviewers
- The modular projects should have a clear statement on the minimum expectation in order to get the funding
- This process puts a cap on the amount of funding one may request.
- Detailed budgets were not executed anyway
- focus initial review group efforts on scientific content
- Modular grants do not reduce administrative burden since I have to put in a complete itemized budget to the University.
- Makes the process easier overall
- To simplify the review process by removing excessive discussion during a study section of the budget.
- Speeds the review process by reducing the tendency to get caught up in budget details. Holds down costs by providing an incentive to request 250,000 or less.
- SIMPLICITY
- to reduce review committee review of budgets
- Please instruct institutions not to request the information that is not required by NIH

B4b Additional Reasons for Implementing Modular Grants

- Simplified and obscured budget review by Study Sections.
- Because for small grants (i.e. \$250 K/yr) in which standard procedures (e.g. molecular biology) are primarily employed it is a WASTE of PI's time to enumerate detailed costs.
- Reduce the burden on NIH staff and on reviewers.
- Reduce NIH workload
- To limit award amounts, by discouraging investigators from submitting larger grant requests.
- I think a modular grant is sufficient for the most part to support a good lab of average size. It is not sufficient to support a large lab. Therefore, this application process is ideal for the majority of investigator.
- saves study section time
- I am not sure that the modular budget saves the PI as much time as the NIH perceives because we must prepare detailed budgets for approval by our institution
- It also simplifies the role of NIH Institutes
- Eliminates some of the gamesmanship of investigators inflating a budget, knowing it will be cut; instilling more integrity to the process
- it's very unlikely that any given grant will be funded, so most nonmodular aspects of the application process are likely to be unnecessary
- Maintains the amount of committed dollars for NIH in the out years. Decreases the administrative burden for NIH.
- To contain the cost of the project
- To allow the NIH to better project its budget since yearly increases are not accommodated in the modular grant budgets.
- 1. The process is simpler and less bureaucratic 2. The institutions also increase the flexibility for the PI by limiting their concern for meeting detailed budgetary allocation restraints.
- minimize grant pages for NIH staff/reviewers to handle for the majority of grants that don't get good scores.
- Decrease paperwork
- Reduces costs to NIH because a PI can only ask for up to \$250,000 before more administrative data is required
- Reduced burden on NIH
- Better focus the study section meetings on scientific, rather than budgetary, deliberations.
- Less complex
- Less paper work for NIH-administrative staffs also.

B4b Additional Reasons for Implementing Modular Grants

- Simplify study sections
- To ensure that reviewers focus on the scientific content of the proposal rather than minor budgetary issues that could be resolved by NIH administrators.
- There is an implicit message that by valuing research in increments of \$25,000, the work is indeed being purchased on a dollar-for-dollar basis. This is not necessarily bad - contracts are routinely structured in this way.
- Focus reviewers' energies on reviewing scientific and technical merit.
- LIMIT BUDGETS TO 250K IN MOST CASES. NEED SPECIAL JUSTIFICATION FOR HIGHER BUDGETS, IF ORIGINAL GRANT WAS FOR 250K - BUDGET CANNOT BE INCREASED
- Eliminate spending unnecessary time and effort of the review panel considering relatively trivial budget details. Prevent the review panel from considering "other support" as a factor in deciding on the level of support to recommend for the application under review.
- Emphasize the novelty component of the grant application, as one of the key factors.
- it is more practical
- Attempt to cap the amount of funding requested (non-modular budgets, i.e. budgets that exceed 250,00 dollars per year, are perceived as being less likely to be funded)
- save time
- Reduce budgetary considerations in the review process
- Easier from the NIH side to deal with budgets
- Process of assigning study section is not clear.
- Eliminating the need to respond to increasing costs in future years.
- Cap award amounts
- Should save paper
- Evaluators don't need to nitpick costs.
- Reduce paperwork
- Cuts need for additional personnel to fill out multiple forms.
- Reduces administrative burden of NIH program staff and simplifies reviewing process
- I think it simplifies the admin paperwork at NIH and the Universities. Grants are more "standardized", perhaps budget/funding projections are easier.
- streamlining NIH internal process
- Financial research needs fluctuate heavily depending on results obtained. New items come up and old ones might become irrelevant. This is different from need for flexibility.

B4b Additional Reasons for Implementing Modular Grants

- Reduce overall administrative costs to the institution (e.g., Grants and Contracts office staff) in times of scarce resources
- Yes, to avoid NIH program staff really knowing how much research costs. A real budget makes these costs very obvious.
- Detailed budgets are a convenient fiction, and everyone knows this. No one really knows precisely where their future expenses will lie, we can only roughly estimate this. The modular budget reflects this reality and prevents us from having to write fiction as part of the grant application process.
- saves money for the NIH
- Reduce administrative burden for NIH. This is more true than for the investigator. While the modular grant does not require a detailed budget the calculation of the overhead does require a detailed budget. This means that the investigator must parcel out the requested money into categories even if they are not written down in the budget.
- Simply applications, reduce tendency of study sections to negotiate a score/reduce budget.
- You should be aware that some universities such as mine still require a full itemized budget even though it is NOT sent to NIH, so does not save any effort to have modular grant and makes review of aspects of grants more difficult as expenses are not itemized.
- It reduces detailed budget requirement.
- Reduce paperwork as most grants are not funded
- Reduce burden on NIH staff. Focus reviewers on the science, not the budget details.
- Easy of use for the PI and interpretation by the reviewers
- Reduce paperwork for NIH
- The greatest limitation of the modular application process is not at the NIH but locally - my university requires that I also prepare non-modular budget pages for internal use. This effectively increases the amount of time and focus I must place on the budgetary aspects of the application.
- This process should be about the merits of the science, not the merits of bookkeeping. Because of the long turn around time in getting NIH proposals funded, many things in a projected budget are likely to change (costs, equipment needs, etc.). The modular format is an excellent implementation for keeping the focus on the science.
- reduce the time reviewers spend evaluating the budget.
- Constrain the number of grants with excessively large budgets
- To focus reviewers on the science not the budget
- To keep the bulk of grants below \$250,000 and to minimize escalation to cover inflation.

B4b Additional Reasons for Implementing Modular Grants

- Most of the approved and funded grants are reduced by double digit percentages, such as 17%-35% without negotiating with the PI. This is awful! Last time my grant was cut by 11! without any justification from the staff. IN addition, all competing continuation grants have a budget cap of up to 35%, this is specifically hwed on single investigator. The NIH reduced my grant funding by 11%, plus capped at 120% of previous grant period. This is a real drag on planned research.
- Budget justification was somewhat arbitrary anyway.
- The "JIT" aspects saves institutional animal and human research review boards from wasting valuable time on protocols for grants that will not be funded.
- Save time at the NIH budget office as well as at negotiations.
- focus the review process on the science as opposed to the financial aspect of the research endeavor
- general efficiency. Increase speed of process
- I think they reduce the cost of an individual proposal, however, reviewers still would like to see the proposals that describe experiments that would require funding beyond the modular award.
- There is no need to specify exact dollar amounts when most grants are not funded.
- Reduce the detail that PIs need to provide and reviewers need to wade through.
- Bureaucratic fiat
- I may not be thinking of other good reasons right now, but I am very much appreciating that we are having it. The modular grant application process is the best.
- Easier for reviewers/ administrators. it makes it easier to recommend that x number of modules should be cut if grant is funded, without looking at specific needs that the investigator had in mind.
- Good for NIH, but the University still wants the old NIH budget forms.
- Reduce administrative burden on scientific review staff.
- FINANCIAL SAVINGS BY AVOIDING NEGOTIATIONS
- Possible effect on the distribution of funds by lowering RO1 average requested costs. This may need more work - namely how to avoid "overfunding" certain projects while not funding others at all.
- Reduce average total cost of grants
- It simplifies the proposal process.
- Reduce administrative work for unfunded grants
- Simplifies the review process.

E2b Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond \$250K

E2b Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond \$250K

- Student salary costs are skyrocketing. I believe that everyone is going to have to cross the \$250k line very soon. These costs are increasing because of department and NIH mandated stipend increases for graduate students and post-docs and because of skyrocketing tuition costs for graduate students.
- In some cases, the work done in a particular year may exceed the \$250K limit
- Sometimes in the first year there is a large amount of equipment, which makes that year artificially high.
- The costs of personnel and research (for instance in my case NMR time, reagents and equipment) have increased
- 250,000 is becoming unrealistically low for most RO1 applications. The modular cap should move up proportionately with the salary cap
- I am not sure why there is a limit. But as the total goes higher there should be better justification.
- The salaries for pre- and post-doctoral fellows have increased significantly since the inception of the program in 1999
- many projects still more expensive to conduct
- It gives the PI additional flexibility for doing research that require larger budgets. For example, our institution has a very small number of graduate students and many of us rely on post-docs. This is a high cost of living area (Washington DC metropolitan area) and this requires higher salaries + fringe benefits.
- I have just turned in a 2.7 M dollar grant, the budgetary process is very time consuming
- Even modest projects may run up to \$100000 higher.
- If it has all the claimed benefits, why have an arbitrary limit to squeeze into?
- The modular grant process does provide an incentive to keep the direct costs below \$250,000 so that a detailed budget is not necessary. I would rather see the actual costs of the research drive this process, not the type of application.
- Some types of research require larger amounts of \$
- only for multi-center studies; like idea of DC limit of 250,000, but exclude IDC's
- This would help offset policy of limiting funding to 4 years of award.
- For a multi-investigator grant, 250000 is clearly not enough
- personnel costs have gone up a great deal
- Research is becoming more expensive

E2b Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond \$250K

- I am at a oft-money institute, i.e., it requires that all of my salary and accessory benefits come from extramural grants. A 250K limit results in me having to carry a minimum of 3 and better 4 RO1 size grants, each on a distinct topic, to free up enough funds for the personnel, animal costs and supplies to make sufficient progress. This results in piecemeal approaches and too little focus.
- Some projects that form a single PI unit need more than 250k, especially with collaborators/consortia where their indirect as well as direct costs come from my direct costs.
- Given the increased costs for personnel and experimental approaches, \$250k are not enough money to perform cutting edge research
- It might increase the number of investigators who apply, and decrease our administrative duties overall.
- The major problem is that I collaborate and adding the indirect costs into the direct costs is prohibitive to such collaborations. I would not mind the total staying 250,000 if the indirect costs of collaborators could remain indirect and not be added into the 250k limit.
- Greater flexibility
- Clinical trials in particular are almost impossible with the \$250,000 cap.
- There has been no adjustment for inflation. \$250,000 does not go as far as it did when modular grants were established. The average grant in my discipline (where PIs tend to have only 1 grant) is now greater than \$250,000.
- It would allow a simpler budget process for grants with a broader scope than is possible with budgets less than \$250,000
- Perhaps equipment should be excluded from the limit. One year with a large piece of equipment requires a detailed budget for the entire grant, although all other years are less than \$250,000
- \$300K to better fit the limits of R21s
- Multi-year studies that include bioassays as a major expense often need "end-loaded" budgets (i.e., more dollars in later years to cover processing of batched samples). Depending on the nature of the bioassay, the current limit may not be sufficient.
- similar logic should hold true despite award amount
- Because most NCI grants go through additional across-the-board cuts, you always wind up with less money than needed to carry out the work. Could ask for more money in anticipation of known cuts.
- There is not much that can be done for \$250k, particularly in clinical studies.
- For Consortium grants, 250,000 is generally too low. Perhaps such applications could have a higher baseline.
- In those cases where PI salary is part of application

E2b Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond \$250K

- For proposals that involve subcontracts between institutions the modular budget needs to be increased to \$350,000 due to the loss of direct funds from indirect costs incurred at the other institution
- Escalating costs of performing research, including salaries for technical assistance
- It has remained at this level for 5 years, while costs of doing research have increased, It is important to have some increase in the top level over time.
- This allows collaboration with colleagues from other institutions.
- In year 1 especially, there are often start up costs for a grant that involve equipment and more consultant salaries.
- There is the perception that one should not ask for more than the limit. Therefore, to provide more flexibility and allow for the continued increased costs of grants the 'cap' should be raised periodically.
- Regardless of the total cost of a proposal, a detailed budget is unnecessary unless and until it receives a fundable score. It makes sense to place that sort of consideration after the consideration of the scientific merit/feasibility.
- The limit has been fine for my previous submissions, but it may not be in the future.
- It is increasing difficult to conduct research within that budgetary limit - tuition costs have gone up for RAs in a major way for example.
- I am currently at the maximum number of modules. I cannot grow the program for future applications; nor can I apply for more modules to cover increases in costs.
- I have a lot of collaborations and this cutoff is killing me.
- I don't see the value of limiting the budget since you need to justify any modules over 25K in the first place.
- some times, it is difficult to fit in the package within \$250,000
- Certain equipment costs can easily inflate one module to be greater than \$250,000 while the other modules are less than or equal to this amount. This then necessitates a non-modular application. I don't think that the limit needs to increase, but there must be some way to incorporate equipment purchases in a modular format.
- I requested 250K. I was granted 200K. After subtracting my salary commitment, I can only fund the research of 2 1/2 technicians or post-doctoral fellows, which makes it difficult to complete my aims. A bit (not a lot) more money would make it much more likely that I will complete those aims.
- The costs of research went up since 1999
- My work is moving toward utilization of transgenic animal models that are very expensive to maintain and thus in the future could put me over the 250K limit
- Too low for large projects

E2b Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond \$250K

- Depends upon type of research, as I use large animal models for my research, my yearly budget always exceeds \$250,000 dollar amount. I think bar should be raised to \$300,000.
- Subcontract costs often push the budget above \$250K. Perhaps extend the \$250 to \$300 if a subcontract is involved.
- Inflation--Possibly \$350,000
- Cost of doing research has increased over the years substantially but maximum modular amount has remained at 250,000.
- It should be available for all RO1's up to \$500K/year direct costs. Why? It's simpler to do the modular budget forms and provides more flexibility after the grant is awarded.
- Since the modular budgets were instituted, the cost of research has increased substantially. Increases in the total amount should reflect this by a readjustment at least every five years
- it is a user friendly process
- Costs are rising and it is often difficult to stay within this limit, especially for Clinical grants. In addition, something really needs to be done about the subcontract costs coming out of direct costs. This significantly impacts a collaborative project. NIH funded schools/Deans need to be forced to appropriately "split" the Indirects based on effort and costs.
- Costs for projects can exceed this limit easily.
- Animal costs (especially nonhuman primates) can significantly increase the budget of a proposal, without altering the scope.
- As a PI I always want more \$ whether it is justified or not!!
- For research requiring large animals, chronic studies, expensive supplies (i.e. cardiopulmonary bypass), the modular cap is not sufficient to support the studies. Same for consortium grants. Same for relatively small clinical studies.
- It would help to make an allowance, at least for the 1st budget year, for equipment purchases.
- Why not?
- More flexibility
- could include more collaborations or budget more per collaboration
- From my experience on Study Sections reviewers will rarely fund requests on non-modular grants greater than the modular grant limit and this restricts the ability of scientists to answer the questions they are addressing in the non-modular proposals. If the non-modular limit were increased, this problem might be diminished.
- For equipment
- Yes, to meet the increasing cost of doing research. For example, every three or four years it should go up \$25,000.
- Escalating personnel costs will soon eclipse the \$250,000/yr barrier.

E2b Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond \$250K

- Some collaborative projects are getting more expensive
- Primarily because of consortium costs. With increased collaborations with investigators at other institutions, there is a substantial "hit" that occurs by including consortium indirect costs off my direct costs. As it is now exists, I am loathe to collaborate at some institutions with particularly high indirect costs.
- It would allow the hiring of more personnel for each project. Salary is a big part of the budget and we can easily go over 250,000 if more than one post-doc is required.
- in order to prepare a modular grant you have to do a detailed budget anyway.
- It is not the dollar amount that should define the level of detail required for a budget. Even in the modular format, we have to detail subsequently the dollar amount for the different parts of an application. If the goal of the modular budget is to help the researcher on the scientific part of the application, the limit does not make any sense. A any budget amount can be either appropriate or inappropriately justified.
- It will provide more direct costs especially post-doc salaries are escalating in the past couple of years.
- Although I have not yet (in 30 years) had occasion to request more than \$250,000, I am now up against that limit and like the modular grant process enough that I would like to be able to continue to use it.
- I find I must decrease the scope of what I consider a reasonable research project in order to fit within this limit, and I have been told to avoid becoming "non-modular" even if the scientific questions require those resources.
- I have found that mid year budgets have to be flattened sometimes to keep all years within the modular cap. On the other hand, raising the cap might encourage budget growth.
- more flexibility; less applications for the same total amount
- The cost of high level science and salaries for PIs and researchers with benefits has increased beyond what the max module can accommodate.
- Can be restrictive in later years of a multiple year award. Perhaps \$400,000 would be reasonable. AS it is now, I imagine that most applicants ask for the maximum each year.
- Research costs are increasing over time. The 250K limit was fine 6 years ago, but it need to increase on a regular basis (say every 5 years) to reflect the cost increase of doing research.
- In grant proposal where more work is required because there is a need for transgenic mice work or that there is a need to have more than 3 or 4 postdocs, PIs should have the option to request more money.
- reasonable and works
- gives pi more flexibility
- Because I tried to use it for a consortium arrangement and the indirect costs from the other institution messed us up and it seems really arbitrary and counter productive. We would have easily been within budget if only direct costs were used for both institutions.

E2b Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond \$250K

- Many typical R01s are now in that range.
- As a scientist at a primate center, animal costs are significantly higher than for most other PIs. It is often difficult to plan experiments requiring the use of animals that would not exceed this limit. A limit of 300,000 would be much more reasonable.
- A toss up. My budgets regularly push the limits of the \$250,000. Without that limit, I would probably be asking for a bit more. But larger awards per grant means fewer grants. I favor anything that will increase the number of grants.
- Yes. In order to include other collaborators and to paid for the double indirect costs.
- I do imaging research and the costs of scan access and other labs don't fit well within the 250K cap.
- Lack of detailed budget justification is just as applicable to the larger grants as the smaller. I would, however, recommend the "broad category" breakdown
- FEWER GRANTS NEEDED TO SUPPORT OUR RESEARCH PROGRAM
- In clinical research a \$250,000 limit generally excludes a majority of achievable and fundable primary data collection projects.
- To cap over-spending of NIH budget and to not decrease the total numbers of grant
- It then truly allows me to focus on research rather than having to tailor research to budget.
- Cutting-edge technologies cost more than ever. The limit should be up to date.
- Would allow for more flexibility, especially on grants that require salary support for a number of collaborators. Also if a subcontract is included a large chunk of the annual funding disappears once overhead from the sub's institution is included (would be great for overhead on subcontracts to not come out of the direct budget)
- More flexibility given rising personnel costs etc.
- In some cases a project maybe between multiple groups and 250K can be limiting.
- The maximum amount has remained the same since the inception of the program in 1999. At 3%-4% cost increases per year over 5 years, a reduction in actual dollars can be calculated at 15% to 20% - in conjunction with cuts of one module with awards, actual dollars for awards have declined with this budget method. In addition, the current cap is insufficient to support collaborative research projects and inhibits collaborative research within and between institutions.
- Any arbitrary set limit can create unjustified preconceptions by the reviewers. I think that the number of modules should not be limited but that there should be more extensive justification to support the amount requested regardless of whether its above or below 250K
- Rising cost of my area of research would put the modular grant limit closer to \$275,000-300,000
- A modest increase, say to \$300 or \$350K would better reflex the normal costs associated with many research programs.

E2b Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond \$250K

- Over the years some costs have risen, especially animal care costs. We can no longer do the same experiments with the same budgets.
- a. Hard to fund animal research within this limit b. NIH has increased student and postdoc stipend minimum levels on a yearly basis. Other salaries have also increased. The fixed yearly budget does not take this into account.
- Raising the limit would give more flexibility to research personnel, especially among private institutions and medical schools where the PI's salary needs to be supported by grants. This also extends to senior researchers on grant support. The flexibility would also help certain universities located in cities where the costs of living are higher than average.
- Personnel and supply costs are increasing.
- Research costs have increased since 1999
- Nowadays, the salary scales for postdocs and graduate students have increased dramatically compared to the days when I was a postdoc and when the modular grant was initiated. Because of a series of mergers between different large biotech companies, the cost of some reagents has gone up significantly. It's getting more and more difficult to hire enough people and purchasing supplies with the budget given. Consequently, I have to constantly think about getting the second RO1.
- Costs of research (particularly salaries) have increased a lot over the past 5 years.
- Constructing the budget is not that big a deal for me. But for those who feel it is time consuming a greater funding limit might allow the modular method to be used by more applicants
- I am unable to use the modular form because my animal charges exceed the limits
- To help the new investigators
- clinical trials are difficult to fund with this low amount.
- human and animal studies routinely go higher
- To allow for sufficient support for subcontracts. To allow sufficient funds for high cost experimentation.
- Costs have risen substantially since the inception of the modular grants, particularly for NIH recommended postdoctoral fellow salaries.
- It is difficult to perform research across groups when small budgets are available. It will be better to fund several small risks grants and then on the second round to have larger grants of those groups that show good results.
- subcontract indirect inclusion
- the modular grant limit needs adjustment for inflation.
- Some of the projects will certainly need more than \$250,000. By increasing the limit could allow more flexibility.

E2b Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond \$250K

- The \$250,000 limit is often not high enough for studies (even very simple studies) that rely on the use of larger animal models.
- The vast majority of my grants include collaborations with investigators from other universities. Thus, I am usually required to submit a detailed budget, which may be placing me at a disadvantage.
- if a grant was funded for 250k and it is renewed 5 years later, budget cannot be increased without using non-modular format
- Would allow for inflation and salary increases.
- It should go up to 300,000
- 250K is now about the minimum amount that it takes to conduct any reasonably active research program. The ceiling is too low so that almost everyone asks for the max.
- It will allow a large proposed experimentation to be carried out.
- Costs are increasing for the high tech approaches - such as microarray - and the current limit tends to curtail the scope of the work. As such, it is harder to stay competitive for the renewal process.
- So I could do more innovative/expensive research without the detailed budget (transgenic rabbits)
- In some research programs, it is difficult to achieve specific aims with a current limit, especially in biomedical imaging field.
- with inflation, my grants typically cost much in excess of \$250,000; thus, in general the modular format is irrelevant to me
- A little higher to accommodate more expensive research, or hiring of additional personnel.
- Because the personnel is much more expensive now.
- Large increase of salaries for postdoc, students, and technicians.
- It would eliminate the adjustment of science to fit the cutoff.
- Because the costs for studies are higher with the additional regulations from HIPAA and so on
- More realistic budget for the lab as a senior investigator. Plus I have the notion that modular grants are easier to get an approved budget from the SS.
- Useful for projects with multiple collaborators.
- The cost of doing research is becoming higher - for example look at the salaries associated with postdocs and graduate students. Animals costs are also very high.
- more options
- many times I can not test all important hypotheses because the limitation in the amount of funds

E2b Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond \$250K

- There is no reason to limit the upper end of the budget. It may be acceptable to require more justification at the higher modules, at least in broader categories (e.g. travel, personnel etc).
- It will offer me the possibility to design large-scale experiments. Therefore, the outcome of my research will contain more information.
- It would provide greater flexibility of what you could propose.
- Costs for personnel and supplies have risen dramatically over the last 5 years and 250,000 basically only covers personnel and leaves very little for supplies etc. Problem is though that unless there is a major increase in NIH budget it is not practical to increase amount and award sufficient number of awards.
- It makes collaboration more difficult. For any projects involving human subjects/clinical activities, the amount is simply too low. The costs of doing genome-related work has also increased greatly in recent years, making the amount too restricting.
- If the budget is cut, it is cut by a whole module irregardless of the costs of doing the research specified in the grant. This often leads the investigators with insufficient funds to conduct the aims of the grant and with no recourse.
- Especially for renewals where programs have grown, \$250,000 becomes sufficiently limiting that PIs must write more grants to keep the lab going.
- Everything costs more these days
- WHY NOT?
- It is simply no longer enough to sustain salaries and operating costs in order to generate the results necessary for renewal
- Costs of senior personnel will drive grant costs up beyond the minimum. If you have a seasoned lab, you will end up decreasing the scope of work or filing a detailed budget. There is a mentality on some study sections that a certain number of modules is reasonable so the PI is not subject to micromanagement in the study section.
- Because much of the research that I plan to do will take more money.
- my research is personnel (not equipment) intensive, and personnel is expensive and often accounts for why I am over \$250,000.
- more likely to submit one
- I believe that the limit should be increased on a yearly basis, in parallel with the total NIH budget.
- To accommodate more interdisciplinary research that involves subcontracts

E2b Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond \$250K

- I would like to see the value of a module increased over time (as opposed to the number of modules being changed). Personnel costs have risen dramatically over the past several years. NIH has set higher minimums on post-doctoral fellow salaries without raising the cost of a module. If the salary minimums go up 10% shouldn't the modules go up accordingly? At my institution, graduate student stipends have risen \$1000 per year for the past several years and are expected to continue to rise at that rate. If I get promoted or my technician gets a well-deserved promotion, our salaries go up at least 10%. Thus, at the beginning of a funding period I might be within budget for a modular grant, but by the end of it, I'm not! I don't mind sticking to 6 modules or 8 modules, but I do think the value of the module could be adjusted each year to account for rising costs.
- Most will request 250,000 and not a dollar more even if a small amount more would make a big difference. The amount should be placed higher.
- To allow for equipment costs.
- Depending on the project, \$250,000 is a fairly limited amount of funding. Increasing it by up to 100% more would be helpful.
- This would allow one to propose and carry out experiments within the scope of the research program that are more ambitious and costly.
- Collaborations among researchers are encouraged and can synergize in obtaining scientific information. Allowing the limit to be higher would allow for increased collaborations and funding for the several laboratories involved.
- On a 5-year proposal with minimum of 2 aims, the budgetary support of \$250,000/yr is not sufficient to adequately support the aims of the research proposal,
- The cost of research has increased more than inflation since 1999, when \$250,000 was set as the upper limit.
- Costs have gone up--look at NIH recommended pay scales. 250K is often not enough to get a project done.
- with the increasing cost in salaries for researchers, \$250,000 is becoming insufficient.
- Doing research is becoming more costly.
- It would allow for more costly projects to be funded.
- The current limit allows for the support of limited personnel, with little remaining for supplies, travel, etc. I do not know how faculty on soft money make ends meet with only 1 grant (i.e. labs of modest size). However, I do not want the number of grants awarded decreased!
- Limits of 250,00 can not support the salary of established PIs and their lab when the only funds coming in are from grants.
- more funding and less cycle time for proposal writing and submission
- My research is labor intensive and it limits some of what I propose.
- Give more flexibility and allow more in-depth research.

E2b Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond \$250K

- If cogent arguments for more funding can be made, the benefits of a more convenient application process should not be sacrificed.
- \$250K today is not that same as \$250K when modular grants started.
- large equipment purchases
- I am a psychotherapy researcher. This is expensive in manpower, while study design and scope can still remain simple. I think this particular limit often hits right against power limits in rcts.
- Most of my grants involve collaborations, so almost none of my grants can be modular. Essentially by setting the bar low in terms of value, you defeat the idea of looking for interdisciplinary work and/or the purpose of having modular budgets
- It limits the scope of the award unnecessarily. I could be carrying out a larger (and potential more productive) project.
- I think many off the logic behind this limit can also be useful larger grant (say for \$300K)
- Too restrictive for grants that use expensive technology. \$250,000 has become an unofficial "cap"
- To encourage more collaborations with other institutions in moderate-sized projects.
- Postdoctoral fellow's salary and graduate student's tuition fee have increased dramatically in recent years.
- Studies involving laboratory animals are particularly expansive
- My program is small so I am OK for now but a modest increase, perhaps to \$300,000, would allow for inflation, somewhat larger projects, etc.
- The cost of research has increased since the original modular standards were established.
- simplifies grant preparation
- allow for inflation
- We need to cover full salary from grant, which occupy significant amount in the awarded grant.
- Science costs more these days and to remain at a plateau is unreasonable
- Some project require more than \$250,000
- cost of research continues to escalate at a steep curve each year
- As you know, recruiting people for post doc is getting harder. Why? Salary is getting lower to compare to the outside campus.
- Because some animal costs, student and post-doc support and reagents are more costly than expected.
- research is becoming expensive and it is difficult to live with this tight budget

E2b Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond \$250K

- I work with Medicare data which is very expensive to purchase in the first year (often close to \$100,000). It is very hard to keep that first year within 250,000 and still have enough personnel to get the grant started. A decent compromise would be to have a higher limit for the first year and 250,000 after that, or to exempt data costs/major equipment costs from the \$250,000.
- personnel costs have increased a great deal, in particular, postdoc and predoc salaries have increased (as they should)
- 250K equates to about two graduate students and one postdoctoral assistant. Many projects require more personnel than this.
- Costs are increasing for salaries, supplies and equipment.
- We need more funds to run laboratories.
- Realities of funding research these days.
- research are more expensive now. And to do something completely and properly, more money is needed.
- More flexibility in the types of projects that can be submitted in this fashion
- some projects need more support with collaboration outside institute
- Two main reasons: 1. Budget shouldn't drive the science. If more money is needed to conduct rigorous research, I'd hate to see investigators cutting the budget to save themselves administrative time. 2. If the rationale for the modular application process is to allow scientists to focus on the science - why only do so for scientists doing relatively small projects? Scientists doing larger, more complex projects could certainly benefit from the reduced admin burden as well.
- Limit for my field makes work under this cap nearly impossible
- I thought it used to be \$500,000.
- Because it make the process easier and there is no reason to make grant bigger than \$250K more painful that it should be.
- The process works well. A modest increase (to \$400,000, say) would be sensible.
- Because of increased costs for equipment, animal use and services
- Gives me as the Pi more flexibility in defining the goals and matching them with a realistic budget
- The inflation rate seems to catch up a little bit. In addition, there is often a budgetary cut across the board, making the \$250,000 limit unreachable in most cases.
- The limit should periodically be reviewed and adjusted for inflation as necessary. If the limit doesn't change, it may become too restrictive at some point.
- Because modules are routinely cut in study section and administratively. Average appears to be approx. \$200,000
- This would extend the advantage of simplification and flexibility to more important projects

E2b Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond \$250K

- Nowadays, \$250,000 is not a very large grant.
- NIH salary recommendations have outpaced increases in NIH budgets seriously limiting the number of personnel that can be funded on a single grant
- Research is becoming more costly
- Since salary amount for postdocs is increased
- Budget cuts will be made in every case and push the funding to a limit that makes it hard to sustain oneself running on soft money, especially as assistant professor.
- It makes it easier and more efficient. One modular grant of 250,000 barely pays the salaries of a small to medium sized lab. A modular grant ceiling of \$350,000 or even \$400,000 would be much easier for planning and execution of research.
- Limit the size of the grant and more PI will get funded.
- Research is much more interdisciplinary and more costly.
- More flexibility and often I work backward with the budget being the major constraint, figuring out how much science is possible within these limits. I find this especially true for human work as opposed to fly or worm work.
- Given that research costs are steadily increasing, it would be good to have a category for higher priced grants
- Since I do biological research, I have animal components in the research application. Therefore, sometimes it is hard to accommodate more animal experiments in the application if the modular limit is \$250,00
- Indirect costs of subcontracts make it difficult to keep the direct costs below this level sometimes
- preclinical and clinical studies could be requested in the same grant in which greater than \$250,000 may be needed.
- Salaries are going up, particularly for post-docs.
- It will provide flexibility for projects requiring collaborations.
- Equipment expenses can be significant in the first year, requiring more than \$250,000 in the budget. If collaborating with an outside investigator, it is impossible to go modular, so an increased limit (or the limit PER SITE) would still permit a modular application to be used.
- For the flexibility of carrying out larger projects.
- Sure, why not. Without budget justification it makes it impossible for the reviewers to know your true cost. Therefore, with an upper limit I am more likely to get more money!!!!
- \$250,000 was a reasonable cap in 1999 but the costs of research have increased sufficiently that even modest, focused proposals require more for the first year and certainly more by the last year of a 5 year proposal. \$300,000 is more logical in 2004.
- Cost of doing research in same general area is going up. Salaries in particular.

E2b Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond \$250K

- Cost of all aspects - personnel, equipment, participant reimbursement, supplies, etc. - continue to rise
- I've heard that the budgets of modular proposals at the limit (\$250k) might be viewed with suspicion, and therefore it's best to come in at \$225k or less (so the effective limit is lower than the official limit).
- same reasons for having a modular budget in the first place; simplicity, flexibility, reality
- convenience - costs to do work are rising
- I think more expensive projects could easily be handled under the modular budget with the option of providing some general budget justifications.
- Form some work, like with monkeys, \$250,000 is too low
- The arbitrary annual cap cripples exceptional expenses and cuts down on the possibilities of acquiring and upgrading equipment for the lab.
- The research efforts may require more funding compared to the limit. My proposal was a multi-university proposal with indirect costs of the secondary university rolled into the proposals direct cost.
- inflation is pushing up costs
- To provide more flexibility
- Personnel salaries are going up in Boston and quickly eat up a lot of the budget. Also, it rules out any collaboration or subcontract out of my institution
- Inflation dictates this is necessary
- Personnel costs have skyrocketed because the NIH has increased the postdoctoral fellow salary scale dramatically in recent years.
- So Science is very expensive, working with knockout rodents for example
- High animal costs. I use transgenic and knockout mice which are very expensive.
- The technology driven grants that involve larger numbers of investigators and costly technologies are often difficult to keep within the \$250,000 limit. The approaches however have become relatively routine and should not have to be relegated to a non-modular (more paper and justification driven) format.
- There should be an upper limit excluding equipment and/or subcontract indirect costs.
- In order to have adequate salary support for the key personnel over the funding period of the award for 5 years (to cover any salary increases which may occur
- The same considerations apply to larger grants.
- Because 250,000 is too low for some projects
- Projects involving heavy use of animals, for example, can be very costly and it can be difficult staying within the 250,000 limit.

E2b Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond \$250K

- I can imagine that startup costs in the first year of a new project might be very high, and this limit might inhibit an applicant from applying under the modular process when they have a project this demanding.
- That will give some researchers the possibility to submit proposals that require more funds under the modular grant category.
- A large fraction of research programs have annual expenses in excess of the current upper limit for modular budgets
- Streamline the process for everyone involved
- Some studies require more than \$250,000 to carry out
- I will not have to prepare a detailed budget.
- Research is more expensive than it used to be
- why not?
- subcontract costs routinely reach that level
- Any flexibility helps the investigator
- It would be helpful to raise it to \$300,000 since the present limit on the cusp of what one realistically needs to run a minimal program.
- to accommodate dollar needs for research goals to include subcontract costs without penalizing my own funds
- Recommended postdoc's salary increases significantly.
- flexibility
- allows no margin for added costs that are unavoidable when training students or if technical difficulties Can not set up outside collab. funding
- In competitive renewals would provide for inflation increases (limited room under the cap to increase grant size at renewal)
- At present budget and funding levels, the \$250k limit is almost a "small grant."
- Provides flexibility and is easier not to need to specify details of every cost.
- I do interdisciplinary research, and the modular cutoff utterly destroys my ability to fund coinvestigators to a reasonable level since I get hit with double indirects. PLEASE change the policy on indirect costs, or increase the modular amount.
- greater flexibility
- 1. More grants can fit the modular format 2. The research that costs 250K in the first year cost a lot more in the fifth.
- At some point the limit will have to be raised to keep pace with inflation.

E2b Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond \$250K

- many projects are larger than 250k, and should be part of the modular process, up to 300k
- Animal housing costs eat up huge amounts of the award.
- because when there are subcontracts, it is impossible to stay within the modular format -- indirect costs added to direct costs of the subcontract bring the budget over the limit
- I'm satisfied with the modular grants for a single PI, but its terrible for subcontracts. Therefore, the limit should be higher.
- functional imaging research is expensive, and generally runs around 300K or more, I would have categories of effectively special exemption category for some modes of research up to 400 K or so.
- 300K would increase restrictions on one time equipment purchases
- For neuroimaging research this limit is too low.
- 1. inflation hits everyone, yet the 250K limit has not changed for several years 2. Scientists who have major focuses to their labs will submit 4 modular grants for 250K, instead of one large grant for 800K, increasing administrative time, as will as requiring 4 times as many competing or noncompeting renewals
- 250,000 doesn't go as far as it used to, esp. due to higher post doc salaries. The modular format is a little easier and more logical, and it focuses review on the science. These are all good features. To my mind, all grants should be modular, but I don't think there should be a fixed dollar amount, or at least not up to say 400K direct.
- Personnel costs have increased substantially.
- All cost increased a lot (e.g. mice cost)
- Needs to keep in pace with cost of living.
- Because I always collaborate with outside institutions and including their indirect in my direct is a hardship.
- Because of increasing postdoc salaries, the amount of work that can be done for \$250000 or less has significantly decreased. Two RO1s barely covers a PI's salary and three other personnel. whereas five years ago an RO1 might cover 50% of a PI salary and two personnel now it's often closer to a single fellow or technician. I am all in favor of higher postdoc salaries, but without increasing modular budget limits, we get squeezed.
- Greater scope of research
- TO INCREASE COLLABORATIVE OPPORTUNITIES
- Ease of application preparation
- Promote interdisciplinary research and interventions research
- Many projects require higher funding amounts, but are at a competitive disadvantage under the modular system

E2b Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond \$250K

- Personnel costs, including benefits and fee payments for graduate students, and equipment costs take a large chunk of \$250,000. I think \$300K would offer a little more flexibility.
- Costs are increasing making it hard to stay within guidelines especially in states with high salaries
- More flexibility in proposing larger projects. Reduction in administrative burden.
- The imposes a limit that often makes it impractical to propose a reasonable research program.
- THE SCOPE OF SOME OF PROJECTS IS ABOVE THIS BUDGET LEVEL.
- There are some types of research that are notoriously expensive but the costs are predictable and hence amenable to a modular grant format
- Sometimes more funds are required for research, e.g. equipment at the start of a new project
- I work with mice. With vivarium costs increasing, it's difficult to propose reasonably ambitious goals and stay within the 250 K budget.
- Many new technologies requires higher budget.
- Modular grant applications are suitable for 2-year R21 applications, but the \$250,000 limit is too low for a 3-year R01 grant.
- SPECIAL EXPENSES
- Some programs require more postdocs or research technicians to carry out the experimental aims.
- Because of inflation since the program was initiated.
- My current research costs about \$300,000/yr and because I am capped at \$250,000 I must ask the School of Medicine for a supplement. A stepped increase allowing for increasing costs would be appropriate.
- 1. So as to take indirect costs for consortiums and subk agreements to be taken into account.
2. Use the modular format for up to \$500K but have budget items listed in categories with total amount requested.
- Inflation, high costs of research in some research areas
- The costs of doing research have increased, particularly the personnel costs.
- This cap seems arbitrary. Costs of research are constantly increasing (staff salaries, equipment, etc.). Larger limits on modular grants (\$500,000) would provide the opportunity to actually get enough money from a single grant to carry a research project forward in a timely manner.
- As costs go up, it should increase. At present, \$250,000 is workable, but already for one of my projects \$275,000 or \$300,000 would have been better, I had to cut one person and therefore the scope of the work to make \$250,000. If more than 25-40% of applications are requesting the maximum, it is time to increase the maximum.

E2b Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond \$250K

- Because my most recent application with only 3 post-docs plus part time dishwasher and of course modest supplies and equipment already totaled more than \$ 250K, and that is a pretty average type of project.
- As salaries for post-doctoral fellows and graduate students increases and as supply budgets balloon because of expensive technologies, I think the upper limit has to adjust. Otherwise we're all forced to apply for non-modular grants
- Costs continue to increase due to inflation, especially in salaries.
- \$250,000 has been the limit for about 5 or more years. There has been a major increase in postdoctoral salaries as well as a greater than inflationary increase in the rest of the expenses.
- Modular grants are easier to submit. This would ease submission of larger grants.
- Because costs have increased substantially since 1999, especially for personnel
- I would prefer anything that does not ask me to spend too much time on writing my budget for every single dollar.
- equipment upgrade is often needed in the middle of the grant period.
- The current limit makes it difficult to include subcontracts which are necessary for some projects and thus require to submit a non-modular grant while the total direct costs are actually less than 250,000
- Nonhuman primate electrophysiology costs a lot.
- 1. It's impossible to compete with NIH, where provides much higher salary ranges to postdocs/ other researchers. 2. When awarded, the total budget gets usually cut by 20-30%, which is not practical.
- Higher awards would prevent scientists from having to write multiple grants to different agencies. Currently, awards barely cover needs. I know of colleagues who have had to tweak grants just enough so as to acquire more funding to keep their labs afloat especially with regard to institutional granting requirements for tenure and lab space justification. this Tweaking takes up huge blocks of time that could be spent on the bench.
- Research costs are going up
- The amount seems to be a one-size-fits-all when not all grants (that are requesting the 250,000 amount) is one size.
- One of my projects includes subcontracts with other institutions/hospitals and gene mapping. The costs for subcontracts mean a reduction in funding for expensive supplies and services. However, without the subcontracts there will be no patients to participate in the studies. Catch22.
- \$250,000 doesn't go far these days for a major project
- Research becomes more and more expensive both with regard to personnel and equipment and supplies. The original level of 250K was fine, but now ore and more grants are going in with detailed budgets again because often 250K does not cover costs any longer.

E2b Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond \$250K

- costs of research increasing
- \$250,000 is not enough money to support a project that is likely to be sufficiently productive to be funded and renewed as an RO1.
- Costs are increasing, because a) grad student and postdoc salaries have increased and b) Deans are requesting faculty to put more of their salary on the grant. (You guys really need to say to Deans - We're not responsible for your payroll!)
- Would allow subcontracts
- If the modular concept works for one level of funding, it should work for all.
- more flexibility
- The cap is limiting for clinical work and for fully pursuing ideas.
- To allow more applicants to use this application mechanism (I believe the limit should be set at the level for the average cost of RO1 grant)
- Most research requires more than 250,000
- The budget request should match the work proposed, not the other way around. If the rationale for using modular grants is valid, it should apply to all grant applications regardless of size.
- Research using primarily in vivo models is significantly more expensive than work using primarily cell culture or in vitro models. If the scientific merit of the in vivo study is high, some allowance should be made for animal housing and purchase.
- It is simply too low, \$500,000 would be reasonable.
- Could get the benefits of a modular grant without having to worry about having to do detailed paperwork.
- I am at the limit for a typical application.
- Increase in personnel costs, reagents, travel for major research projects.
- in many areas of research/e.g. where large animals, like dogs, are involved costs are higher than the present limit.
- The base salaries for graduate students and post-docs have increased substantially in the last two years. There must be some accommodations for these increases in the award.
- The award limit was begun several years ago now and needs inflationary adjustment.
- Make it possible to request major eqpt. items without doing detailed budgets.
- I think higher awards would benefit from the program.
- Costs are very high these days, particularly for key personnel. If modular grants work for the current limit, there is no reason it would not work for a somewhat higher limit.
- To allow researchers to focus on the scientific merit of their proposals.

E2b Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond \$250K

- Because it would be possible to collaborate with other institutions. Because it limits most data collection projects, which may have large budgets in a single year. Sometimes spreading costs over multiple years reduces efficiency.
- There are times when an application requires collaboration between laboratories involving more personnel costs that can easily exceed the 250K limit
- The costs of supplies, genetically engineered mice, technician and post doctoral fellows salaries and travel have steeply gone up.
- Salaries are rising, service fees are rising
- Raise to \$300K to cover rising costs of doing research
- Some thought needs to go into the cap for them modular grants, if nothing else than to account for increased costs of doing business. By increasing the cap, you may get more PIs using the modular system.
- Give more flexibility with increasing costs
- Because \$250K pays for what I believe is a sub-optimal sized lab, necessitating that the average successful PI have 2-3 of these grants in order to begin to compete with their colleagues with HHMI or other foundation funding.
- Costs of reagents and salary levels, particularly for graduate students and postdocs, keep going up, so that the same research effort is significantly more expensive now than 5 years ago.
- The current limit seems artificial. The costs of any project should be related to the nature and scope of the project proposed -- not an arbitrary threshold.
- because I have previously inappropriately limited my budget for a grant in the (unsupported) belief that requesting the maximal amount would be seen as a negative for funding.
- allows more flexibility for researchers
- * Significant increases in personnel salary makes it hard to cover more than 2 salaries in \$250,000. * Animal research is very expensive
- The upper limit has been in place for a number of years, but research costs have increased substantially
- many important projects are over this limit.
- costs keep rising; there should be periodic adjustments to the upper limit.
- I would move it to 300,000
- Encourages interdisciplinary research.
- It is easy to handle and flexible, why limit those advantages?
- more latitude for investigators, increasing research costs.
- \$250K is now a rather small grant, and with the usual cuts, the real amount is often <\$200

E2b Raise Modular Grant Limit Beyond \$250K

- cost increases
- Larger budgets are needed for collaborative projects.
- better question: why not?
- costs have dramatically escalated
- As required salaries for grad students / postdocs go up, so should the upper limit on modular grants. (Because most grant money is spent on salaries.)
- It may allow to increase the work .
- to accommodate larger requests
- Sometimes this level of funding is not sufficient for the type of proposed studies
- Considering inflation and that I have been the PI on such an award for five years, it is probably time to raise the ceiling to \$300,000
- The cost of everything has increased the past 5 years- you have to offer more salary to remain competitive.
- Costs of everything are rising each year.
- Costs have gone way up. In the first year, equipment may be needed that pushes the total over \$250,000.
- Yes - Some substantial grants are limited in the funding available to them. No - Too many light weight grants will request (and be granted) too much money.
- For a given project the overall cost including personnel, possible need of new equipment or funds to cover services (proteomics, arrays etc) can exceed that amount, and changes in the scientific content of the project to limit costs may jeopardize the overall scientific merit and hence the review process.
- all research is increasing in cost, and it is just as difficult to write a 250k grant as a 350k one.
- To extend the convenience to larger projects
- So one doesn't have to receive prior authorization for submitting a grant application over this amount.

E2c Keep Modular Grant Limit at \$250K

E2c Keep Modular Grant Limit at \$250K

- By increasing the funding for more than \$250,000 per year per grant will further reduce the percentage of awardees, which is already low in the past few years.
- It's average total is ok.
- More detailed justification should be included at higher levels.
- It is a reasonable amount to conduct research on more public health issues. Furthermore there is mechanism in place to go above \$250,000.
- Because it is just about the right limit at the present time for 90% grant applications. It may have to be modified later if the inflation increases significantly.
- The upper limit \$250,000 seems reasonable to meet the direct costs. Projects with budgets above those amount would be best justified as program projects.
- Simple accountability. This seems like sufficient money that one should be able to take the time to explain what it is for.
- May result in award inflation and fewer awards.
- investigators should be more accountable for larger grants
- Think at some threshold, a detailed budget becomes a reasonable expectation
- It makes sense to me to keep the limit relatively low; for larger grant, a detailed budget should be provided to the reviewer
- The modular grant process has made it too easy for investigators to ask for and receive more money than they actually need. Extending the limit would just exacerbate this problem.
- \$250,000 is already a sizable amount already.
- too few people are soaking up too much money. spread it around more.
- My research usually requires budgets of \$250,000 or less.
- Higher amounts should be justified in detail.
- The grant with higher budget should not be submitted to the modular grant.
- reviewing large awards should be subject to elimination of "padding"
- Because I am a clinical research laboratory within the department of Surgery with no graduate students. I work with Research techs and residents, consequently spent more than 50% on bench work. Thus giving me less time to write proposals. I can only propose smaller grants.
- it is sufficient to do excellent job and give some money to more investigators
- It is a fair amount of money for most proposed research
- For most projects, \$250000 is a reasonable amount. At the moment, greater justification really should be provided for more. In a few years, with inflation, that issue should be reassessed.

E2c Keep Modular Grant Limit at \$250K

- It would just encourage investigators to request whatever the limit is raised to.
- I believe that for most of the research projects 250,000 USD are sufficient to cover all the expenses.
- not likely to help me
- Most applicants request 200,000 and above. If limit increase, amount of request will increase.
- 250,000 is a very reasonable cap.
- Most projects can be done within this amount. If there are larger projects, they should be fully described.
- I have the feeling, if the grant limit was higher, then the people who are most likely to get grants (that's people who already have lots of grants) will 'go' to the next limit. In fact everybody will. So then people like me, who are in the category 'won't get a grant, if possible' will not be able to get a grant. This is because the overall budget for the grants is not going to increase - not with the budgetary problems of the US and the high oil prices and the war and the troubled economy. So if the over-all budget is going to level off or get smaller, then an increase in the 'limits' of the modular grants, will translate into fewer grants being rewarded each cycle. So for me that would mean that I will go from the category 'unlikely to get a grant' into the category 'make sure that she definitely will not get a grant'. I do believe that it would be better to lower the limit. This would make sure that the numbers of grants given per cycle can stay within 80 % of the numbers of grants given 2 or 3 years ago. That way, people like me would have a chance to obtain funding.
- high enough for most researchers
- It is a reasonable amount of money to accomplish most proposals.
- \$250,000 is usually sufficient for any project. If not, it should be justified
- Most of our proposed research fits well into the \$250,000 or less category
- I would rather see more investigators funded with smaller grant budgets than funding being limited to big awards to very senior investigators
- detailed budget planning is necessary for projects costing in excess of 250,000
- There is a tendency for requested amounts to increase with the modular grant process. The study sections do a pretty good job of correcting inappropriate budget requests, but increasing the maximum would make it more difficult to battle the "all I can get" approach to budgeting.
- Most investigators would automatically put in the higher figure.
- the limit is sufficient for my needs
- I don't think the modular process works -- reviewers still evaluate budgets and do so without detailed justification.
- That amount seems to be a reasonable limit for the modular format. I would like more detail and justification for grants beyond this amount - both as an applicant and as a reviewer.

E2c Keep Modular Grant Limit at \$250K

- 250K is a high amount for most individual projects and having a higher amount that does not need to be justified does not make sense.
- Too much concentration of NIH resources in fewer labs
- You do need to know more details about the budget when a larger amount of funding is requested.
- I think for the average 5 year RO1, it is difficult to accurately project and justify 250K. In other words, it is difficult to propose (as an applicant) and evaluate (as a reviewer) 400K worth of science. This only applies to the typical RO1 that provides research costs to PIs doing basic research.
- I favor more smaller grants.
- Average grant size is not more than 10 modules.
- because I have a small lab and don't generally request a budget > \$250K.
- The current limit covers most applications for R01 grants; proposals that request larger amounts should give a stronger, and more detailed, justification.
- With the budget cuts in NIH funding expected, it would allow more proposals to be funded.
- No need for larger sums of money in a single grant.
- This would take away all accountability for large sums of taxpayers' money that is spent on research.
- In general people ask for the maximum or near maximum. With ~\$250,000/year good science can be done without too much administrative oversight. If limit was higher, people would apply for more. Study section scrutiny is not too great, and there will be less money to spread around to multiple investigators...those that succeed will get more, so payline will shrink.
- I think that 250,000 is an appropriate upper limit to run an NIH-funded research program.
- Most grant applications are below \$250,000
- There are few projects that require more than \$250K per year. Increasing the limit would increase the average award size, and a smaller percentage of grants will be funded.
- Any ceiling is largely arbitrary and the present is as good as any.
- 250 seems high enough for most R01 applications. Higher levels need justification.
- It is an adequate amount of money to support the scale of my research studies.
- Overall, I favor awarding more grants at lower levels of funding. The cap provides a good motivation for efficient budgeting.
- I think that if someone is asking for a very large award we need to make sure that they aren't excessively padding the figures. If the award is below the 250K cap and it seems reasonable then why bother to look at each small expenditure.
- Budgets of this scale should probably be more specifically justified.

E2c Keep Modular Grant Limit at \$250K

- PI should have to justify asking for more than \$250,000
- The requested amount of support for an average grant has already increased to a point that fewer grants can be awarded per year. Most applicants request the maximum amount of support and the reviewers could only reduce one or two modules for any grant even if the amount is considered as excessive.
- Almost all investigator initiated research that can be explained in 25 pages can be performed on 250k a year.
- Either way I have to prepare a detailed budget, which I would need to submit internally and to approximate the number of modules that I would have to request.
- The relative number of projects requiring funds that exceed this amount for personnel and supplies is relatively small (e.g. clinical trials). I am in favor of full disclosure/accountability/justification for high price tag projects.
- This seems like a very reasonable cut off above which one should justify why an RO1 costs more per year.
- It will limit science merit
- Over 250K requires budget justifications for the review process to be accurate.
- This amount allows for more PIs to be funded instead of all the money going to a few
- Probably not necessary.
- Large budgets typically require more justification to see if budget is reasonable. I am not sure if \$250,000 is critical level, but it seems reasonable.
- Yes and No. Yes since salary costs are increasing. No since it is important to limit expectations for any one program. More individuals can participate and provide creativity and diversity if no one program is too large.
- Non modular is available if really needed, and EVERYONE asks for as much as possible. This will decrease the number of awards.
- It is usually enough for my regular R01 application
- not enough money to do this at this time. W. wants to send it to Iraq
- It has been working well so far. I have not heard any negative feedbacks.
- This limit seems appropriate.
- This should be enough to support most NIH projects.
- I can keep my budgets within that total and that forces a concentration on the objectives and improves the focus of the proposal.
- As a reviewer, the modular process gives you no basis on which to make budgetary recommendations, for large grants there should be more justification.
- Large requests should have better justification for proper review

E2c Keep Modular Grant Limit at \$250K

- Larger grants should be scrutinized more closely to determine if costs are appropriate.
- The fat cats would get fatter faster.
- PI can always submit non-modular grants for grants over \$250K.
- It's not the amount, but the disconnect between science and funding promoted by modular grants
- The main problem I see with modular grants is the lack of transparency. Reviewers are not informed that a high proportion of the funds is required for salaries (for example, non-tenure track PIs provide often close to 100% of their own salary).
- I won't submit a modular application again.
- \$250,000 appears reasonable
- Larger grants are usually more complicated in budget and harder for reviewers to adjudicate appropriateness of costs.
- Don't perceive a need for it personally. Higher limit likely means less researchers will be funded
- I think it would impact on the number of grants awarded would decrease. This concentrates research, the direction of research, and ultimately our understanding of biology into fewer "hands". I think is good to have a broad range of investigators tackling a problem. When science goes astray, it now is virtually impossible to fight published dogma. I also believe that scientists are under such pressure to produce that shortcuts are taken and mistakes are made.
- For that kind of money you should have a good plan on how you are going to spend it
- Not necessary
- But only if you eliminate post-award cuts.
- grants that request more than 250,000 should have to justify costs in broad categories (travel, personnel, etc)
- 250K is a reasonable award for an R01. Budgets higher than this should be justified
- This is a reasonable compromise for 4-5 years of research. If more funding is necessary, one can request a supplement or submit a second proposal.
- \$250,000/year for a single PI conducting a focused, well-constructed project is sufficient
- It should all go to a modified modular, with amounts for the major categories listed in particular major sub-items: e.g. animal care, microarray costs, etc. should be broken out.
- my work can be done more efficiently if I stay within that budget.
- More grants (total # of grants) need to be awarded rather than increasing amount per grant
- It would lead to waste of increasingly precious NIH research dollars.
- The NIH should focus on funding as many grants as possible. This approach requires a limit to the total amount of funding for each grant. The \$250,000 limit is acceptable for most grants.

E2c Keep Modular Grant Limit at \$250K

- Because a more thorough assessment of the risks associated with large budget research seems to justify a detailed budget.
- I think that people tend to ask for the maximum amount that they can and as a result may be asking for more than they would if they had to give a detailed budget.
- It's too easy to inflate budgets when one doesn't have to itemize and think through the costs of the experiments, personnel, etc. It is also extremely difficult for reviewers to evaluate properly whether the budget requested is appropriate in a modular grant.
- I think that the system is fine as it is.
- I would rather see more grants awarded than fewer larger grants
- This amount is fine for a RO1...without the hassles of doing a detailed budget.
- While it may increase the funding for individual grants, it will result in a substantial decrease in the success rate.
- Larger amounts of money should be more specified.
- To "limit" requested budget. There is ways to request higher, non-modular budget anyway.
- I think a higher budget request should be more heavily scrutinized.
- This is a good compromise level, allowing flexibility, but requiring justification for large grants with increased number of modules.
- Would encourage inflation of budgets
- This is a reasonable limit for the kind of research I carry out.
- This will not be reasonable given the budget of the NIH
- At some point, the PI has to clearly defend the request for support. Above 250K seems reasonable. I could even support a lower cap.
- Unless a large collaborative project, that amount should cover the expenses for a normal project
- don't need so much
- I think that research funds are used more effectively when awarded in smaller quanta.
- That is not the issue. The modular process should be eliminated.
- We need more grants overall to raise the cut off line in the percentile ranking.
- Grants need to be smaller since the NIH budget is not increasing much
- The institutions or departments often put pressure on the PI to "top off" the budget.
- anything bigger needs scrutiny.
- I think for most researcher-initiated NIH grant, a direct cost of \$250/year is enough for most of the research to be proposed.

E2c Keep Modular Grant Limit at \$250K

- If the limits are increased, some investigators will inflate their budgets to meet the new cap, thus decreasing the total number of grants awarded.
- I think that it would simply encourage investigators to request more money without having to explain their requests. It is difficult for reviewers to evaluate modular grant budgets to determine if they are appropriate, especially in terms of personnel time.
- The average R01 grant proposal does not need more than \$250,000 per year
- Not needed at this time
- larger grants need more justification
- need to spread the wealth to younger investigators
- At this stage of my research, the \$250,000 limit is sufficient for my needs.
- Beyond this amount there should be a high degree of justification that is not a requirement for the modular system.
- For now \$250,000 is sufficient for my research
- Request up to \$250,000 is a reasonable amount required to conduct meaningful research. Any request above \$250,000 should be justified so the grant review panel can make a decision.
- I do not much experience yet. But the limit seems OK to me.
- Would not seem necessary for the size of my laboratory
- Most work can be done in 250K modules and there exists a mechanism for awards that exceed 250K
- It limits number of total RO1 awards. This is particularly difficult for new investigators getting funded.
- I'm hoping the competitive renewal of my RO1 will fall above this limit so I don't have to do the modular budget. We have to prepare the detailed budget for our institution anyway, so the module budget represents additional work and reduces flexibility because I have to figure out how to divide my budget into \$25,000 packages.
- I would try to keep everyone within these limits. Already there are so many grants asking more than 250,000.
- One has to draw the line at some figure. \$250K provides sufficient fund to complete work with the most commonly proposed models and personnel.
- Funds requested in excess of this amount should be more carefully scrutinized.
- Most projects can be done with that limit, and investigators can still apply above the limit if justified.
- For my area of research the limit is adequate.
- From a reviewing point of view, the budget details matter

E2c Keep Modular Grant Limit at \$250K

- Very large amounts of funding to a single investigator should require more detailed justification and budget description since it is a major investment of taxpayer money
- But it should increase at some point in the future.
- budget information is useful in assessing planned goals of a project
- Seems reasonable to request more accountability for higher budget requests.
- Adequate for most projects.
- It is important to fund more investigators than to support a higher dollars project for selected investigators. There is an increasing difficulty for younger investigators to get funds from NIH.
- If it is higher, the budget justification should be more detailed. With a lower ceiling (remaining at \$250K, more PIs will be able to funded, and research questions will perhaps be more focused.
- Above this amount greater scrutiny of budgets is required.
- I think we should do away with them
- Would invite further escalation
- Higher requested amounts should be scrutinized more carefully to ensure proper utilization of resources.
- I believe that all NIH grants should be capped.
- There are too few grants funded already. Raising the limits would only reduce the number of investigators able to do research, to the detriment of the scientific enterprise in the US.
- Very few P.I.'s can justify such a high cost for a one year period.
- There is a need to distribute funding to more individual labs to support the US academic research infrastructure. 250,000 seems to remain an appropriate size for a good individual laboratory contribution.
- Grants have already escalated to the \$250,000 limit. Raising the limit would only increase the amounts asked for.
- Too much funding goes to too few investigators
- The modular budgets of the applications from the biggest/strongest labs would be inflated, smaller labs and less established investigators would suffer more
- At present, \$250000 is a substantial sum of money for a single year of a single project. Costs higher than this probably should require some specific details on where the money is going, and the non-modular budget is not a serious enough burden to dissuade those who would actually require a budget of this magnitude.
- It is better to distribute the limited resources to as many investigators as possible than giving a large grant to a single investigator. This will permit testing of more ideas
- For a single PI, \$250,000/year is a lot.

E2c Keep Modular Grant Limit at \$250K

- I don't think its necessary in the majority of cases.
- \$250,000 fits most of research need.
- \$250,000 is sufficient
- I believe this amount is sufficient for most studies undertaken in one year.
- For bigger budgets, details are useful
- For now, that is a reasonable amount of money to run a lab.
- My perception is that the system is working well. I assume some change will have to made for inflation.
- would make the process of reviewing and assessing budgetary needs only worse
- The amount is sufficient for most grants
- It's a reasonable cap and is sufficient for supporting studies that can be done in one year in most cases.
- none of my grants require more than \$200,000
- I think that 250,000 is a good cutoff. I don't think that reviewers would be able to evaluate the appropriateness of budgets that were not itemized above that value. However, budgets could be less detailed especially in the supplies/equipment parts.
- The \$250,000 limit seems to be adequate for the average RO1 award.
- Currently, this seems to provide enough money for many grants. I perceive this amount to be a (easily broken) boundary for financial requests. At some point it seems fair to require a detailed justification of why a certain amount is necessary. This would be advantageous to the applicant who can make her/his case and to the reviewer who can interpret the need better.
- BUDGETS ALREADY SEEM OVER-INFLATED FOR THE AMOUNT OF WORK TO BE PERFORMED - INCREASING THE LIMIT WOULD INCREASE THE INFLATION RATE
- This amount already seems optimal.
- At least for most of the studies that we do this amount is sufficient.
- Research costs are already escalated
- I believe \$250,000 per year (or less) is a reasonable amount for the majority of R01-type research projects
- This seems to me to have been set at a reasonable level. Larger budgets warrant more detail.
- This is reasonable
- Most project can be covered by this amount.
- Reviewers need detailed budgets to assess the appropriateness when a grant asks for higher sums of money.

E2c Keep Modular Grant Limit at \$250K

- Too much money is used by Institution to cover salaries of PI. This will encourage Universities/ Research Institutes to expect increased percentage of PI salaries from the grant. Additionally, it will reduce the number of awards.
- most work in biology by an ROI single pi can be done for that, and if more is needed than get a center award.
- It's a reasonable amount of money for medium size projects
- Less potentially funded awards will be awarded
- Considering the research I am proposing that sum is sufficient
- Grants are already too big to begin with. We can fund more laboratories and more projects if funding is kept within a reasonable level.
- Everyone asks for the max anyway,.
- It hasn't come up yet for me.
- Appropriate amount for most research projects and those with more chance at funding (more established investigators may obtain disproportionately more funding.
- That is a reasonable limit.
- I think that an application requesting more than \$250,000 should provide a detailed budget and justification. I also think that it is better to fund more applications at a reasonable amount than to fund fewer large grants.
- I prefer regular grants
- SOME KIND OF LINE MUST BE DRAWN. THAT IS REASONABLE
- Most modular grant requests are \$250,000 now and will increase to the size whatever the limit is. This will lower the chance of funding for everyone.
- Reviewers probably think too greedy to ask more than \$250k for the research in the average size of laboratory.
- I WOULD PREFER TO SEE MORE INVESTIGATORS FUNDED THAN INCREASE THE CEILING OF AWARDS.
- Other mechanisms such as PO1 for greater funding
- better to fund more investigators instead
- For most biomedical research \$250,000 per year in direct cost is quite sufficient. What disturbs me is the 17-35% cut in approved budget, that puts an enormous strain on the personnel and supplies. I would rather see keeping the promised and approved budget to the same, no cuts.
- Agree with the need for a limit
- In times of limited funding it is important to fund more grants. This will give optimal progress and is also better for the scientists as a whole.

E2c Keep Modular Grant Limit at \$250K

- This is a good size for most of the projects. If a project needs higher cost it can be submitted as regular grant. In my opinion keeping the limit to \$250 may help fund more number of applications that deserve funding.
- It limits the expansion of grant award amounts over the recent inflation and will keep the over all payline reachable since the total NIH budget will not be increasing as much with the huge budget deficit
- I believe it is important to maintain or increase the number R01 grants. A higher limit would likely make this more difficult.
- \$250,000 is more than sufficient for most of the proposals I ever sent to NIH
- I think budgets higher than \$250,000 should be justified in more detail.
- In general my projects are <10 modules.
- A sense that detailed budgets curb expenditures that may not be essential to the scientific process. Less essential expenditures may be more likely in very large grants. Second, my observations over the years indicate that very large grants generally provide less creative bang for bucks than smaller focused grants.
- I would prefer to go back to itemized budget
- This limit includes most young and mid-level scientists.
- One NIH grant should be not too much, this will decrease the funding choice for other grants. Junior faculties are struggling for their first grant.
- I think many grantees ask for the limit and could do their projects for less. I think over time this will limit the available funds for new grants and funds to start new investigators
- A large grant should make clear the need for above average funding.
- don't think an amount greater than \$250K is necessary for individual research awards except under extraordinary conditions
- It's covers well the amount of work that can be done within the scope of an RO1 grant
- That appears to be a reasonable limit for average awards. Greater awards need to be further justified by specific details.
- This amount currently seems correct for an individual project. It is sufficient to fund a substantial project that can be reviewed efficiently and effectively. With inflation it will need to be increased in a timely manner.
- It's not about the money. \$250,000 would be enough for most proposals. I am just worried about that many grant don't go the right people.
- More than that merits detailed justification.
- seem OK as is
- Investigators will almost always ask for the max regardless. Without budget information it is impossible to determine if the request is justified.

E2c Keep Modular Grant Limit at \$250K

- BIG ITEMS THAT WILL AFFECT THE LIMIT HAVE TO BE REPORTED ANY WAY.
- I think all NIH (R01) grants should have a capping Of \$250,000.
- If you want more you should have to justify it
- So far we have not needed larger annual amounts from NIH
- 1) For someone running a small lab, I feel that there is little emphasis on cost-effective research. Increasing the limit will further erode cost consciousness for PI's. 2) My impression is that anyone applying for a modular R01 is encouraged to ask for the maximum. I've heard anecdotes that asking for less than \$250K imparts an impression that the PI is not confident or is naive. Both of these concerns underlie my impression that more investigators could be funded if there were greater attention paid to fiscal responsibility.
- I think if individuals are going to ask for higher sums for their research, the review panels need to know where that money is going.
- RO1 and comparable proposals that require unusually large budgets should probably receive more objective budgetary review than is possible with the modular format.
- \$250K is generally adequate except under unusual circumstances.
- This level is compatible with the resources needed for my research
- Making the limit \$250K had the effect of increasing the size of the average award significantly (although not to \$250K). I don't think that starting grants need to be larger than this, on average, but I think that increasing the limit will lead to another increase.
- Larger budgets require more detailed justification.
- As long as there is no penalty for submitting nonmodular grants (i.e. the perception that they are less likely to get funded based on their budget, is untrue) then I think the 250000 limit is reasonable. When given money above that amount one probably should have to account for it in a more detailed fashion.
- 250K is a reasonable amount conducting a very specific research project
- In my field, majority of awards are in this range. Only if there is a general trend towards funding smaller number of larger grants, it would make sense to increase the present limit.
- For most research projects I have seen, very few need a larger budget. Increasing the amount will encourage PI to ask for more money just because they can.
- This is a lot of money, we need to know what such large amount is needed.
- This is a reasonable amount for an individual research project. One of the main problems with NIH funding is the bloated budgets of the individual projects: trying to answer a question with financial overkill rather than clever experimentation reduces the number of investigators and questions that can be funded.
- It is about right

Comments for Principal Investigators

E2c Keep Modular Grant Limit at \$250K

- WHEN SUPPORT IS REQUESTED OVER 250,000 REVIEWERS SHOULD BE ABLE TO ASSESS THE BUDGET FOR JUSTIFICATION
- Grant budgets have already increased because of modular grants. With the tight NIH budget, the cap should stay where it is.
- Seems like a reasonable limit at this time
- My current investigations do not require a budget that exceeds this value
- For now, the type of scientific research that can be described in an investigator-initiated R01 application should be supported at \$250,000. Applications in excess of this amount should be reviewed in a different way.

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- The ease of preparation.
- I like the fact that you do not have to fill out a detailed budget.
- Ease of establishing the budget page
- The Budgets are easier.
- Simplification of the process. More thought into the application and less into paperwork.
- It saves time and provides flexibility.
- Simplifies the budget page
- Convenience. No detail. No rounding off.
- Flexibility during the post-award period.
- Ease and efficiency of proposal preparation.
- If I didn't have to provide a detailed budget to my institution, the modular application would certainly be easier.
- Simply putting the amount needed for my research project for each year.
- Easier to prepare grant.
- eliminates need for detailed budgeting and perhaps more important, rebudgeting later
- simplified process
- Takes less time to prepare budget - more time can be donated to the Research Plan
- Reduced budget justification for minor items
- less itemization
- NO DETAILED BUDGET. MORE FLEXIBILITY FOR PI
- Simplified process
- The only aspect is that it simplifies budget calculation as the budget does not change.
- Ease of budget justification.
- simple, no point to make details before you obtain funding
- A little less work for the PI
- The fact that I don't need to make a budget and can concentrate on the scientific aspects of the grant.
- Reduced paperwork. Easier to get through local systems.
- not having to itemize so much

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- They are straightforward but there is a problem of yearly increase in salary of PI and personnel.
- Getting funded.
- Simplicity
- makes preparing application very easy, can concentrate on science and not waste time justifying consumables.
- Less time devoted to budget justification in application process.
- The simplified structure of the budget and other support. However, we have to assemble a detailed budget so to prepare the modular format! This kind of negates some of the goals of the modular format!
- It is simpler to budget. One cannot truly budget a project until it is awarded because of possible budget cutbacks, so the initial budgets submitted are somewhat artificial anyhow.
- Ease of preparation and ease of review
- Ease of preparation.
- The simplicity and flexibility of budgeting.
- The budgeting process is much easier.
- The more sane approach to describing budget outlays.
- no need to justify all expenses
- No need to fully justify while trying to get the proposal out the door.
- gives more freedom to estimate
- Don't have to justify every pipet tips that we buy. Flexibility and trust in to the PIs judgments.
- Save tremendous amount of time in preparing budgets and in writing justifications.
- A good mechanism for funding secondary data analyses.
- Simplicity.
- Simplifies budget preparation.
- It reduces the time for preparing detailed budget.
- It is much easier to complete and therefore less time-consuming, more flexible spending and allows more time to be spent thinking about the science which is what gets the proposal accepted rather than details of how money will be spent.
- I only did one and it wasn't funded so I'm not sure. Perhaps it is easier once one has done one. Not having to do the Other Support Pages makes sense since those things often change by the time the grant actually starts, if it is funded.
- It's faster and easier to complete

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- Simplified the budget pages and budget justification
- Much less paperwork. Can focus on the science more.
- Simplified process.
- Simplifies the application process.
- Spending flexibility, less budget work just when finishing a grant and when Office Sponsored Projects is very busy.
- It allows applicants to concentrate more on scientific parts. □
- Not having to work so much on the details of the budget and other items.
- Simplicity and flexibility; saving time
- One page presentation of the budget
- No budget details, flexibility
- Less worry about budget.
- time savings
- Budget flexibility makes grant life MUCH simpler.
- Reduced administrative burden
- Simplicity
- LESS BUREAUCRACY
- stream line administ. paper work
- No need to prepare detailed budget.
- non-detailed budget - flexibility
- Less budget discussion at study section meetings.
- In principle, simpler budget preparation, but this is negated by my university's requirement for a detailed budget, even for a modular grant.
- Time saving
- flexibility (post award) reduce workload (before award, esp. when unfunded).
- Once you learn how to do the application (i.e. which sections to complete and how to complete them) the process is very straightforward.
- Focus on science
- Streamlining so more time is spent on science and less worrying about details such as where to get the best price for pipette tips!
- easier preparation of the application

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- not having to put together a specific budget
- It is easier to prepare than a detailed budget and it provides greater flexibility in spending.
- ease of application, lack of "negotiation"
- one page budget
- Less paper work, less to think about detailed budget.
- Not having to fill in a detailed budget. The budget I fill in for the department and the research administration only needs to have the salary details for personnel and the amount for equipment. I can easily estimate the rest based on past expenses.
- Flexibility Reduces nitpicking by reviews over budget issues
- simple and flexible
- Don't need to break down the budget, however, offset by institutional requirements for detailed budgets.
- FLEXIBILITY, LESS HASSLE
- Ease in application More flexibility in budget
- Ease of filling out the application
- No need for detailed budget which may save some time if Harvard did not ask for the detailed budget.
- Ease of preparation of proposal, ease of budgetary management if awarded
- somewhat easy
- Provides flexibility and is easier not to need to specify details of every cost.
- The basic idea is a good one, to encourage flexibility in budgeting at all stages.
- I answered all questions about good aspects of modular grant application process
- Ease of filling out budget.
- simplicity
- The idea of a modular grant application is good - but it does not help me when I still have to file a detailed budget with my university
- The modular format is a little easier and more logical, and it focuses review on the science.
- I think it is helpful not to have to submit a detailed budget. Particularly, it is easy to assess the approximate cost of running a lab for five years, but it is difficult and inherently inaccurate to predict the exact manner in which money will be spent.
- Less paperwork.

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- The ease of filling out the budget part of the proposal. Detailed budgets and their justification can entail a fair degree of effort that with the modular grant can be spent on scientific parts. This process is easier for our administrative staff as well
- time save
- overall every thing is OK
- reduced budget justification section and increased budget flexibility
- 1. Focus on the research plan, not the budget. 2. Ability to rebudget without notification. 3. Administrative supplemental awards.
- Less detailed work
- flexibility of spending
- Budgeting is simple (although my institution's grants office still requires a detailed budget, and they claim that they're required to ask for it by NIH).
- saves a lot of time
- streamlined process
- Not detailed budget and other support to start with
- Slightly simpler.
- The process avoids the minutiae of budgeting and the gamesmanship of creative accounting.
- not having to have a budget until it is likely to get funded
- Not dealing with detailed budgets, which are a complete waste of scientific brain power.
- Requires less time preparing budget and budget justification
- Less calculation of dollar amounts that in any event are likely to change during the course of the project
- Not having to submit the detailed budget.
- Flexibility.
- Less detail for something that will change anyway as the grant proceeds. Although not part of the modular process, per se, the carryover provisions have been good both for cost savings and for financial management. I also like the just in time provision, which improves the scientific quality by allowing more focus on design near the deadline and less on local committees.
- ease, ease, ease
- its simplicity
- STREAMLINED APPLICATION PROCESS SO THAT ONLY THE LARGE ITEMS OF THE COSTS NEED TO BE LISTED.

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- The budget is easy and fast.
- Not having to cope with details of the budget.
- Less budget prep time
- Overall, seems somewhat simpler to prepare.
- The flexibility to use funds as per the need at a given time rather than be forced to follow specific categories.
- No detailed budget saves time and anxiety. Unfortunately, some institutions still require detailed budgets, which adds time, but not anxiety.
- The reduced need to fill out detailed budget forms even though we need to provide this data to our administration.
- Stream-lining the budget process. Adding some flexibility.
- Simple, less time consuming, flexible
- I especially like spending more of my time on the science in an application rather than the finances.
- Quick with no hassle.
- The modular application is easier--however the overall effort is not much reduced because we have to file detailed budgets at the University anyway--this effort is usually later duplicated by a University request for a budget for an awarded grant..
- Once the process is understood, it is more streamlined.
- Less paperwork on top of the science
- Saves time
- No detailed budgets or justification
- Almost every aspect.
- Ease of preparing grant.
- As an administrator, I have had extensive experience with modular grants even though my own R01 is not modular. I like the confidentiality of salaries and the elimination of gamesmanship in budgeting, where people would try to guess what individual items reviewers would approve or disapprove.
- Providing a detailed budget is extremely time consuming. As the research program develops over time, the specifics of the proposed budget are likely to change. With the modular format the investigator has more flexibility,
- It does simplify the time and effort to construct the budget.
- Quick and easier to prepare the budget

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- It is easy to fill out, and does not take any more time. I have to do a detailed budget for our ORSP, however, that just allows me to quickly do the modular pages without more extensive forms.
- I like not spending the huge amount of time required for detailed budget and justification. Also, during review, study sections can focus on the science; too many hours were wasted reading and discussing budgets.
- The ease of developing a detailed budget for internal purposes only, and the flexibility this allows for the conduct of the research project.
- the simplicity
- Reduces preparation time. Line items do not get knit-picked by reviewers
- I have had advice in the past to think carefully and be quite explicit about justifying radioactive and hazardous waste disposal, administrative support, etc and I think it was a waste of time. NO one ever said concentrate on your SA because that is the first hurdle that the reviewer will put you through and if you pass that and the review of the experiments only then will they care what you budget says. At that point I would think that they are looking mostly at total dollar amounts not minor points like justifying small amounts.
- Easy, flexible.
- Not having to submit a detailed budget or other support information. This not only reduces the PI time spent on the grant application, but it also directs the peer reviewers to focus on the science and hopefully eliminates/reduces the impact of this information on the reviewer's scoring.
- less hassle to justify the budgetary items.
- Flexibility of use of funds
- The simplicity of the budget preparation and the flexibility in spending the funds.
- Freedom from time spent with detailed budget. Acknowledgment of flexibility with funds.
- Less time spent on budget preparation. Less vulnerability to specific budget cuts by the review committee.
- The streamlining of the budget preparation process.
- It makes it much easier to use the funds effectively to get the work done. Preparation is a little easier, but the real benefits start when the award is made.
- Ease of proposal preparation to NIH.
- the ease of the budget
- I like the fact that one needs not worry about exact costs of lab supplies etc.. at this stage of the grant application process when 50% of the applications will get triaged anyway
- Not held to a detailed budget; gives some flexibility over non-modular budgets, but not a lot.
- Makes the proposal process much simpler.

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- The straight forward approach of that section
- Overall it is a great idea and should simplify the submission process. There is less nitpicking about budgets during the review panels. Salaries are generally kept confidential.
- I don't have to be very exact about the budget while I am submitting the grant.
- The reduction in time needed to complete budget pages.
- Elimination of budget justification
- Aspects seem more streamlined. I do like the biosketches that are more extensive and not doing the other support pages.
- Saves a lot of time for me and my support staff.
- No detailed budget (for NIH)
- As a PI and reviewer it makes the process more uniform and boilerplate mentality can exist. However, my university still requires a detailed budget so the work is still there. I just do not have to write the justification.
- Simplicity
- I like the flexibility for rebudgeting (between categories) after the award has been given. While it is convenient not to have to provide a detailed budget for each year, I prepare a budget of the major items (personnel and supplies) for myself (in consultation with my department administrator) in any case. This step is not required by my department but always seems like a reasonable thing to do.
- Flexibility (at least with NIH) with how the award is spent.
- flexibility
- As an applicant, it simplifies the process and it is harder for the reviewers to identify overlap since other support page is not included.
- simplicity and flexibility
- Budget planning
- ease of use
- flexibility
- Preparing the application, since it has simplified the process at some level.
- I don't have to prepare a detailed budget for the NIH.
- I believe that the reduction in administrative burden as far as submitting a detailed budget is fantastic, and a major plus.
- It is easier to prepare the budget and focus on the science.

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- Not having to have a detailed budget is great--it is hard to anticipate changes in direction, etc over a 5 year period. It essentially becomes some kind of guessing game, not a useful expenditure of time.
- In theory, should save time.
- Flexibility
- Simplifies preparation - unfortunately I still have to do the full budget due to institutional requirements.
- save time
- not having to prepare a detailed budget
- much easier to do the budget
- not having to provide a detailed budget too early.
- The requirement for a detailed budget was one of the least satisfying aspects of the last bit of activity prior to submission. Not having to expend that effort for a non-funded proposal is a plus.
- Our administration gets the grants through their review process more quickly.
- Ease of submission
- A little easier to fill out
- it makes very little difference to the application process. you still need to think about a detailed budget and everyone has other support pages, so that is not a problem.
- SIMPLICITY
- Not having to prepare a detailed budget before the scientific goals are well defined.
- Simple form
- the fact that every detail of budget is not spelled out
- do not need to provide an exact budget- just round to nearest 25K
- Flexibility in modifying scientific approaches to research problems I find the modular approach to be superior to the previous funding process
- Budget Flexibility
- Less time required for administrative details
- It makes it easier to prepare the budget and simplified justification, and when reviewing an application I have found the information sufficient.
- I can skip the Other Support form and focus on the scientific aspect of my proposal.
- I think that the format of modular grant application processes are clear and easy to follow

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- Less work on budget justification details
- I appreciate the time saved in dealing with detailed budget justifications. This usually took about 6 hours, now the budget takes no more than 2 hours.
- Time saver!
- more simplified justification
- Simplified budget planning.
- not dealing with precise \$ amounts
- Simplification of the budget.
- It is much simpler and less of a problem.
- Clear structure No detailed budget which increases flexibility
- I like its straightforward nature, everything is clear and simple.
- less time being creative with budget
- I think it works very well.
- simplicity.
- No need to make detailed and other costs budgets.
- easy, takes relatively little time
- Not preparing a detailed budget that realistically cannot be adhered to in toto.
- I would like not having to make a detailed budget, but my institution requires me to do so anyway.
- I still have to prepare a detailed budget but I don't have to defend it to the extent that I have to for a study section.
- Flexibility of budget allocation
- Budget preparation is a bit easier
- The streamlined budget requirements.
- Not having to prepare a detailed budget
- Shift of emphasis from budgetary to scientific considerations
- I like the fact that the modular budget allows me flexibility to adjust expenditures (e.g., from personnel to supplies), as needed, during the course of the project. This flexibility improves my research efficiency.
- Have more time to concentrate on the science
- It is less work.

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- Flexibility. Because institution requires a detailed budget, time isn't the main gain.
- Nice to not have to submit the detailed budget.
- Either modular or non-modular I don't handle the budget issues
- The research plan.
- Increased flexibility in budgeting. Reduced effort in preparing detailed budgets.
- simplicity
- The equipment nodules give flexibility.
- Keeps reviewers from being too highly focused and petty about budgetary issues during study section.
- flexibility, ease of preparation
- Our fiscal person does most of the financial work, but they seem to be able to move through the process more quickly than was previously the case.
- I very much like the flexibility imparted by the modular budget.
- Simpler and more flexibility.
- It simplifies the budget and budget justification process
- Lack of detailed budget
- Streamlining, "In Time" aspects
- easy
- Some flexibility and some lowered contact with NIH budget staff. Not in my opinion an overwhelming benefit.
- I believe it is more flexible. See my previous comments with respect to serving on Study Section.
- flexibility in budget management
- The lack of a justification for each item in a budget
- They are nicely addressed in the above survey.
- A little less paper work (although my institution makes me do the paper work anyway).
- Spending less time on the budget justification.
- The flexibility it provides
- stress free preparation and review

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- As I always have to do an internal detailed budget for pre-award grant routing submission, it seems as if the institution has implemented stricter requirements than NIH. Thus, I am not sure the full benefits of the modular grant application process have been leveraged by my institution.
- Easier and faster, leaving more time for section D.
- ease of completion
- Simpler application because the budgets required for the institution are flexible and more like a formality (therefore don't take much time to prepare). I also like the simplified post-award process and simpler annual reports.
- Simplifies budgetary application substantially.
- no budget. Flexible spending
- budget is easier to put in place and gives some flexibility in re-distribution of funds mandated by experimental results.
- I do like the ability of using my judgment for what monies need to be spent where at what time.
- Ease of application process and flexibility in spending. It is a good idea. I think that "downward negotiation" is a necessary response to the limitations in the NIH budget and upward trend of requests. It is a fair way to maintain the payline.
- Budgetary simplicity.
- It is easy to put it together
- It is easier than preparing a detailed budget
- the simple budget page
- Ease of preparation; Just-In-Time; reduced paperwork.
- Ease of application re: budgetary issues.
- Just in time features
- It does reduce the amount of time creating fictitious details about exact levels of expenses, and decreases the quibbling about details from reviewers.
- simplicity
- flexibility of grant management
- simplicity
- No need to submit detailed budget.
- The simplicity and straightforward process
- Less time spent on budget and related forms in preparing application.
- Less work, more flexibility

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- a little faster to prepare grant but not significant
- I do not have to waste time giving too much detail.
- less administrative work & more simple
- Not having to write detailed budget justification but this is not a major time saving function.
- TIME SPENT ON BUDGET JUSTIFICATION AND NEGOTIATIONS. ALTHOUGH THIS ASPECT HAS STILL TO BE DONE FOR THE INSTITUTION. IN THE REVIEW COMMITTEES IT SAVES A LOT OF TIME IF WE DONT HAVE TO DEAL WITH SMALL ITEM BUDGETS AND OTHER UNIMPORTANT ASPCETS OF HOW THE PI WANTS TO SPEND AND ALLOCATE THE RESOURCES.
- Simplicity
- quicker and easier to complete
- Easy and save time to write scientific parts.
- No detailed budget needs to be submitted.
- Not required to write long budget justifications
- To me it is no different since our University makes us do a detailed budget anyway with justification which we have to have approved before submitting it---thus there is no reduction in work. Since the study sections do not review specific requests for budgetary items on Modular Grants that are necessary for the conduct of the proposed research, such as FedEx charges for shipping cell lines,etc. to collaborators, our local administrators will not let us make those charges because they were not approved by the SS. Had they been approved by the SS, they would approve them.
- Somewhat easier, but the university still requires a detailed budget.
- simplicity, flexibility, trust
- Reduction in time on application.
- Less paperwork to feds. Review focused on science not budget.
- It seems less likely that the scientific review will focus on non-scientific issues when the details of the budget are kept to a minimum.
- Not having to come up with the costs of kimwipes and pipets.
- Ease of writing budgets.
- Efficiency, encourages more applications
- flexibility in spending funds
- It makes the application easier.
- simplicity

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- don't have to sit and figure the price of gloves versus tubes
- The simplicity of the budget.
- Budgetary flexibility
- ease of applying
- Not preparing detailed budgets and other support pages
- No detailed budget required
- don't have to agonize over details of the budget --- previously, it was very important to take the time to do this as it needs to be scientifically justified, got reviewed along with the science. And we need to get the budget done early to route through institutional offices for sign offs. But often one is working on science till the last minute -- often one wants to change the budget details but it is too late.
- I like the concept of reduced paper work and less up-front time needed for detailed budgets.
- The ease of filling out the budget section. Not having to justify every little reagents anticipated to be used. Easy for non-competing renewals.
- These are apparent in the answers to other questions you had.
- Easier to fill out forms
- I like the limited budget justification section, this saves precious time and allows more time to focus on the research proposal.
- Saves some time and increases emphasis on the science instead of detailed budgets.
- No detail budgets or breakdown
- streamlined for the NIH - still tedious locally
- I am relatively new the grant-writing business, and have never submitted the non-modular form. The modular process seems reasonable and is less trouble than some of the non-NIH grants that I have submitted.
- Simple!
- 1. Saves time when preparing the application, 2. Gives more flexibility to the P.I. when awarded
- Not justifying a detailed budget
- more compact submission, lower hassle-factor
- I used to it.
- Simple
- Easy to prepare the NIH budget

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- I very much appreciate the reduced need to come up with exact cost estimates for expenditures that are not actually going to be made for a few years. I also like the reduced preparation time for the budget, although this is negated in part by the detailed budget required by my university.
- The intended purposes.
- It seems to slightly reduce the amount of time required to put together a proposal.
- I'm not sure I can pinpoint anything that I like about the modular vs. nonmodular application because the changes are either inconsequential or represent more work (like having to prepare two budgets).
- It just amounts to a little less work in the application process. Because I have to prepare a detailed budget for our institution, it amounts to being only a very small amount of reduced work. If the elimination of the modular grant also meant that the investigator had to adhere very closely to the submitted detailed budget, then that would be an unpleasant burden that would require that a lot of time be spent to determine exact amounts for each category, and then playing the game about how much the grant will probably be cut for non-scientific reasons.
- Diminished detail of the budget pages.
- It simplifies the budget determination. For example, exact quotes don't need to be obtained.
- Don't really find it that much different, frankly
- being able to go with approximations of line item costs rather than detailed justifications.,
- Not having to spend a lot of time working out minute details of the budget, which may change before the grant is awarded or during the grant anyway. Also, general formulations are often used, which may not be relevant to the real spending later.
- To work and improve as much as possible the Scientific Part of the Grant - Grant Description.
- Save a little time.
- Preparation of the budget and not including other support.
- If I didn't have to do a detailed budget for my institution, it would be great.
- Letting me control the money allocation.
- Less depressing paperwork ; the applicant can spend more time on the substance of the application.
- simplicity
- It makes the budget more flexible.
- The advantages listed above.
- Reduced calculations and time spent on budget
- By reducing paper work it allows applicants focus more on the scientific part of the proposal.

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- I like all aspects
- Simplification of the Budget pages in a typical new application, and a reduction or elimination of discussion of budget during scientific peer review. Also, the goal of supporting 'grant-in-aid' philosophy is well served.
- simple justification
- How calculating budgets are facilitated.
- I like the simplicity of the process and the avoidance of the reviewers focusing on the budget rather than the science.
- I can focus more on the scientific merit of my application
- Less budgetary details and Just-in-time.
- The limited justification needed
- Budgeting
- The budget
- Just-in-time IACUC and IRB concept, "modular" budget approach, reconstructed other support format
- Only need to deal with P.I. institutes regarding detailed budgets and not NIH.
- I just ask for the limit.
- Less time required to prepare and justify a detailed budget
- No detailed budget. Request may be actually higher than non-modular due to rounding up to nearest 25,000
- ease of preparation and justification
- Not preparing a budget unless it gets funded
- Flexibility
- Reviewers do not have to deal with detailed budget.
- Not having to spend time/effort on budget details until proposal is likely to be funded. It's already discouraging to spend so much time writing a grant proposal when the funding rate is low.
- substantial time saving and flexibility
- less bureaucracy in filling out forms
- as a writer, not writing a budget is a strength
- simpler to develop budgets
- Easy budget preparation

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- the modular aspect is largely irrelevant
- Simplification of the budget preparation process
- It is much simpler to figure out how much we need for the proposal.
- It allows for me to be flexible with my research and not have to justify every penny.
- Less administrative work
- easier to prepare, easier to review grants, more confidential since salaries don't have to be provided
- Simple
- It saves a lot of time for everyone, especially when a grant may not be in a fundable range, cuts down on preparation time and I assume the reviewers time.
- I can spend more time on research and the scientific aspects of my grants.
- Budget pages are simplified
- Round numbers that generally fit categories of funding incrementally (i.e., graduate student - 1 module/yr)
- flexibility in spending the money that arrives almost a year after is requested.
- Saves a bit of time
- Ease and flexibility of budget planning and management.
- I have never done a non-modular grant application for NIH, so I can only compare to other agencies. In most respects the application process is worse than say NSF. See below.
- The lack of detailed budget specifying different types of reagents etc. No need to provide other support till the proposal has real chances to get funded.
- Time saving
- The ease/simplicity of the application and the lack of a need to spend time detailing each category of costs
- Relief from the homework involved in estimating the costs of supplies, future travel, on-campus service charges, etc.
- no detailed budget- saves a small amount of time
- focus on the science
- not having to do a detailed budget
- less time figuring out budgets
- Easy to prepare and flexible.

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- Not having to calculate an exact budget saves considerable time, and allows me to focus on the science portions of the grant application.
- 250,000 limit
- Grant evaluation is on the science of the grant.
- like time for PI.
- No "Other Support" form is needed
- No itemization needed
- NO detailed budget
- Its budgetary flexibility. I find unrealistic the idea of predicting how much my lab will spend on each category (personnel, reagents, animal costs) a few years from now, because these expenses will depend largely on the course of the research.
- No detailed budget, no other support page
- I believe it does save the PI time not to have to prepare a budget.
- Easy to prepare.
- not agonizing over the budget
- It is more streamlined to contain only important information.
- Simple budget preparation
- Simplifies the application process
- Not needing to supply other support, which seems a bit meaningless (in reality), anyway.
- The flexibility to stay with \$25,000 modules
- Flexibility for PI, and simplification of reviewing process.
- General streamlined procedures
- less time to deal with budget
- I like not having to come up with a detailed equipment and supplies budget.
- simplicity
- The tremendous simplification at the front end, the application is totally worth it for me. It's frustrating to have to spend so much time with detailed budgets that 2, 3, 4 years later don't apply anyway.
- It allows one to make easy rebudgeting decisions
- simple biosketches No detailed budget.

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- No need to prepare a detailed budget which frequently is more fiction than truth anyhow. It also allows for easier changes when the research goes in novel directions with unforeseen needs.
- In particular the budgetary flexibility is valuable. It encourages the kind of innovative research that NIH wishes to support.
- Saves time and paper.
- streamlines budget preparation process for grant
- No budget justifications required: it saves time
- Not having to work out minute details of the budget.
- That I don't have to specify how every dollar will be spent.
- No detailed budget - saves numerous hours calculating budgets, Flexibility in effecting expenditures. Reduced time needed for fiscal management, permission for re-budgeting from NIH.
- That I don't have to list the PI's salary.
- Saves time during grant preparation
- Less time and detail in putting the grant together.
- It does cut down the time
- Budgeting simplicity
- 1. Save time in budgeting. 2. Flexibility in using awarded fund.
- Paperwork is simpler.
- It save administrative time and cost. If only 20% of the grants are funded why go through the whole detailed budget process for the 80% of grant applications that are not funded, that would be a great waste of time.
- The detailed budgets were largely make-work--and they took a lot of time that could have been spent on the scientific part of the grant.
- EMPHASIS ON SCIENCE
- Not having to write fictional detailed budgets.
- It's somewhat easier to do as a PI but somewhat harder to review as a study section member.
- I like taking the focus away from money towards research. Also the implicit trust implied is a morale booster.
- Not having to prepare a detailed budget, which is rather a useless activity.
- EASE OF GETTING APPLICATION READY
- The simplicity

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- Budget preparation takes less time. Gives needed flexibility to the Investigator on budget issues. Somewhat easier as reviewer.
- Simplicity and time saving
- Allows one to focus more on the scientific aspects of the application and less time on budgetary issues
- don't argue over prices for many small items, e.g. animal costs, freezers, etc
- I can focus on the scientific part of the grant.
- Budget prep was left to the last minute and done with only brief consideration. Now it takes so little time that it is possible to think about the dollars requested.
- Ability to concentrate on research section
- The simplicity of the budget and its preparation, exact amounts not needed.
- Simplicity
- Allows significant flexibility when adjustments are needed in a year to year budget.
- required budget information is less
- Preparing detailed budget justification to NIH
- The fact that I don't have to prepare a detailed budget. Saves me a lot of time.
- Simplified budgeting.
- Less budget
- Less formal paperwork to be filled out and submitted with the proposal application.
- Simple and easy to fill in
- Easy to prepare
- Flexibility regarding salaries -- not being locked into a dollar amount for techs submitted in a budget - allows hiring of varying experience without hassle. Stress saved by omitting a budget page, even though the university requires one.
- Ability to move funds between categories in cases of unexpected changes
- Slight reduction in preparation time
- Makes rebudgeting easier.
- saves time in many ways gives flexibility to spend funds in most productive way
- I don't like your survey in that it timed me out and lost my comments on this section! Now that I understand the goals of the project, I think it could be a good idea...
- Flexibility, reduced grant preparation time.

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- Ease of grant preparation.
- Simplifies budget
- The streamlined budget and justification.
- non-detailed budget
- Saves time that would be spent attempting to give a best estimate (guess) of spending each year. Saves time dealing with budget forms.
- It's fairly straightforward to set up.
- The concept is good, but with the requirements of our university to submit a detailed budget, most of the benefits are lost. Anything to reduce the overall burden is a plus.
- It is a bit simpler, but one must still do a full budget for the institution.
- Convenience and ability to concentrate on science
- PIs get to focus their energy on experiments and strategies to solve problems.
- Ease of budget creation.
- Not having to guess numbers for specific budget lines
- not having to prepare a detailed budget
- Ease and flexibility of the budget
- Less time spent for preparation of the budget
- 1) no micromanaging of research 2) no need for some administrative pages before actual funding
- No budget
- The flexibility and lack of details that are impossible to predict.
- Much less work than with non-modular grants.
- I like the just-in-time very much.
- Ease.
- Simplifies preparation of grant application.
- I like simplifying the application.
- Ease of use.
- It allowed me to focus most of my effort on the scientific aspects of the proposal.
- Less work in preparation of the application.
- ease of application, ability to focus on scientific portion of grant

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- No hassle of preparing detailed budget justification
- save time
- Saves time in preparing the application, makes the grant review process a bit easy and allows more flexibility for the PI in rebudgeting. Allows streamlined budgeting for NIH.
- simplicity
- indifferent
- It has brought down the cost of some capital equipment. For example, manufacturers have figured out that the cost of an instrument is best set at 1-module. Light cyclers have decreased from \$40-50K down to ~\$24k. This is not likely a co-incidence.
- Time saved during grant preparation. The lack of need to focus on a detailed budget allows me to focus only on the science.
- Quick and easy
- simplicity
- simplicity, allows one to focus on science.
- I can focus on the research plan
- Saves time with grant writing.
- Frees me from obsessing as to which of several specific brands of equipment I want to purchase. Saves time.
- Flexibility in spending.
- It clearly save time in the application process and provides the PI with more freedom.
- Elimination of detailed budget
- less forms to fill
- less time spent on budget.
- Eliminates question " what I should add to my budget to get more money?"
- as long as stay above bottom line, don't have to worry about transferring funds around
- streamlining submissions to NIH.
- Reduced administrative burden up front, when investigators should be working to formulate the science. JIT information helps a great deal.
- less time spent on the "face pages". Once the grant is awarded, money is changed from categories at the university level anyway. So, I think the modular system eliminates work.
- The relative lack of administrative/financial hassle...I can focus on the idea, the science and form of my application.

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- absence of detailed justification for individual expenditures
- Not having to take the time to submit a detailed budget to NIH at the time of applying.
- I don't worry about a precise budget since I always round up to the next modular.
- Ease of preparing the budget.
- The application process seems simple.
- Not needing all the old form pages unless an award is likely. Less final negotiations about the award.
- To long ago to remember
- We have to prepare a detailed budget anyway for the University of Tennessee so the time saving that the modular process should provide is negated.
- Not having to carefully justify the budget.
- It is faster, and gives more flexibility in spending the money.
- I really did not like it that much
- The budget flexibility
- Simplicity
- That I do not have to send the individual dollar amounts for each category. Also more often, the necessity for each category changes. With the modular I am able to change the budgeted amount more easily.
- Its simplicity and flexibility.
- Elimination of the detailed budget justification.
- It simplify the initial application
- It greatly facilitates the application process and allows the PI to focus on the research.
- Nothing. Since my school wants a detailed budget anyway.
- The fact that I don't have to provide a detailed budget makes the application process less stressful, and allows flexibility for the use of the award.
- Not having to provide a detailed budget
- The streamlined and simplified paper work. Just-in-time feature works extremely well.
- Easy of budget, fungibility of monies.
- Less time on budget prior to award
- no detailed budget is required at the time of application

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- The modular process does not really save time. To my mind whether it is required by the NIH or not an investigator really needs to construct a budget for his own purposes - that is to now that the project is financially feasible.
- should save time---if we were not required to provide budget to ORA
- Allows me to focus exclusively on the science. Detailed budgets are a pain and they become almost irrelevant after the 1st or 2nd year anyway.
- The simplified budget
- save time
- Streamlining
- don't have to worry about specific details
- budget flexibility
- modular applications save time of PI. Given that a succinct and informative justification is provided, this is all a reviewer will need in my opinion. However, the PIs institution usually requires a detailed budget, so in the end the PI is not benefiting much in the preaward process.
- simplicity, flexibility
- Budget simplicity and to negotiate the overhead separately
- Save time
- awards in modules rather than dollar-by-dollar amounts; budget justification process rather than detailed budget; flexibility in funding categories; withholding other support documentation until just in time
- Flexibility
- no need for extensive detail on finances
- less focus on admin. more on science
- It doesn't save a lot of time, because the institution requires detailed budget, but at least it doesn't get second guessed in the funding process.
- flexibility
- save time and energy
- It avoids the stress of having to make guesses about how many dollars will be spent in various categories and then finding out you were either wrong in the first place or finding out that personnel and project direction/cost issues forced changes in all the categories anyway.

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- Dear friends, I know you will regard me as utterly stupid, but I don't know what a modular grant application is, nobody has ever told me, and you don't even tell me here (that would be a useful introductory statement for these pages). So how can I evaluate it? I sense, from filling out two "modular grant applications," that there is something different about them from previous applications, but for me a grant application has always been a huge and trying experience and it still is that way today in spite of the apparent changes involved in a "modular grant application." I think it would be good if somewhere in the application procedure you would tell that this is a "modular grant application" and how this differs from previous applications - or perhaps you do tell and I have just neglected to assimilate this (because my effort is focused on trying very hard to produce an excellent application). Neither do you tell us what "just-in-time procedure" is, I sure don't know. All this will surely surprise you. I wonder if it's just "stupid" me or if many people react this way.
- I do not have to prepare a detailed budget
- Simplified budget information in application
- It is easy and saves a lot of time.
- I like the ease much better than a detailed budget
- Relative ease of paperwork.
- That the materials can be downloaded and filled out via computer
- Fast time and flexibility
- Not getting bogged down in the details of the budget.
- Flexibility of spending as PI
- Somewhat less burdensome.
- Because I still have to do the detailed budget for my institution it is no benefit whatsoever.
- Not having to spend too much time on the budget. Feeling like I have a little flexibility in my spending.
- no detailed budget, flexibility of managing funds after the award
- The flexibility in budgeting and the fact that I don't have to write 15 pages of budget justifications to avoid budget cuts.
- I like the flexibility. as a new investigator, I like having an arbitrary rationale for a ceiling on my request (I choose to stay under 250K to remain in the modular format). this keeps me from trying to have my plans get too grandiose and keeps me focused on science.
- That less written budget justification is required.
- Simple and more time can be spent on research content.
- less time spent in detailing budget justification.
- No real time needed to justify budget to NIH

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- I don't have to make every penny balance from university predictions to NIH budget page.
- Less administrative work associated with grant submission
- Flexibility in budgeting; avoid lengthy exchange with NIH when need to reallocate funds across categories
- Certainly, it saves time at study section meetings and provides modest time saving during the preparation of applications. It probably also provides some modest increase in flexibility post award.
- flexibility
- Simplicity, budgetary flexibility.
- Although we are still required to submit budgets internally, they are not as detailed as previously required for NIH grants and it is helpful not to have them in final form before the grant submission. I also like the use of JIT information, particularly for animal use approvals.
- Although I do not have to do the budget, the department finance secretary still has to prepare a detailed budget for the department, college and the office of sponsored programs.
- It appears to be simpler at first, but...
- No more budget pages
- ease
- Easier to allocate funds
- Ease of preparation, just in time provision
- Simple budget make me focus on science
- Simplicity in preparing the application, simplicity in reviewing the budget as a reviewer.
- Simplicity of budget page
- More efficient and don't need to go back and forth to make your budget right.
- detailing the budget and justifications.
- Budget ease and flexibility at review and submission (tho still need detailed for institutional sign off)
- First is the elimination of detailed budget, which is time consuming and often not realistic anyway. Second, it does provide flexibility in managing the grant.
- The modular grant eliminates the details of the budget from the scientific review process. This is probably it's greatest benefit. Heretofore, reviewers would often "pick on" minor details or inconsistencies in the budget. Now it's transparent.
- The ability to round up

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- Simplicity in preparation and review focuses on scientific merit more than details of budget.
- simple
- Less budgetary work
- Flexibility in shifting expenditures from one category to another. Sometimes a new technology makes it possible to buy goods that can replace services, or vice versa.
- no need to provide detailed budget
- Having flexibility in the budget, although my university's procedures are not quite in line with this approach.
- not having to itemize all research resources
- The ease of budget preparation.
- Pound wise and penny foolish
- The flexibility.
- It's a bit more efficient to submit.
- SAVES A BIT OF TIME
- cuts down on time in preparing application
- reduced time to prepare proposal
- The preparation of the budget is easy. My laboratory assistants (who are college graduates 'in between college and graduate school or med school' can fill out the budget pages for me.
- Flexibility to rebudget, including carry over unobligated balances.
- no details for budget.
- Ease of preparation and flexibility post award.
- don't have to come up with detailed budget.
- simplicity, saves some time wasted on small details
- easier
- No detailed budget required.
- Shorter time for preparing the grant
- Complicated computations of cost-of-living adjustments to salary and fringe benefits are eliminated. The modular process has some similarity to the Federal Demonstration Project rules - fewer restrictions regarding allocation of budget.
- The reduction in the amount of paper work and administrative procedures.
- Budgeting to NIH is easier and does not become a part of scientific review.

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- It greatly facilitates the review process. It allows reviewers and Study Section members to focus exclusively on the merits of the scientific content of the proposal.
- Simplifies things for our administrator who deals with budgets.
- ease of budget
- No hassle budget
- It may be a little bit easier to prepare, although for the kind of grants I write, I not sure that it makes a huge difference.
- No initial detailed budgetary explanation.
- Saves a little bit of time during grant preparation.
- Time saving
- Focuses budgetary considerations on personnel issues.
- Saving time for study section member in review process. No other benefit. Modular grant is not fair for small, long lasting grants, because it will not allow PI to increase funding level sufficient for increasing scope of study when in competitive renewal. Only way to increase funding level is to apply a new grant which requests upper limit of modules.
- No need for a detailed budget
- no detailed budget necessary
- Saving time in preparing detailed budget so that I can focus on the scientific part of the grant.
- the opportunity to develop a worthwhile research question and to have expert reviewers impressions
- not having to fill out a detailed budget with justifications
- There is little change for me because I still have to complete a detailed budget for Sponsored Programs. The best change to the application process is not requiring an IRB approval for grant review, which was very inefficient use of time for the investigator and the IRB.
- simplicity
- Ease of preparing
- Not having to provide a detailed budget
- Because I have to prepare so much information for my contracts and grants office, I get almost no benefit from the modular application process.
- Less time for non-scientific stuff.
- Ease in choosing number of modules for budget.
- Flexibility
- No need to justify expenditures

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- No need to fill out detailed budget pages for grant.
- The flexibility to administer the grant financially. Also, the slightly shorter time of grant preparation.
- not having to prepare a detailed budget
- Not having to give a detailed budget that one may not follow anyway
- Less work on unnecessary detail.
- Simplicity and lack of detailed budget justification.
- Flexibility, easier submission
- not submitting detailed budget information
- Funding in \$25,000 modules seems to ad some budgeting flexibility.
- less time on budget
- Less budget restrictions
- elimination of a detailed budget.
- No detailed justification required.
- Budget flexibility. It was always an artificial exercise to try to account for every dollar in one category or another. Having said that, I do not believe that the modular system in any way contributes to irresponsible spending.
- Simplification of preparation. Simplification of review.
- the whole package
- Not needing to provide detailed budget information.
- Flexibility to the PI in managing the budget
- simplifies the grant process
- Budget section
- Ease of budget preparations
- no need to prepare a detailed budget and justifications
- The greater simplicity
- the budgetary flexibility the decreased amount of time to prepare the budget
- No Budget. (But institutions require a budget for internal purposes. NIH should advise them to avoid it).
- No detailed budget is required and no other support page is required.
- More flexibility in budgetary allotments

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- My experience is too limited at this point as my only award to date has been a KO1
- No detailed budget or justification. Abbreviated other support.
- Not having to prepare a detailed budget.
- somewhat less paperwork - although I still have to submit a detailed budget to my institution
- cleaner simpler application
- saves time
- The ease of preparation and lack of unnecessary detail in the budgets. The flexibility of moving funds is also better.
- Flexibility in responding to changes in the field
- ease of budgetary justification--saves time
- Focus on scientific aspects of research, not bookkeeping
- Straight forward and flexible.
- It saves my time and energy from doing the detailed budgets and devote more to scientific aspects of grant application.
- Not having to worry about justifying each expense and having the flexibility to adjust the budget as needs arise.
- ease of preparation
- Do not need to report all detail budget to NIH.
- Fixed budget and no detailed justification is needed
- Since I need to prepare a budget for my institution, the only time saved is getting bids or prices for equipment.
- The proposal is just simpler to prepare and review without a detailed budget.
- It eliminates the haggling over tiny budget items that can take up quite a lot of time at study section.
- Less time spent on budget issues; allows focus on the project description.
- Not having to prepare a detailed budget.
- I do not find it a major improvement over the non-modular process. I like it fine but nothing special stands out for me.
- Submission is easier, one doesn't have to detail supply budgets, which are very difficult to predict and vary according to how the research goes.
- It is easy, you don't have to justify the entire budget.
- Not needing to include a detailed budget and the just in time features for IRB etc.

E3 Reasons for Liking Modular Grants

- Investigators don't need to spend a large amount of time to detail the budget.
- Not having the chase down the other support pages from co-investigators.
- Not having to include a detailed budget with justification for each expense.
- The clear structure of the modules.
- Less work on administrative pages As a reviewer, less work to evaluate the budget
- More focus on research than putting together a budget. More flexibility with research project.
- changing among budget categories during the research
- faster and easier
- Do not have to worry about the details of the budget
- Simplified budget preparation and increased flexibility
- The fact the budgetary issues are temporarily waived.
- It allows for more flexibility
- Review panel doesn't waste time on trivial budget details and focuses more on the scientific merit of the applications. The amount of "other support" is not a factor in deciding on the level of support for a new line of research.

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- Frequent changes in formats/regulations for submission cause difficulties for research support staff, leading to substantial amounts of time devoted to searching for information and reading web links
- Since we have to prepare a detailed internal budget, it doesn't make much difference to have a modular system - it is the same amount of work internally.
- it does not explain how one goes about requesting \$250K vs. say smaller amounts like \$150K total costs
- to estimate the modular budget we collect the same info as before- the only difference is that it is not shared with NIH
- the limitations/cap on the amount and the limit on indirect costs that has caused us to have to shift line items on our specific budget within the university regulations.
- would be nice to have higher amounts of awards
- A detailed budget is still required for our institution. When reviewing grants, often applicants do not put down sufficient information to allow a proper review of the funds required.
- It only really saves a small amount of time
- Not much not to like.
- I have to prepare a detailed budget for the University of XXX anyway-so I'm not sure what it saves. ADDED 11/01/04 My competitive renewal was due in the Sponsored Projects Administration office yesterday. Since that time I have had three calls from the administrative reviewer on my grant about the budget. I had worked with our accountant/budget person in chemistry on my budget and justification. We produced what was considered the typical justifications for the equipment and supplies. We had also noticed that the University Electronic grants Management system (EGMS) was eliminating and changing certain items in the budget, so we had carefully printed out a detailed budget on October 25, just to make sure everything was there. My university administrator called me three times with budget questions. First he wanted more justification for my equipment and lab supplies. We provided that. Then he said that the name of a collaborator had been left off the budget-I said no, that the EGMS was eliminating things from the system. He accused me of making a mistake. He said I needed to go back and fix the budget yet again. I refused. I then had to fax the detailed budget I had printed out three days before. They finally fixed that. Finally, this morning, he asked me how to calculate the indirect costs. I referred him to our administrator in the Department. She determined that he was changing the budget without my knowledge. This person is overstepping his bounds as an administrative reviewer. He is not doing a scientific review-how does he know if justification is sufficient? This is what I am subjected to in the name of modular budgets at this University.
- That I still need to submit to my institution the detailed budget anyway. It defeats the time-saving purpose of the modular grant.
- need for biographical sketches for key personnel. need for detailed budgets for my department and office of grants management

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- A reduction in a single module can affect the entire grant
- requirement to include indirect costs of extramural collaborators. budget reductions recommended at review are arbitrary
- Reduced consideration given to review panels to consider budgetary aspects of the proposed work, especially in relation to total funding of a lab.
- Low cap
- The total limit. My institution requires a detailed budget so little time is saved on the budget.
- I still need to make a detailed budget for my own use, so it doesn't save very much time
- It is my perception that it has inflated research costs. Most people ask for all modules whether the research really justifies it or not.
- inflation of initial grant amount request by junior investigator; budget cut in modular makes some studies impossible to carry out.
- The only thing I don't like is that I still have to do a specific budget for my sponsored projects administration.
- 250,000 limit
- When reviewing, I have a hard time to assess the justification of the budget.
- Nothing on the NIH side - but I think my institution's requirements for a budget pre-award are a real burden.
- I still have to submit a detailed budget to my institution so I end up doing more work than the traditional budget. Also, to project the budget modules you really do need a detailed budget.
- Concerns that it may have increased the average size of grant awards and, thus, reduced the number of awards made. I think the number of awards made needs to be increased, not their size!
- indirect costs are added to consortium/subcontractor's total cost
- As a reviewer, it helps me to see a detailed budget and justification to help determine if the proposed studies and budget match. In other words, do the scope of the work and budget match. As a PI and center director I encourage young investigators to go through a budget so that they can be more realistic.
- the upper limit being too small
- That I have to do a detailed budget anyway. I think that the detailed budget forces investigators to think carefully more carefully about integration of different dimensions of a proposed project.
- My only proposal to NIH was not funded.
- Maintaining 2 sets of biosketches. Why not handle Other Support the same way for both types of grants?

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- Still need to do detail budget for sponsored program office.
- The eSNAP renewal process was a little confusing since it seems to be geared to non-modular applications.
- little to no time-saving in preparing
- As a reviewer, it is difficult to answer the question, "Does the research presented justify the budget requested?" without knowing how the money is to be spent and whether or not there is other funding to support the proposed research.
- the nuances of the procedure to follow after the award is granted is still not as clear.
- Not as clear about overlaps with other grants or other funding situation....this can influence reviewers.
- The arbitrary reduction of modules by the NIH staff. This was done for the last two years of funding of my award.
- Doesn't save any time. Reviewers are unable to judge if the budget is inflated. The amount awarded has no relation to the amount requested.
- Insufficient dollar support.
- There are no increases over time (the award period) yet the cost of personnel continues to go up constantly as mandated by NIH fellowship guidelines.
- In general, the application process it is fine. It would be better to increase the grant limit to an amount higher than \$250,000. For example, \$350,000.
- The fact that we have to do a highly detailed budget anyway at our institution.
- There is a significant problem with overlap of grants since reviewers are not allowed to raise this issue. Many P.I.s receive multiple grants on roughly the same topic with minor twists to satisfy the administrative staff who are not keen to push the P.I.s to explain the potential overlap issue when a fundable score is given by the study section. This has significantly increased the use of cross-the-board cut for all grants since it is the easiest way for the administrations to control overall costs.
- I dislike being stuck with the same amount of money each year--in the last case, for 5 years. With rising salaries and cost of doing research, this is really very restrictive and even successful, productive labs can lose valuable trained personnel because of these problems.
- I have to prepare two budgets. One for the modular and one for the university. It adds to the time since I have to prepare a detailed budget anyway.
- Would like there to be more flexibility in terms of the award - and for it to more readily account for cost of living increases.
- I still have to prepare a detailed budget for my institution. I feel my proposals are unlikely to be funded if I go over the \$250,000 limit for a modular application. Post-award budgets are cut by NIH administrators by entire modules.

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- The notion that you should try to get the budget under the modular grant cap and the difficulty with using modular budgets for consortium or subcontracts.
- first year and last year amounts are same
- I think that overlap issues are neglected such that some researchers are getting multiple funding for the same work.
- funding limit.
- Cut is always by some number of modules
- the fact that my institution does not reflect the same form budgetary flexibility. They fear governmental prosecution if audited. Thus I am still saddled with providing the detailed annual budgets as was required prior to NIH modular budgets were instituted, and in fact this burden has worsened.
- ADMINISTRATIVE CUTS
- Having still to prepare a detailed budget for my home institution - this is a waste.
- As noted, the inclusion of indirect consortium costs in my direct costs. In some areas, like the inclusion of a phase I clinical study on a vaccine, this process won't work at all (in view of the \$250,000 limitation). The \$250,000 limit would be acceptable for most proposals if the consortium costs were not included.
- Having to make a detailed budget in house.
- Doesn't because detailed budgets needed internally, and review process is less precise (unless detailed justification is included in which case you might as well do real budget.
- The institutions still requires detailed budget for internal processing.
- 1. The lack of a detailed budget justification leads in general to cuts in the number of modules awarded without giving the PI an opportunity to explain why the total number of modules was requested. 2. The modular grant does not allow increases in budgets over time. For example, NIH postdoc salary rates and institutional fringe benefit rates have increased markedly the past couple of years. Since modular grants do not allow budget increases each year, for grants that were awarded a few years ago funds have to be diverted from research expenses to cover salary increases, which can affect productivity towards completing the project.
- I would like to have more of an opportunity to justify the number of modules that I request. For instance, I may need to request the maximum number of modules because my budget requires it. However, it may appear that I may just be reflexively asking for as much money as the modular budget will allow. There is little way for a reviewer to distinguish between these possibilities. The stated policy of the NIH notwithstanding, I believe that the budget DOES make a difference in the review process, at the very least in terms of the attitude that a reviewer takes towards the submitted grant.
- Budgetary ceiling
- I have no idea how much funding I'll be awarded.
- the limit

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- Difficult to evaluate budgetary issues in study section. Tends to encourage larger budgets.
- Not really a significant time savings.
- Having various "flavors" of biosketch for different kinds of application seems unnecessarily complex. Either the amount of money, or the aims, or both of projects could be relevant to either kind of grant, but it is unnecessarily inconvenient to have to maintain 2 kinds of biosketch. Also, the simplification in budgeting is real (don't need to get precise costings for everything) but limited (one does still need to work out a pretty accurate budget in order to know how many modules to ask for).
- Still need a detailed budget for institution. Budget cap and need to justify variations across years.
- the fact that I must pay double indirects severely limits the research that I can do, given the cutoff is \$250K
- Module size is a bit big. Must always estimate to next higher level to accommodate cost changes over 5 years. Because year to year changes must be justified, this means asking for the highest amount needed in any one year in every year. Budget cuts are in number of modules so may be larger.
- Reviewers are somewhat cavalier about reducing the number of modules.
- Cost of conducting the same research at different institutions varies. Modular system strongly penalizes researchers at certain institutions (e.g., private universities with relatively high tuition rates).
- That the amount is fixed for the entire grant while if you submit a non-modular grant that is a little higher but gets cut back to the same amt one would get annual increases. It doesn't save significant time. You need to know other support as a reviewer to make sure labs are not being overfunded
- Reduced perception of research costs in the reviewing process
- Upper limit is too low. Should be 300.
- 1. The arbitrary nature of budgetary reductions on the part of reviewers 2. The lack of 3-4% yearly cost increases in the budgets of funded modular grants.
- It makes collaborations across the institutions difficult because subcontracting is nearly impossible with the 250,000 cap.
- I still need to complete a detailed budget for my university
- The present \$250,000 limit. Also, \$25,000 increment is too large. If the study section cuts one module, it can have a major effect on being able to carry out the work.
- 250K limit

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- The institute officials do not want to deal with non-modular, so almost everything is forced into a modular budget, even when there is a subcontract. Modular budgets do not work for collaborations that involve subcontracts!!!! This needs to be fixed. As a reviewer, it's apparent that just about everyone asks for \$250K, and it is almost impossible to determine who really needs that amount, and who does not. A junior investigator seeking his/her first award will ask for the same amount as a senior investigator who is in the 15th year of a project. This is not reflective of the true needs.
- Dollar limit too small
- Less flexibility on indirect costs. My institution calculates indirect using only salaries and benefits. This caused major problems when award was made and resulted in loss of indirect from NIH. These costs must now come out of my direct costs, reducing the award I received. For this reason, I will avoid modular proposals if possible in the future. Thanks for the opportunity to provide feedback.
- Extra expense to PI associated with consortium arrangements.
- At study section it's very easy to say "drop a module". Then the institute cuts by 20%. At the end, the budget could be severely cut to the point where all you can do is start working on another grant to make up the difference. I would strongly suggest limiting NIH funding per investigator, or somehow correlating grants with productivity. This most often becomes non-linear once someone has more than 10-12 people.
- The requirement that budget amounts be the same each year.
- No specific reason is provided for cutdown of requested budget.
- The need to prepare a detailed budget for my institution anyway largely overrides the benefits from the NIH.
- \$250,000 limit
- the 250K max, although probably whatever the max is set at is what people will ask for
- The inclusion of subcontract indirects in the direct costs for the application. This makes it more difficult for collaborative applications to fit within the budget limits, and treats indirects differently for the applicant institution and the subcontracting institution. There is no clear rationale for this policy.
- Not real benefit: need detailed budget anyway because (1) institution requires it, (2) I need it to know how many modules to ask for
- That I still have to submit a budget to my institution.
- no easy way to allow for inflation-related increases
- Initial uncertainty/confusion about what information is needed/not needed in the grant application.

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- The modular grant application hurts people in a field like mine, biostatistics, we frequently participate in grant applications as collaborators for a small percent effort, 5% or 15% say. if that is not specified in the application, then when the grant is awarded the PI sometimes cuts or eliminates this percentage, especially if there has been a cut in the number of modules.
- I have to prepare two budgets: one for NIH, one for my institution. also, without dollar values, reviewers are cutting budgets with inadequate information. this hurts getting the work done.
- doesn't take into account increasing salaries
- Overall, I am VERY satisfied with the modular grant procedures.
- It seems that perhaps it is easier to lop off a mod without giving much thought to what that will do to the research, especially if there is more than one investigator involved.
- Having to figure consortium total costs as direct costs is hard to keep within the modular limitations. It does dampen enthusiasm, and possibilities, for external collaboration. While I very much like having the forms available online, some of them are difficult to work with. In particular, the modular budget form does not allow adequate space to justify personnel - we have had to create our own version of that form.
- Funds for awards are cut by modular increments
- the fact that I still have to submit a full budget internally with a detailed justification--so it really doesn't make a difference to me in terms of time or effort
- I find that having to add the indirect costs of collaborators leads to reduced scope of research, no collaboration, or tense arguments with collaborators.
- The ceiling is low, and without a budget justification, cuts can be made frivolously.
- The limit is artificial. Reviewer's cut budget components kind of artificially: "He/She is asking too much!" or "Aim 3 is not good, let's cut a module".
- The major problem is that the application forms have not been rewritten from nonmodular format. The instructions for completing in a modular format (in particular those related to which information to include in the 'just in time' format) are unclear and need to be rewritten. It would be helpful if these instructions and forms were separated from the nonmodular instructions and forms to make things easier to find. Other than that problem, my major problem with the format is that the university has refused to adopt it, so my administrative tasks have not been reduced. I need to prepare and submit all of the nonmodular information for the university even though it is not required for the grant. Getting the university to adopt the format is a better solution than abandoning the modular format.
- discouraging collaboration between institutions because of "double indirect cost" and significant decrease of actual dollars for research.
- Low max limit of \$250K
- As a reviewer it is difficult to evaluate the budget objectively. If reviewers wish to reduce a budget it has to be done by \$25,000 increments, which can be an unreasonably large chunk.

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- To be realistic in budgeting it is necessary to build a detailed budget. Then having built one, I don't use it. Building the detailed budget is not that big a deal because no one can think through everything 5 years in advance - there is always some slop, but building the detailed helps PI get a more realistic estimate of costs. And as to Other Support - the staff has that stuff available anyway - adding it is no big deal.
- Paying indirect costs of collaborators/consortia with my direct costs.
- Module limits and the inflexibility in having different numbers in different years. Although this is possible, I have been advised to avoid this.
- In August 2004 I received reviewing results on my R21 application (PA-03-156) submitted in February 2004. However, the results were not complete in ?Investigator? section from the second reviewer. I have asked several times for a complete report but still have not received it.
- The 25K blocks often force us to request more money just to get a few K. More flexibility, like 15K or 1/2 blocks would be good. It could be limited to one 1/2 block per year for example.
- That my institution does not honor this mechanism and still requires a detailed budget which limits the value of this application process to myself and others at my institution.
- The award remains the same but costs increase steadily. Budget awarded represent cost of research in the first year for most people. Study Sec
- All of the boiler plate forms. I have to fill in all of these forms myself. I don't have admin assistance and it takes too much time to fill in the biographical sketches etc.
- Internally to my institution, the modular process is ignored. Detailed budgets are created. Then they are summarized on the modular process forms. All of the potential time-savings and cost-savings aspects of the modular preparation process are lost. The "just in time" process requires that the detailed preparation be done again. This is an internal institutional problem, not an NIH problem.
- grant limit
- Often, information accompanying modular budgets is insufficient to let review panels reach an informed decision about appropriateness of budget.
- Renewal increase Caps by institute keep within a module
- That my institution still wants me to make out a detailed budget for them
- prepare biosketches for all the key personnel.
- It is actually an extra bother. If I understand correctly, the awards are not made (at least I never saw the dollars) in modules. So what is the point?
- I'm not sure if my impression is correct that a greater % is cut across the board. If that were true, it would be a great disadvantage.
- 1. No cost of living increase, especially for salaries, is unreasonable. 2. Having served on study sections, I think that it is very difficult to judge whether the budget is appropriate. Different institutions have very different costs associated with doing research and salaries vary greatly from region to region.

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- As a new investigator, it is difficult to understand how much your entire research operation will cost. I think that some new investigators are underfunded because they think if they put down \$250K they won't get funded. So they ask for \$175-200K and that is not enough.
- Year-to-year budgeting, and a fixed amount for each year in a multi-year grant (unless special justification provided).
- I feel that in study section modules are eliminated without a clear justification. The grantee in the current system is not given the opportunity to justify expenses that might not be obvious to the referees and these are rarely if ever restored later in the negotiation with the institute representatives.
- The cap is limiting.
- As a grant writer, the detailed budget forces me to justify the number of people working on the grant. As a grant reviewer, the modular budget gives me no information.
- Affects the actual science of a proposal by trying to limit expenses to stay within the budgetary allotment
- maybe a limited amount of award
- not knowing how many modules will be cut
- Apparent reluctance of study section and council to favorably review grants \$250K
- If multiple collaborators are involved, it may be difficult to keep budgets under the maximum amount.
- that I still have to fill out a detailed budget for the grants office (although it is much less detailed than what NIH used to require).
- As reviewer, I like to see the other support of investigators.
- The preparation on the grant application does not make any much difference from the regular grant application. It takes about the same amount of time and effort.
- The high limits of the modular grant remain the same for several years.
- My experience is too limited at this point as my only award to date has been a KO1
- The limit on \$250,000.
- 250K limit.
- The unreasonably low maximum of \$250,000
- See above - I don't think I can really give the study section an accurate view of what my research needs are.
- Cuts are too severe if they have to be an entire module
- When cutting grant budgets, the reviewers have to remove by modules rather than more limited amounts.

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- Reviewers still apparently basing their decisions on budgets for which they have little detail; I don't see how reviewers can assert whether one has budgeted enough or too much money when they don't have the detail about amounts allocated for specific components AND about the specific context of a researcher's request
- Having to provide my institution with a detailed budget even though I don't need to submit one to NIDA when applying for the grant.
- costs for collaborator in different institution are included in the direct costs
- I suspect most of us have to do detailed budgets for our universities anyway so simply not submitting the detailed budget is a small step.
- Ceiling and 25K increments
- The loss of an entire module is a major change in budget. I have been concerned in some instances that reviewers may not appreciate the costs involved without seeing a rudimentary budget.
- The lack of an inflation factor is a BIG problem. By the end of the 5th year of the award, inflation and university COLAs on salary have eaten away at the purchase value.
- No increase over succeeding years which makes you artificially inflate initial budget
- 1) lack of accountability by PI 2) promotion of multiplicity of grants by PI 3) indirect way of fostering funding overlap
- There's nothing about it that I dislike.
- The fact that my department still requires me to submit a detailed budget.
- when NIH cuts the requested budget, it does so in \$25,000 modules: when you only request 150,000, then 25,000 cut is HUGE: I have had difficulty funding the research because of that large cut
- Skipping budgets.
- As a PI, I feel budget decisions are made capriciously and not based on the cost of the project and as a reviewer, I find it impossible to evaluate the budget beyond the number of years requested.
- The lack of transparency for reviewers (see above). Often, there is a recommendation for removing a full module. In combination with the administrative cut, it may be difficult to complete the proposed projects.

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- Without some budget information not currently provided, it is impossible to tell how justified the number of modules is. It would help immensely if salary amounts were provided for key personnel and cage costs for animals as these vary so much between institutions. Most investigators indicate if there is some unusually expensive aspect to their research that may not be obvious to reviewers, and this is helpful. As it is now, there is not enough information for reviewers to make a rationale decision about the number of modules requested and the decision is often arbitrary, usually erring too high. There is also a clear tendency for investigators to inflate the amount requested, in part because they do not have to justify it and they hope it will slip by.
- The grant limit could be increased, modestly.
- Probably the \$250K, although that is not a tremendous problem, but could be, for me, in the immediate future when we start involving more expensive methodologies and more interdisciplinary personnel
- the entire system of PI's department taking full credit for the grant at a school of medicine level and the concept of only one PI per grant. This system hurts the vision of the NIH roadmap as it does not encourage real collaboration
- Not sure. I have not submitted a non-modular grant for comparison
- limited budget
- LACK OF FLEXIBILITY
- there is a lack of increase in personnel funds across years unless we rebudget them for other categories. This is a problem when NIH post doc pay scales increase with every year of experience.
- Consortium/subcontract agreements
- no allowance for annual inflation costs, limit of \$250,000
- it's ok. I just need to get my grants.
- As a reviewer, it can be hard to figure out where the money will go. I much prefer non-modular
- bio? and other support tedious
- The \$250K limit for a major research project.
- Having no inflation increases over a 5 year term.
- Many people request more than 250,000 and get that, making me feel I should have asked for more also.
- biosketch
- Reviewers may not perceive costs according to what is proposed.
- The flat yearly modules do not take into account salary increases over the life of the grant.
- That is not clear why if I got excellent reviews I still not getting the grant. The selection of awards process is not clear.

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- I did not know about some of the post-award features
- restricted to grants under \$250,000
- Study section members should receive some guidelines about number of modules and grant costs.
- (1) The budget has to match multiples of \$25,000.
- having to do a detailed budget for my own institution
- As a reviewer I would like to see more information on other support.
- Impact on negotiation unclear to me.
- As a reviewer, lack of tool to evaluate whether a budget is appropriate or not
- The subcontract indirects cutting into the direct costs. Also, it would be great to have more time-saving incentives built in a modular application (i.e. shorter Resources page, etc.)
- Need for detailed internal budget despite modular grant. \$250,000 cap
- having to submit a detailed budget to the institution
- \$250,000 limit
- Problems following an admin cut it having sufficient money to pay rapidly rising salaries, tuition, benefits, of post-docs and grad students. These increase very yr and have to be paid from a fixed amount.
- limit
- The fact that my home institution requires a detailed budget prior to submission of the grant defeats much of the "just in time" timesaving potential of the modular approach.
- Limits
- not having to prepare a detailed budget -- in order to get a reasonable idea of how much to ask for, you do need to develop some idea of a budget. otherwise I think people are likely to ask for much more than they need simply because they will anticipate that they've forgotten some aspect/detail.
- The inflexibility of the amount over time. That is, a \$200,000 award in year one is a \$200,000 award in year four, yet over that time my actual costs for personnel and supplies would be more like \$215,000 to \$220,000. Since it is hoped that productivity, and thus the costs of supplies and such should not decline over that time, there is no way to offset the increased personnel costs in particular.
- I think it was a great innovation
- I dislike the 250k limit. With time, this limit will make the modular budget pathway untenable for those wishing to include consortia.
- In general, I like the idea; I'd just prefer that the limit be higher.

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- If the budget is cut it is cut by a whole module at least no matter what the rationale for the cut.
- My main objection is as a reviewer. The detailed budgets often help to make the science clear. One gets a clear picture of whether the PI thought through the experiments carefully if there is a detailed accounting in the budget.
- The smallest possible budget cut is too high -- \$25,000. This is a big problem in my opinion, especially when program officials impose administrative cuts above those suggested by study section.
- That you are discouraged from having modules be different amounts. Different amounts are often necessary. This is especially true when you might need to go over the modular amount in one year, but under it in other years. Should have some flexibility with this.
- If I come in with a non-modular big budget it immediately raises a red flag and causes an unfair review. I think Modularity are good for R03's, R21's etc.
- The \$25k module seems artificial and useless. My current grant request was for \$250k but it was cut by 10% to \$237.5k which is not an integral number of modules.
- writing out the personnel descriptions seems pretty futile
- I don't believe it is a significant time saver, and the discipline of writing a budget justification is worthwhile. I prefer to justify my budget needs rather than force a review panel to estimate my needs with a ruler that has increments of \$25,000. As a reviewer I found the detailed budget and justification a very useful indicator of the applicant's approach. A surprising amount of information could be gleaned from the budget by an experienced reviewer.
- Time it takes
- Without a detailed budget it is difficult to justify the total amount requested
- \$250,000 limit.
- Thinking about the details of the budget helps in the planning and execution of the grant
- too easy for SS to take away "x" modules arbitrarily.
- Limitation to \$250,000 with cross board reduction each year.
- Insistence by my home institution that I prepare a detailed budget. The 250K ceiling is too low. Routine cutting of one or two modules by review panels without adequate consideration for the impact on the specific aims of the proposed research.
- In my short and limited experience, I do not have anything negative to say.
- No annual increase
- \$25,000 ARE SOMEWHAT TOO MUCH. IT MAY WORK BETTER WITH MODULES OF 15-20K
- All the biosketches for key personnel, some of whom are not financially supported
- The modular grant process has made it too easy for investigators to ask for and receive more money than they actually need.

E4 **Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants**

- XXX Hospital's Research Administration Office still requires detailed budget diminishing the time otherwise saved
- As a reviewer, the modular format provides less information, which can impair the review process.
- Limit too low. My university still requires a detailed budget.
- Sense that occasional investigators simply ask for the maximum \$250,000 expecting to be pared down.
- the costs of doing research in major urban areas are much more expansive, which is not reconcilable by the modular system.
- limit in total cost
- The limited budget.
- I'm ok with modular grants.....if I could get one!
- Justification of an additional module requested in subsequent years usually to cover necessary "cost of living" salary increases, as well as increases in supplies and equipment cost. In particular, the cost of certain supplies and equipment is difficult to project in the third, fourth and fifth year.
- Secrecy of evaluation. Especially evaluation is totally based on completed results. There is no appreciation for good theory or designing experiments.
- Some restriction for R21 and other grants.
- It is a fine system, if NIH can control of growth of averaging grant sizes boosted by the modular grant system.
- too small limit for certain types of grants,
- Funding limit, and the fact that budgets are cut by modules and not by dollar amounts
- Addition of contract/consortium indirect costs.
- The goal of saving time by eliminating the detailed budget are great and could save time and provide flexibility. Unfortunately, my institution and I am guessing many others still requires a detailed budget. As a result, there is no time saved, and rebudget justifications are needed.
- Cannot justify some items effectively
- I worry that peer reviewers on study sections may regard applicants (rather than applications) as being "worth" a set figure, based on their own assessments and value scales, irrespective of the merits of an application.
- NIH takes advantage of the flexibility and administrative cuts have been higher.
- The price cap of \$250,000
- Biosketch

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- I think it has tremendously inflated grant requests.
- In reviews there is often insufficient information with which to judge the appropriateness of the request.
- I really like a detailed budget -- it helps me to cost out the project.
- The award sizes have increased. Yet, I have one grant that I have held for 22 years that still has not reached the \$250,000 maximum because of imposed limits on competitive renewal increases. In its last competitive review, it received a 0.2 percentile ranking. Yet new proposals that are smaller in scope can and do receive \$250,000 modular budgets. I believe that the modular budget has removed a responsibility of the study section and NIH to insure the budget is consistent with and awarded at a level that needed to conduct the work.
- None aware of as a new PI
- Still have to prepare a detailed budget for the University.
- it's too easy for program officials to cut "2 or 3 modules" which is a lot as opposed to reducing by percentages
- having to write a detailed budget at my university, so write two budgets, and when reviewing lacking information on supplies etc.
- Nothing really, but the fact the we have to do everything for the Institution (detailed budget, makes the modular budget quite irrelevant.
- It limits at 250,000
- No facility for cost of living increases
- None, except that the limit should be raised \$300, 000 for competing renewals of modular grants.
- Budget limits per year could be increased and allowed to take into consideration yearly salary increases and other costs many times mandated by universities without a way of obtaining additional funds from NIH via the modular grant format
- Subcontracts and cooperative agreements tend to limit real budget.
- I never know how much to ask for, e.g., whether to round up or down. The size of the awards seems to be shrinking as a result of the tendency of administrators to round down. I also don't know how reviewers can fully evaluate a proposal without information about the budget and other support.
- Inability to add modules in later years
- Limit of \$250,000
- Without individual salary information, I'm concerned that it can be difficult to know if what is being requested is reasonable or not. Supporting two experienced technicians, for example, is completely different than two new, just out of school technicians

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- ...the irony is that I have to submit a detailed budget to the Office of Sponsored Programs, and, therefore, I might as well send this to the NIH from the very beginning, because, many reviewers, such as myself, would prefer to have the information justifying the budget anyway.
- The fact that we have to prepare a detailed budget for our Dean's Office and Office of sponsored programs, means that we save no time whatsoever when using a modular budget.
- Still have to prepare detailed budgets for University.
- The fact that I end up having to fill out a detailed budget for my institution cuts down on the actual convenience of the modular budget.
- Cuts in budget by 1 module are mandatory when actually the cut might be for just 1/2 of a module in excess
- Elimination of details with the NIH was great, but having those same details at the university level is unnecessary.
- Currently I cannot think of a negative.
- the limits of \$250,000
- If my grant is well written the reviewer should recognize the need for the budget requested, i.e., spelling out the expertise of personnel, needs for animals and any other high cost items.
- The perception that you need to totally spend each years funding. The budgeting aspect should be highlighted.
- Have found few if any disadvantages.
- The difficulty of arranging for increases in salary over the funding period. If the project needs three full time lab personnel (with different levels of expertise) chances are that the PI will have to increase salaries in different ways every year, which creates always problems. The possibility of having this already included into the original application (increases in salary/year) would make things easier. In my opinion this problems is much less severe regarding the expected increases in buying reagents.
- Can be cut short in one year if you didn't allocate appropriately.
- It does not support the real costs of research in outlying years.
- Have to prepare 2 budgets, one for grants office, one for grant.
- Proposed budgets may be cut more, since the reviewers only suggest integral numbers of modules. A modular gradation seems too coarse e.g. for a \$150,000 proposed budget ($\pm 17\%$).
- In reviewing grants outside one's main area of expertise, it is sometimes difficult to judge the appropriateness of the budget. It might be useful to have some sample budgets related to different types of research accessible to reviewers
- Random deduction of one module, then another 10-17% reduction on top of that, happened to my grant on its first cycle. This made the scope of work very difficult to achieve.

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- When the study section makes cuts in the budget, it is in modules and sometimes that can be quite devastating to a budget. I got cut 2 modules one time and I had asked for a realistic, not inflated, number of modules. I was really upset and told my program officer that I just couldn't do the project with \$50K less per year. She suggested that I go ahead and try, sure enough into the 3rd year, I'm broke and cannot perform the last aim which involves microarrays. So.. I've applied for some supplementary funding for partial recompense. If I don't get the supplementary funding, I just won't be able to go further, and this is tremendously frustrating given all the time and energy and momentum that has built up around the project. I think the modular format makes it too easy to slash and burn budgets.
- Modular grants do not allow for the high annual increases in tuition and stipend for graduate students, which consume most of the grant in my lab. It is completely unclear to me how the budget is finally awarded and why modules are deleted from the requested budget. How can such decisions be made if there is no information about the costs of running a lab at a given institution?
- BUDGET LIMIT
- No ability or requirement to justify the amount requested. The number of modules requested appears rather random, especially when talking with junior faculty. Equally random then are the cuts that are made in the final award.
- DISCREPANCY BETWEEN FILLING OUT DETAILED BUDGET FOR UNIVERSITY BUT MODULAR BUDGET FOR NIH
- There is unjustified inflation of grant budgets that lowers the total number of grants awarded.
- I am a strong supporter, and do not have particular dislikes.
- I have had at least one instance when the study section used the budget request to deny the grant. As I understand it, the money and scientific merit decisions are meant to be separate. A better job should be done in educating the people on the study section, particularly the chairs, who can be very weak about the correct way to review grants.
- I didn't realize until this questionnaire that this was connected to modular budgets, but the indirect costs from collaborations/consortiums should not be considered direct costs for the whole grant. This penalizes collaboration, which is bad for science.
- I think it keeps one from getting the amount of money needed for a project. Expenses are NOT the same at different institutions yet those awarding money/the grant seem to have a set amount of money they're willing to give certain project. This does not take into account different costs at different places/universities. For example, postdoc salaries and student salaries are more expensive here than many places. We have no way to justify this now. It seems as if there is now a preconceived notion about how much something should cost and the modular grants/lack of budget allow those giving the award to just give a certain number of modules.
- makes it easier to "double dip" resulting in reduced funding.
- I like to be able to justify each item in the budget, because I think reviewers are less likely to reduce the amount of the award if this is done.

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- have to do detailed budget anyways for local administration
- The overall structure with various categories that must be filled out is annoying to say the list. Reducing a complex multiyear program into a bunch of bullets makes little sense. The modular grant is supposed to make it so that no detailed budget is required. However, on the last page of the grant application, the exact amount of the overhead is required. To get the amount of over head, a exact detailed budget must be prepared. This really is crazy. We need blocks that add up to exactly certain amounts of money and the we need to put them into specific expenditures so that the over head can be calculated. Therefore, the claim that a modular budget does not require a detailed budget is wrong if the amount of over head is required. Because the actual award amount is less that requested, another detailed budget must be prepared. Furthermore, why allow a 5 year application if 5 years are almost never awarded.
- grants, if they are to be limited to 250K, have to be rather limited in scope.
- Not having benefited from doing the homework mentioned in E3.
- That I can not justify unusual costs of my project. Someone else decides what this project can be done for, but I am the one who really knows what it costs. NIH may think that a grant in aid philosophy is great, but where is the rest of the money to come from?
- I think that, by justifying budget requests, I think more about how the work load will be distributed among my post-docs, students, techs, etc. I think I can make a better case for support of my grant to the reviewing team, if I have to justify how the individuals will be contributing to the grant. As a reviewer, I certainly feel this is the case.
- Limit of \$250,000.
- I recently submitted a competing renewal using the modular approach. The study section lopped off one module, and then there was an administrative cut that left me with roughly the same amount of money ~\$195 that I had in the previous year of the grant. Now, however, I am stuck with that amount for the next 4 years; if I had resubmitted using the non-modular approach, I would have been able to get an annual increase of 4-5% minimum.
- I still need detailed budgets for my own institution anyway
- No adjustment to increasing costs.
- The paucity of information regarding equipment.
- The idea that one will not need a detailed budget is not correct at our institution. I would think that anyone would want to have a general idea of the cost for a project in manpower and resources before the writing process begins. So you really don't save a lot of time.
- The amount should not be limited.
- reviewing modular grants- very difficult or impossible to decide whether the proposed budget is reasonable or not.
- not involved in discussion on cutting budget
- No increases to allow for standard salary increases - operating costs become reduced

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- no budget, budget increases, biosketch info needed
- Discussing the consortium budgets. I think that just-in-time budgeting should mean that.
- The size of the R01 awards has increased
- To long ago to remember
- The total dollar limit.
- Can not increase the budget.
- The trend is to potentially inflate budgets and review groups are less able to evaluate overlap with other funded projects. I would rather see more grants funded than have fewer grants with more dollars attached.
- As a reviewer it makes it impossible to know the true costs in salary and other needs. I can no longer judge the budget as fair or not. As a reviewer, I now spend very little time on the budget. That means that overall costs of individual grants has gone up meaning less grants overall
- modular limit
- consortium agreements
- \$ limit hasn't changed
- Budgets are cut by 25,000 modules. Reviewers/NIH should be allowed to make cuts/additions of much smaller amounts.
- Everything. As a reviewer, it is impossible to see where money is being spent. Cuts are not being made as they were in the past, thus awards are much bigger and funding scores are harder.
- Still have to prepare a detailed budget for my institution (MCW)
- As a reviewer, I hate the lack of a reasonably detailed budget to help estimate whether the research proposed is roughly consistent with the budget. Also, more generally, the lack of detail (especially annual direct cost numbers) in the research support segment of the New NIH BioSketches makes it extremely difficult to evaluate shared equipment grants and training grants, where the need and enhancement of research criteria are very closely tied with current funding levels of the PI's.
- No increase in support level over the duration of the grant. My suggestion would be to have a modular year 1 budget with a 3 or 4 % annual increase in direct costs to account for increased personnel/supply expenses over time.
- the 250,000 limit for every year. Very hard for the first year with data/equipment costs.
- If possible, would like it see it evolve to a system like NSF Fastlane.
- In my opinion, study section does not always have realistic expectation for the amount of science that even a fully funded modular award can support.

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- My university still requires a traditional, detailed budget... so there's really no work/time savings. Also, because there is no provision for annual escalation of costs, early years of the grant accumulate significant unspent funds. This "carryover" then has to be justified to the NIH, which is a big hassle.
- Grant reviewers can't tell exactly if the budget is appropriate. Without knowing if it's appropriate, they often say that an applicant budgets too much for the project.
- Making the budget work from year to year at a given rate
- \$ limits
- Arbitrary post-award cuts.
- The lack of yearly increases to meet increasing costs. It is like the senior citizens living on a fixed income. The across the board budget cuts are also a problem. Why have a modular system is there is a 8% across the board cut.
- less money, have to adjust aims to meet budget.
- A bit harder to review
- Applicants tend to fill up the maximum.
- Indirect from subcontracts
- \$250K limit - please raise to \$300K
- The modular grant is cut in rather large increments by reviewers often without adequate explanation. It would be helpful when resubmitting a proposal to know why the budgetary cuts were recommended
- As a reviewer, I don't feel we can easily make overlap decisions, and don't believe NIH staff has time/expertise to do this. Also the cost of projects has increased once reviewers no longer scrutinized expenses.
- Reviewer might not understand budgetary needs.
- No inflation adjustment.
- Arbitrary budget cuts - even on grants that score extremely well.
- Unclear guidelines on what level of funding to request.
- The \$25000 modules may be inappropriate for some costs, particularly subcontracts
- You still have to do a fairly detailed budget in order to know how to do the modular budget.
- The 250K limit.
- Caps on yearly costs.
- none - but since my university asks for a detailed budget, in the end I'm not sure how much time I really save.

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- Impossible to evaluate the budget at time of review.
- The scope of some of my research plans has been modified to fit within the \$250K cap. In some cases, I think the proposal suffered.
- The study section will cut grants only by defined modules, and do not receive enough information to determine whether those cuts will adversely affect the ability of the PI to conduct his research. Module cutting by the study sections are frequently not carefully thought through and are quite arbitrary. Some investigators get cut others don't.
- none except, perhaps, the ceiling at \$250,000
- Don't like to have to submit detailed budget to the Office of Sponsored Projects
- There is no escalation for inflation each year, but there is absolutely no question that the effective budget each year goes down, reducing the amount of research possible.
- The limitations of the 250K budget, no increases allowed over time, and the impossibility of seeing on review if animal costs or other costs are being unduly inflated.
- None. This has allowed scientists to focus more on science than administration. There is enough administration after the grant is awarded.
- harder to review, harder to control costs
- Few
- I would like to know how it has affected the average request. If it has caused an inflation outside of the historical increase, that could rob some investigators on the edge of the pay line.
- Seems to be a waste of time.
- Cuts are probably bigger.
- office of grants of contracts still wants a detailed budget defeating somewhat the benefits of the modular grant application
- As a reviewer, lack of budget justification.
- The vast majority of the rest of the application is the same
- Constrain as to future increase especially if graduate student stipends or postdoctoral salaries increase at your institution
- you still need to carefully think through the expected costs before deciding on how much a research project will cost to do.
- Cut of budget based on each modular
- no increase
- Essentially the 4 page biosketch has replaced the Other support. In seems to be all rolled in to one. Therefore, there is limited benefit from getting to "leave off" the other support page. I dislike our OSP requirements, but unfortunately that is out of NIH's hands.

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- While the study section reviews the budgetary information and makes a recommendation for a grant application, the advisory council makes the final decision regarding the size of the award. In my experience, there is consistently a reduction in the final award. Since this is the case, what is the point of any budgetary justification (modular or nonmodular)? The cuts in the final budget appear to the PI as arbitrary and even go against the recommendation of the study section. For example, my RO1 was reviewed and received a very good percentile score (0.3). The budget requested in the modular format was viewed by study section as appropriate, but was cut 25,000/year by council. It is frustrating because it was done without a stated reason. This seemingly arbitrary reduction in total dollars will prevent me from performing all of the studies proposed in the original application.
- The fact that the universities' requirements defeat the intended purposes.
- I dislike the inability to reflect annual increases in expenses. Over the course of a four year grant, a 3% cost-of-living/inflation increase can amount to a 10% increase in costs by the final year, which would be a full module in a \$250,000 grant. Surely some mechanism can be put in place to reflect such increases, tied to an inflationary index of some sort.
- Limits the number of awards made since the grants are much larger now.
- The limitation of justifying the price of the research.
- I remember there was SOMETHING my secretary and I preferred "the old way" a couple of years ago, but I don't remember what! Some may just be the confusion between modular, the "old RO1" method and the SCOR project rules we currently have!
- The dollar limit.
- indifferent
- the year limit of \$250,000
- It is extremely difficult for reviewers to assess whether the budget is accurate (needed) or inflated. So their practice is to just lop off modules, even though many investigators include budgetary information. Thus, there is a certain randomness to the process. In addition, I know several female scientists who have been advised to "ask for less" so that they will get funded. After receiving the award, the reduction in modules at the study section level plus the administrative reductions leave them with inadequate funding. While this is ultimately the PIs responsibility, it seems that new investigators, especially women, make this critically important mistake.
- I didn't dislike any aspects of the application process. I didn't find the need for biographical sketches of all personnel burdensome.

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- I need to write a detailed, fully justified budget for my institution regardless of NIH guidelines. My institution is still responsible for oversight of all changes in the modular budget. Thus, my flexibility for the use of funds has not changed, only the oversight has changed. NIH has shifted the burden to the local institution. Now, my local institution finds it costs them too much to administer grants. Thus, it appears that any cost saving that might have come from modular grants has just shifted from one bureaucracy to another. The individual investigator must still take time to prepare a detailed budget and seek permission to make changes. As a reviewer, it is difficult to determine whether a PI really requires the amount of funds requested. It is nearly impossible to make a valid judgment and, if we can't, then who will make that judgment? Will this be an administrator who doesn't have first-hand knowledge of the costs of research?
- we have to do all the internal budget projections anyway and biosketches and other support are constantly being updated so there is really no savings in work with a modular grant as far as I am concerned
- Perhaps will have some limitations if projects grow significantly
- It is possible that changing needs and costs can exceed the \$250k cap.
- That it is always cut.
- ...but it has been wholly unsuccessful since various levels of administration at my institution, including the office of sponsored programs, refuses to process paperwork without a detailed budget. Deadlines have been missed as people along the approval line stop my proposal, assuring me that they are helping me, since my proposal could not possibly be approved or funded without a detailed budget.
- Grants should increment each year. Costs NEVER remain the same and by later years the grant is inadequate to fully support the work.
- If collaborations/consortiums are added to the grant this drives the cost over the modular limit
- limit
- Lack of details.
- Over budgeting of grants. Some aspects of the grant reviewing process is difficult as there is no clear idea how is allocated to salary/travel
- dollar limit is too low
- For some grants it is difficult to do the work in 10 modules allowed. It will help if module is increased to 35,000 from 25,000.
- There is actually no time saved on preparing the budget, since I still have to prepare a detailed budget to arrive at an accurate modular budget.
- Sometime hard to judge scope of work when reviewing grants.
- \$250,000 upper limit and no extra dollar for consortium/ contractual research

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- From a grant reviewers standpoint, the modular application makes it very difficult to judge whether a proposed budget is reasonable or not. For example, salaries can be quite different in different parts of the country. Since salaries are not known in the modular grant, then neither is that part of the budget required for expendables. So really nothing is known that a judgment can be base on (other than some really far out numbers).
- lack of budget justification, especially in terms of personnel time
- the vast majority of the grants I review request the maximum amount, I believe PIs just request the maximum as a matter of course and expect to be cut. but during study section only a small percentage actually get cut
- I always find it daunting to look up all the rules of applications and renewals. I never feel comfortable that I'm doing the right thing. Luckily, I have good grant administration support.
- Not getting funded.
- escalating awards
- Increase the budget
- Arbitrary cuts in funds.
- The biosketch pages with short limits that contain critical justification of investigator's experience/expertise and other support.
- Institutional requirement for itemized budget not required by NIH negates the time savings.
- almost automatic decrement in modules
- upper limit of \$250,000
- Why the request gets cut. This appears arbitrary. However, it beats nickel and dime negotiation over little things.
- Some projects deserve more financial compensation and a modular budget is often difficult to decipher whether the expenses are justified.
- The desire for Institutions to require what has been eliminated as a local requirement at the same time as grant submission. 'Just in Time' concepts need to somehow be mandated or made clearly advantageous in terms of local Specific Budget preparation at the time of grant submission.
- Encourages grant dollar inflation
- The main thing is having to prepare two budgets, detailed for the university and then modular, which doesn't take much time to fill out the form, but more time in the budget justifications when one knows the reviewer doesn't get the detailed budget which speaks for itself.
- The university requires preparing a full budget whether or not NIH does, so the amount of work is the same either way!!
- The fact that our grants office requires a detailed budget
- None, the experience so far has been very positive

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- Coming up with a detailed budget, then rounding down some categories to stay within a certain number of modules.
- The time and effort to write a grant proposal is very high. Changing the budget mechanism to modular is helpful, but its effect is somewhat limited. A pre-proposal system would further limit the time spent on ideas that are unlikely to be funded.
- I prefer the non-modular grants because I need to itemize the expenses anyway to calculate how much to request. Transferring that information to an application form doesn't require that much time. More importantly, the present funding limit on modular grants is too low.
- It is difficult to judge why the module is cut by the review process.
- the cap
- Decreased ability to emphasize how the requested level of funding will be employed
- I do worry some investigators are being excessive in their requests for funds.
- one must invent silly ways to spread the budget over the several years to account for the inflexibility of the modules--i.e.. no increases in later years.
- The requested by the institution wastes a lot of our time to make up a nonsense detail budget.
- I would prefer to have the limit raised to \$350,000
- Consortium cost is part of direct cost
- If budgets are reduced in increments of 25,000 dollars, objectives may be compromised.
- as a reviewer not seeing the budget is a deficiency
- A detailed internal budget must still be submitted so there is not much time saved in budget preparation
- The constraint on asking for what you need when you need to round up or down to fit the module size. Being in a separate (and potentially more strictly reviewed) category if you exceed the \$250K limit.
- Lack of an escalation factor. In the case of R03s- the grants are two modules/year - which doesn't allow fluctuation for salary and expense increases.
- limited funds
- The indirect costs for sub-contracts should not be included in the overall project direct costs. These are overhead costs over which the PI has no control.
- a) A cut by one module typically leaves you with 1/2 person unfunded, so you have to find that amount of support somewhere else. (Or inflate the initial request to anticipate this.) b) The lack of escalation for inflation and raises means fewer Aims and people in the out years of the grant.
- Funding cap.
- Having to fill out a detailed budget and justification for my university.

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- Harder to review
- less information in review panel meeting
- The cuts are arbitrary. Taken with cuts recommended by study sections along with cuts imposed by institutes, the amount of cuts are often quite big.
- Lack of strict accountability?
- One can slip into carelessness on actual costs, thereby not asking for sufficient funds to cover the costs of the projected work.
- The lack of increase in the budget in continuation years, since costs (particularly salaries over which the PI has no control) increase. As a consequence less research is bought each year.
- there is no way of seeing why modules have been reduced except for the notion that the agency wants to save money on the research.
- The budgetary cap.
- 250,000 limit
- They are straightforward but there is a problem of yearly increase in salary of PI and personnel. Let us say you put 20% salary on grant and you get 3% raise, where will the money come from in subsequent years. Same thing about personnel. The NIH should distribute less money and then escalate by 3% every year. Otherwise Institutions expect you to bring additional 3% increase from other sources. It is stressful.
- personnel descriptions
- Funding cap.
- Cannot justify budget for major items, in particular salaries. This is by far the major problem with the process.
- Including subcontract indirect costs in budget.
- Deciding whether to go over the limit
- BUREAUCRACY !!!
- Despite the good intentions, because I must do a detailed budget for my institution, it actually creates more paperwork!
- Same amount for the budget per year
- The limit should be raised, to be compatible with typical amounts requested for 3-year R01 applications.
- It solves only a small problem in the grant review process.
- We have to go through a pretty detailed budget at our institution, so if the process could be streamlined also at the local institutions it would be much better.

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- Applicants may hide frivolous expenditures
- The limit of \$250k. I believe it should be raised to a level for the average cost for a RO1 grant.
- The requirement by sponsored programs to have a detailed budget and associated justification.
- In submitting proposals from my institution, detailed budgets must still be prepared. In reviewing proposals, having no budget information does not help in the evaluation
- overhead on subcontracts counts as direct costs on prime contract
- I dislike the implied ceiling of the costs, which puts pressure on the PI to stay below this cap or be "punished".
- I dislike having to provide a detailed budget to my sponsored programs office prior to the grant being awarded. This seems to directly contradict the purpose of the modular grants program.
- May be difficult to adequately project for NIH-recommended increases in salaries etc.
- Being awarded less than the requested amount even though at least on reviewer recommended an increased budget amount for the proposed studies.
- Can't explain why I need the 10 modules.
- It is essentially pointless as long as I have to do a detailed budget for my institution anyway.
- By not knowing the level of support available in a lab, the reviewers do not take into consideration the ability of an investigator to provide additional data to address a reviews concerns. When a lab is faced with complete loss of funding, then this can takes years to recover from due to the loss of trained personnel.
- My institution requires that I submit a detailed budget using the non-modular NIH forms. Although the institution does not submit these forms to NIH, it takes the same amount of time for me to prepare it for the institution as it would for me to prepare it for NIH. My institution maintains that they are required by NIH to require PIs to prepare detailed budgets. I wonder if this is not actually NIH policy; if it is not NIH policy, then it is possible that there are misunderstandings of NIH policy; if it is NIH policy, then it is unclear to me how the modular-grant systems saves time for PIs or facilitates the focus on science.
- budget limits
- THE INSTITUTIONAL NITPICKING IS STILL A PAIN IN THE NECK AND COMES AT A TIME WHEN WE NEED THE MOST TIME FOR FOCUSING ON THE SCIENCE AND NOT ON HOW THE FUNDS GIVEN UNDER THIS PROGRAM WILL BE USED. WHY SHOULD THE INSTITUTION CARE IF THE NIH HAS GIVEN YOU THE MODULAR GRANT. I CAN UNDERSTAND THE INSTITUTION BEING CONCERNED ABOUT PERSONNEL ON THE PROPOSAL BUT THAT CONCERN CAN BE ADDRESSED BY ALREADY ESTABLISHED PROCEDURES AND DONT HAVE TO IMPINGE ON THE MODULAR GRANT MECHANISM.
- Just in general, lack of clarity on budgets.
- 250 K/year is too much. make it harder to get a 2nd or 3rd RO1. these changes would allow more investigators to be funded.

E4 **Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants**

- 1. See Response E3. 2. Limited funding levels that make investigators need to have more than one grant to survive.
- It still has the same problem with other processes that I mentioned earlier. I think there is a big problem to pick good proposals. Like in my case, I have submitted many 'good' proposals to NIH, but most of them got failed. At first, I think something might be wrong with me and I kept changing myself to adjust the reviewers. Now, I realize that it is almost impossible for me to get funded because the fact is the most people (such as reviewers) don't believe great ideas at first. They prefer their friends or whoever they know. And one negative comment from reviewers is enough to turn the proposal down. That's a big shame.
- I still need a detailed budget for my institution
- Cap on the increase from previous competitive renewal and arbitrary cuts.
- 1. The resubmission of the application is meaningless in that new reviewers often come up with critiques on top of ones provided by previous reviewers. The second reviewer process should be done by the same reviewers to make consistency of the reviewing process. 2. Often, some reviewers participate in the review process although he/she is not an expert in the area of the research or unfamiliar with the topics. 3. Some investigators, who have been in the reviewer panel, get more than 3 R01 grants, whose project goals are similar each other. It is not fair.
- I dislike the fact that I have to ask for \$250,000 full knowing that I will be cut back. I asked for exactly what I needed for my first grant and was cut back, which required me to write another grant to cover the cutbacks. I was very frustrated and enlightened as to how the NIH works.
- limit of \$250,000
- The fact that the indirect cost of a subcontract counts toward the direct cost of the primary applicant.
- strict limitation to adhere the \$250,000 limit every year.
- the need to ask for equipment as a module. It makes asking for an 11,000 centrifuge awkward
- the limitations on size --- cant deal with subcontracts well.
- More detail in Biosketches Preparing detailed budgets for the University even though they are not required by the NIH
- Somewhat risky for PI if has not prepared a detailed budget and discovers that has underbudgeted certain categories
- \$250,000
- There is some hassle on the border of the funding limit, but this may be necessary.
- Difficult to account for yearly increases in salaries or the addition on new personnel in the middle of the grant. Year 1 salaries may be much less than for years 3 and 4 for example.

E4 Reasons for Disliking Modular Grants

- I dislike the \$250,000 annual limit, no annual increases in budget over the course of an award, caps that diminish the appeal for applying for a competitive renewal. I also dislike the excessively detailed budgets required by the institution at the time of submission, which means that submission of revised applications requires redoing detailed budgets with every revision. The detailed budgets required by the institution always need to be revised once the award is made.

F6 Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

F6 Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- not having to prepare an IACUC protocol unless necessary
- Relieves the pressure to get some forms and approvals by the due time
- No need for an IRB when submitting the application.
- One does not have to submit Just in time material at the time of initial grant submission.
- focus my efforts on the science rather than administrative concerns
- it works just fine
- No need to submit IACUC,IRB and other approvals at the time of grant submission.
- The IRB submission process is very lengthy and time-consuming. If a project has no chance of funding then it would prevent the waste of this time.
- It gives time to get documents ready.
- Saves times during submission of grant application
- The timing of the request for the material. It doesn't have to be submitted at the time of the proposal.
- No need to submit all this information with the grant application.
- submit material only if funding is likely
- Fewer things to think about when planning the scientific part of proposal.
- elimination of any paper work at the time of application allows me to spend more time for scientific contents.
- Not having to provide a large body of information that is largely unrelated to the science in the grant until I know the grant has been funded
- Delays in approval of vertebrate animal protocols do not slow down grant application submission.
- having to do the extra work only if likely to be funded
- Separating the administrative requirements from the scientific preparation of the grant is very helpful during a period of time when not only the applicant, but more importantly the administrators, are under stress. Within a department numerous grants may be submitted at the same deadline, over taxing the administrative staff. This procedure removes some of that burden.
- saves time
- Save a lot of time in submission process in our institute.
- It makes sense to judge the other support at the time of grant award rather than grant submission.

F6 Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- It saves having to prepare the material over when a re-submission is required.
- Good to have flexibility to get certain things in later.
- Not having to have the IRB material submitted by application time makes grant submission much easier.
- Spreads the burden, focus on grant, get the excess paperwork done later, and/or only when needed
- Saving time in application preparation
- Not required to but in considerable amounts of time for something we may not get to do because it is not funded.
- online
- The Just-in-Time materials don't need to be submitted with the entire grant application.
- Saves work if the proposal is not funded
- A few less things to be concerned about during the grant application.
- Not enough experience to comment at this time
- Not having to get animal protocols approved for projects that may never happen because the grant may not be funded
- It saves time when preparing a proposal
- Reduces the need to submit IRB proposals for projects that may never get run as designed, especially if a revised submission is encouraged.
- It saves time in submitting a grant proposal, more time to focus on grant.
- Ability to postpone performing the tasks needed to supply this detailed information to a later time. No need to spend time doing these tasks if the grant is not favorably reviewed.
- Flexibility
- Save time in grant preparation.
- it allows you to postpone focusing on details of the unlikely event: funding-until it really will happen
- IF my institution didn't require a budget up front (upon submission of the proposal), I think it would save me a fair amount of time.
- SOUNDS LIKE A GREAT WAY TO ACCESS STATUS OF THE APPLICATION
- it makes it much easier if one submits a grant that involves human subjects.
- Gives me time to focus on the actual proposal
- Gives me time to prepare and submit them after the grant application if I need to do so.

F6 Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- Ambivalent
- saves wasted time on animal protocols
- ability to submit up to date info
- Saves time
- Complex calculations, especially for personnel, can be deferred until notice of impending award is received.
- I like the concept that I can wait to submit forms etc, until I think the grant will be funded - however, see below.
- Not having to submit the material at the time of submission
- The time is saves for wasted effort if not funded.
- saves time at time of application
- save time.
- don't have to submit IRB and IACUC prior to application
- time savings during grant preparation
- Not wasting the time gathering the materials if an award is not going to be made.
- You know there is at least a possibility of funding.
- linked to funded grants; don't have to waste time for nonfunded applications.
- Allows some time flexibility.
- Just-in-Time helps to focus on the science.
- Haven't used it
- As with the modular grant procedure, the JIT procedure allows me to focus on science first and deal with details of the business aspect of the grant only when there is some reasonable expectation that the effect were serve a useful purpose.
- The saving of time when preparing a grant proposal. Also the avoidance of submitting many IRB protocols for institutional approval for research that may never get funded and never be done.
- Major time savings. If the grant is not funded I may not bother with the HSC applications.
- It saves me unnecessary work when no award is made.
- reduces unnecessary paper work, as protocol will be reviewed only after the proposal is identified as fundable
- NIH Staff helpful!
- The fact that I can focus on the science during grant preparation.

F6 Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- I like not having to fill in a large list of meaningless pending proposals when submitting each proposal. Since proposals won't be funded anyway, it is a waste of time to make a large list of pending proposals at the time of submission. Also, I think a list of pending proposals makes the reviewers think one has more money than one really does (since pending proposals look like other support, but are unlikely to actually produce any support).
- facilitating the funding of the award
- not having to complete these materials during the time I am preparing a grant
- The burden on IRB and IACUC is decreased.
- The fact that one does not have to have all IACUC/IRB completed by the time the grant is submitted.
- IRB approval does not have to be finalized prior to grant submission
- I like the fact that this option exists. It does relieve the busy-ness and stress in submitting grant applications for a particular deadline
- saves time- we only go through the process if award is imminent- also helps my institution's IRB and IACUC
- the time it saves when preparing the grant for submission
- Getting IRB approval would delay submitting grant applications by up to 3 or 4 months at my institution.
- No point in going through all that paper work if the proposal doesn't get funded in the end.
- Not having to do it before the grant is awarded.
- None, this has not impacted me at all.
- It does save time.
- Not having to submit material at the time of application
- Time saving during proposal writing
- Not having to provide the materials at the time the application is due. It would be a great loss of time to have to go through the IACUC or IRB for studies that are not funded yet (and may never be!)
- not having to submit at the same time as application is due
- Threshold for submitting a proposal is reduced--more likely to follow up on a fresh idea
- The only aspect of it that applies to my research at this time is the other support material as I don't use animals or humans in my research. I have to have the other support information at hand for other purposes so whether I do it before submitting a grant application or later in the process doesn't make much difference. One thing I like about it is that when the Just-in-Time material is requested, I know that the application is being considered favorably for funding!
- The flexibility to do first things first.

F6 Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- Budget preparation
- Saving time near the grant deadline.
- Save time at application time. Time for review by IRB.
- 1) Saves time in preparing the application. 2) More often than not, there are changes in study design which would require a major amendment or re-write of the IRB application - i.e. JIT saves work & time.
- Not having to worry about the information at the time of the initial application.
- It saved my time during the stressing period of preparing the application.
- Submission closer to start of actual project lets materials be up to date and more accurate than if there is a long delay.
- It can save a lot of time during the application process. This is very important because the "administrative" issues can be postponed to allow focus on the "scientific" issues in the application.
- saves time at the time of application
- I like the time-saving aspects of the Just-in-Time procedures. The time it takes is a lot when putting together an application, but seems like nothing when the application is likely to be funded!
- Saves time at submission and if not funded saves wasted effort.
- Don't have to worry about unless NIH ask for it.
- It eliminates the rush to get everything done for the same deadline. It takes time pressure off of IRB and IACUC review processes, allowing for better reviews.
- Saves effort for funded projects.
- Reduction in unnecessary paperwork for the PI, institution staff, and review committees. Better focus of the IRB and IACUC on research that will actually take place.
- I do not know much about them.
- I do not have to waste time on the preparation of documents if my grant is not funded.
- Cuts down the work for grants that are not going to be funded.
- The ability to have the grant reviewed without the necessity of putting in consent forms or animal approval at the time
- nice idea
- Reduces burden when writing grant...when all time needs to be spent on science.
- Less paperwork to deal with at the time of application. IRB and IACUC applications can be postponed

F6 Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- I do not need to deal with IACUC, etc until I know the application is likely to be funded.
- Not having to have that information when one is trying to get the grant application out the door.
- Simple and straightforward
- Saves time, and do not have to worry about until a funding recommendation has been made.
- It saves a lot of effort by the IACUC in not reviewing grants that are not recommended for funding and relieves stress of trying to get an application reviewed by an over-burdened IACUC in time to submit.
- The materials are requested only when a grant is recommended for funding
- Does save time in preparation
- It is supposed to streamline applications in order to facilitate the process so far as the PI is concerned.
- Ease of process
- Neutral remark: the information has to be provided one place or another. The absence of information at the time of a review often clouds the review process.
- I don't have to think about rather unimportant things when trying to think about the scientific aspects of the proposal.
- Saving time for the most important thing: the scientific concept of the grant body
- Information is up-to-date at time of award. NIH staff have a better overview of funding than review committees.
- Do not have to go through time consuming approval for research that will not be funded.
- Do not waste time to complete lengthy and detailed forms (e.g. IRB and IACUC) for application that is not funded anyway.
- It saves the stress of having to have everything done before submitting a grant. However, I would go ahead and submit the proposal to the IRB as soon as possible anyway.
- I like the fact that IACUC approval does not need to be in place at the time the grant is submitted. This saves a great deal of time and burden on the PI and IACUC to prepare and review something that may not be supported.
- Paperwork is reduced unless the grant is awarded.
- Effectiveness at NIH is great
- This policy makes perfect sense. I don't know why it took so long to implement. This approach greatly simplifies the application preparation and minimizes work for proposals that are not funded ultimately.
- Decreases time spent on proposal preparation.

F6 Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- It gives me time to focus on the scientific application rather than spend time submitting detailed paper work for approval from the Institutional Animal Care facility.
- Avoids futility
- Saves time and work.
- The fact that what ultimately may be unnecessary approvals do not have to be obtained until they are indeed necessary saves time and effort.
- Less paper work
- Time saver when getting a grant in its final form.
- makes process easier
- It's efficient and effective.
- DISLIKE TIME IT TAKES TO GET MATERIALS AT THE TIME OF SUBMISSION
- Less paperwork associated with grant submission
- Very helpful not to have to spend time on writing and getting approvals for protocols that may never be funded or will at least need such major revisions as to require re-review.
- The fact that if the proposal fails, I will have suffered just that little bit less. Preparing documentation for animal use protocols at my university is a horrible experience. The process for use of human subjects is even worse, so the just-in-time is WONDERFUL.
- No need to get IACUC at time of submission which is usually lots of busy work. Also no wasted time if grant not funded
- save me time
- every aspects
- The fact that I can wait until the application has been sent in to submit my IRB application. It's true that we can't wait until the grant is likely to get funded (since IRB processing often takes 6-8 weeks at UCSF), but it's still nice not to have to get everything in before the grant deadline.
- gives the PI some breathing room...
- save time and energy
- Why bother with complex forms if the grant isn't funded.
- Allows one to concentrate on the science, rather than obtaining administrative approvals.
- Not having to get it done until you know whether you received a decent (possibly fundable score).
- The flexibility around animal care protocol approval - one less thing to worry about when submitting a grant.
- Reduces the workload for unfunded proposals.

F6 Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- Minimizes preparation of material for grant
- saves a great deal of my colleagues time because they are not dealing with unfunded protocols
- Reduces up-front effort that may be totally unnecessary if an application is not funded.
- There is less stress regarding budgeting.
- what is it ?
- It saves time when preparing the application and allows me to focus on the science.
- it helps the researcher and the institution not to invest time into certain regulatory issues unless the grant is going to be funded. So I applaud the concept behind just in time.
- One less hassle at the time of submission
- Not having to get IRB approval before submitting
- clear instructions
- It is easy and fast.
- Not having to send in detailed information for grants that are not funded
- Contracts office handles this portion so it doesn't really affect me.
- I have not had to submit IACUC or other protocols so I do not have a strong opinion. My colleagues like it and our Biosafety and IACUC like it.
- efficiency
- It gives you time to receive internal approvals
- You are allowed to send in new data
- One fewer administrative items to think about when applying for a grant. Not a waste of time if grant is not awarded.
- It allows time to get the IACUC approval while grant is being evaluated.
- Eliminates unnecessary work if grant is not funded
- That it is available!
- Efficiency.
- It diminishes the amount of work required from the applicant and from the boards involved in the different certifications. This aspect is very welcome when the application doesn't get funded.
- Not having to prepare the material before submitting the grant.

F6 Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- It greatly facilitates the application process as oftentimes the grant cannot be prepared in sufficient advanced time to allow for IRB approval prior to its submission to the NIH. Furthermore, it allows the PI to focus on drafting complete regulatory documents once the pressure of the submission is over. It is a more efficient process in this regard as the potential for errors and rewrites of the regulatory documents is less. Overall, I feel that it results in improved human protection as appropriate time can be given to drafting and filing important IRB documents such as the patient consent form
- It is useless to obtain institutional approvals for NIH grants in advance since there is a good chance that not all grant proposals are funded as is and resubmissions may require changes of protocols that need institutional approval.
- time
- flexibility
- Not needing IACUC approval at the time of submission (my institution just requires submission of the protocol to the IACUC to get the grant signed-off).
- It allows more focus on the scientific aspects of the grant in the "crunch time", rather than the administrative aspects
- It is one less thing to worry about when you submit a grant.
- It is not especially relevant to me because I require neither Vertebrate Animal nor Human documentation forms.
- Grants are often not awarded on their first submission, but the details change from one submission to another. Just-in-time saves repeating these tasks when the application is not paid.
- Only asks for extra information if the grant application is funded -- timesaver.
- I don't waste time preparing materials until I know that the award will be made, it also prevents duplication of efforts to a degree on revised applications.
- As a grant writer, it saves me time...no need to do IRB or IACUC for grants that are not funded. As a member of these committees I don't waste my time on grants that are not funded.
- Saves time and effort in IRB/IACUC prep if a grant is not being funded
- Focus on my sciences when I write a proposal
- ability to not send in paperwork if a grant is not funded
- Saves time when writing the proposal. Also, saves time for those proposals that are not funded. It also saves time as a reviewer since I don't have to worry about budget stuff and evaluate only the science.
- Specific requests are made from NIH and handled by the PI with help from the OGC at the University.
- Allows the PI to focus on the grant application.

F6 Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- It simplifies the paper work.
- ease, ease, ease
- That they exist at all.
- Save more time in preparation of a grant
- IF the grant isn't funded, many investigators won't have to waste time on this. However, institutions that require a detailed budget if the above benefit.
- Saves time
- I appreciate having less paperwork to fill out unless there is a chance you might get an award.
- This is good procedure, if I have known about this exactly.
- I like all aspect that I do not have to submit it to the institutional animal committee during the application submission time. It saves me time, which I can spend on writing the application.
- Having more time to concentrate on the writing of the grant prior to the application deadline.
- That it happens when it is relevant.
- Not having to have IRB or Animal approval when grant is submitted
- It saves us time in that we only have to get protocols approved for studies that we are initiating or are going to be funded. More importantly, it saves IRB, IAACUC and Biosafety review times.
- Saving effort unless necessary.
- Not having to deal with the just-in-time materials at the same time that I am preparing the proposal.
- other support is fine for just in time
- In the event that institutional review boards are behind schedule, there is less of a crisis. The PI has no control over review boards or the clerical help that shuttles protocols to the members of the review boards.
- Reduces considerable waste of PI's effort hassling with IRB for a project that may not get funded
- everything around here is "just in time". it's not any different for me.
- Reduced administrative burden at proposal deadline--allows more time to formulate the scientific content.
- saves time at front end
- saves time
- Saves time to focus on the scientific plan of the application
- Not having to submit documents unless funded

F6 Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- Not having to submit animal use forms, etc, for grants that won't be funded.
- A great saving in time and effort results from not having to prepare materials to support a grant application eventually not funded.
- Not having to submit materials that may later need to be modified
- To long ago to remember
- Not submitting materials at the time the application is submitted.
- save time when generating the grant application
- Saves precious time during the preparation of the application
- No need to hassle with those documents prior to award granted.
- Eliminate unnecessary paperwork if a grant isn't funded.
- One less thing to do by the grant submission deadline.
- Prep time and deadlines easier to meet.
- The short funding time
- efficiency, no need to file lengthy forms at institution until grant is funded
- saves time during grant preparation
- Since the funding rates are so low, and the Human Studies and Animal protocols so burdensome, it saves a vast amount of paperwork for grants that are never received. For a university's HIC and Animal committees, this has to be terrific.
- The ability to have the grant that was submitted (with all revisions) sent to the IRB for consideration (and not have to send in revisions related to late breaking grant changes made).
- Efficiency
- This is based on a single experience, my first ROI award, and the time between notification and deadline was very short. I believe that the fault most likely was at my institution, since I received the requests will after they were dated as being emailed to the institution.
- I have no problems with it, its fine
- NO need to prepare material if not likely to fund
- JIT allows applicants to submit current support and certifications after grant application been reviewed. This really save applicants time and allow them to focus more on scientific part of the proposal.
- Have not utilized them
- I do not know what just in time is.
- less busywork when applying for grants

F6 Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- It's just a great idea -- I wish my institution were quicker, but then again they also have their burdens,
- Saves a lot of time if the application is not funded
- Time saving
- Saves time and effort for myself and other personnel if the grant is not favorably reviewed.
- That I do not have to prepare materials unnecessarily
- Additional time for Human Subjects approval allows for better development of workable protocol (which we submit to IRB while grant is under review so as to have approval in hand when award is made.
- Cuts administrative time up-front during the period we are focusing on the science.
- Not having to have IRB approval at the time of submission of the grant
- can initially focus on science, followed by compliance issues
- It is wonderful not to have to submit the IRB and other materials until you are sure you will be funded. This saves a tremendous amount of time.
- Saves time during grant preparation.
- Some information can be delayed. This does save time.
- saves time when preparing application eliminates wasted time preparing documents for unfunded applications
- The idea is great but does not reconcile with reality - it takes 2-3 months to get IACUC or IRB approval at XXX. So, these local processes will always need to start up as soon as the grant goes out the door. There will be an advantage to PIs, however, as long as grants can be sent out for review without IRB or IACUC approval.
- Requested after proposal submission
- Just a little less paperwork at submission time. IACUC impediments can take time that may not be available prior to grant submission deadlines.
- I do not need IACUC approval to submit.
- It saves time not having to complete certain materials, e.g. IACUC approvals, should the grant not be awarded.
- I have time to get animal and human subject approval after I receive notice from NIH.
- Any reduction of items that need to be completed prior to a grant deadline increases the amount of time available for preparing the proposal. The questions in the survey suggest that there is not enough time to complete IACUC review after Just-in-time notification. My perspective is that the Just-in-time process is good because I can begin the IACUC review after the grant deadline, which leaves adequate time for informing NIH about IACUC approval the time of a Just-in-time request.

F6 Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- It saves time for working on the science of the grant.
- It is a huge waste of time to get all detailed ancillary information for grant if grant is not in fundable range.
- It does make the process more efficient. It reduces effort that might not be necessary. For example in the case of grant applications that are "streamlined."
- Decreases paper work at the time of grant writing.
- less work, more time, flexibility in scheduling work
- It avoids detailed preparations for applications that do not get funded
- We don't need to spare time if the grand is not funded.
- have had no prior experience with Just-in-Time procedures
- Allows me to concentrate on the proposal without worrying about details until necessary
- IT GIVES YOU TIME TO FOCUS ON THE SCIENTIFIC WRITE UP RATHER THAN WASTE TIME TO GET APPROVALS WHICH MAY NOT BE NEEDED IF THE GRANT IS NOT FUNDED. IT SAVES TIME OF THE COMMITTEE AS IT DOES NOT HAVE TO WASTE EFFORT ON APPLICATIONS WHICH ARE NOT GOING TO GET FUNDABLE PRIORITY.
- Electronic format
- It is fine, with the exception that my institution makes us do a lot of it at the time of submission, so there is not time savings.
- You can delay the filling of forms until after the grant is submitted
- The definition of JIT describes it.
- Less up-front paper work.
- Not having to do paperwork for research apps that don't get funded! Saving hu. subjects research ??? time.
- Delay to focus on research and not having to write them at all if not funded.
- After all these years, it seems pretty painless.
- It helps getting approvals faster through the campus
- Not needed for unfunded award
- Simplifies proposal preparation.
- Straightforward negotiations with NIH staff
- not having to do it if the award is not going to be made
- It saves a lot of unnecessary effort when the grant application is not awarded.

F6 Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- I have more time to submit applications to the IACUC and CHR. Trying to do this at the same time the grant is being written is cumbersome.
- In my case I only deal with IACUC review process. I think is helpful to avoid the need of getting approval for an animal protocol for a project that never may start if the application is not funded.
- Saves time during grant preparation process
- IRB approval
- Not having to submit human subjects approval at the time of grant proposal submission. IRB's can be so spiteful or slow-moving that they can force you to miss application deadlines.
- Save the time and easy to prepare.
- earlier notification
- Flexibility to submit missing or required documentation
- Do not need to proceed if grant is unsuccessful.
- Not have to submit at the time application is due
- The concept of not having to deal with the animal and human research approvals unless you are reasonably sure of being funded is a worthy goal.
- Reduces time for preparation of grant application. If only 25% of grants are funded, 75% of the applicants waste time preparing documents that won't be needed.
- Not wasting time on paperwork that will never be implemented if the grant is not funded.
- Do not have to worry about completing IACUC and IRB forms for a grant that you might not get anyway.
- Saving time on grants that aren't funded.
- That the information does not have to be a concern of the reviewers. Also that I do not have to have IACUC, IBC, IRB information done before I submit the grant. I do it right after I submit the grant, so can have approval prior to grant review.
- No need to waste effort on paperwork that will not be needed if no funding occurs
- Ease of use.
- Saves time when submitting an application
- The funding decision is much closer to the award date, so the information used by NIH is much more accurate and up to date.
- That I don't have to prepare the items unless I am going to be funded.
- With just-in-time, I don't have to get full animal protocol approval before the grant submission deadline. Approval takes several months and would significantly delay grant submission if it had to be done before the submission deadline.

F6 Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- Less to "distractors" to deal with in period leading up to grant submission
- Not having to do these ahead of time.
- Don't have to be sent with application, and therefore don't have to be changed, e.g. protocol approval, other support. Protocol approval can delay submissions!
- I like that the IRB protocols don't have to be approved before the application. Writing protocols and having them move through committee here is enormously time-consuming and complex. All of that is wasted if the grant isn't funded. It's nice to be able to only go for protocols that you know will be funded.
- Efficiency
- No need to spend time on IRB and IACUC if research is not funded.
- It saves time.
- NOT HAVING JUST IN TIME MATERIAL CONFUSE THE REVIEW PROCESS
- No need to prepare materials that are not needed should the award not be made.
- BEING ABLE TO PREPARE IT AT SOME TIMEPOINT BETWEEN GRANT SUBMISSION AND PRE-AWARD NOTIFICATION
- I like not having to prepare forms and then have the whole exercise prove a waste of time if the grant should be turned down.
- It makes perfect sense- why go through the trouble of supplying the information if you don't get an award?
- Not having to waste time preparing paperwork before it is actually needed, and flexibility in case an approval is not yet granted at the time I submit a grant.
- If I grant isn't funded, I don't have to do all this paper work.
- It saves having to put together material for a grant that may not be funded.
- Not having to do this at time of submission
- Reduces paperwork at time of application.
- I do not need to prepare both grant proposal and animal protocol at the same time.
- It greatly simplifies the proposal preparation process.
- Not having to deal with that info until it is really needed.
- Saves time overall
- It reduces the burden of work associated with preparing the scientific application.
- Avoidance of potentially unnecessary paperwork before the chance of funding becomes known.
- positive reinforcement--data is needed if grant is funded.

F6 Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- not having to do this paperwork for grants that are not funded allows me to work on the science in the grant without the distraction of this paperwork
- A slight reduction in the information required.
- I don't have to get institutional approvals (e.g. irb, iacuc, biohazard) before submitting or before NIH review.
- Writing the IACUC protocol is a great distraction from grant writing. I usually start writing it right after submitted the proposal
- Not having to submit Just-in-Time materials at the same time the grant application saves me time when preparing my application and makes the grant preparation process easier for me.
- Obtain study section results faster and much earlier, and it is easy to keep track of all grant application information.
- Don't need to provide information until awarded.
- Program officers cater to needs (time, missing info, etc)
- Saves my time
- Ease and timeliness
- It saves time when preparing the application
- Not having to submit the approval at the time of submitting the application
- MINIMIZE THE WORK LOAD TO PREPARE FOR THE APPROVAL BEFORE SUBMITTING THE GRANT APPLICATION.
- less pressure
- Not all grants submitted to NIH are awarded. With this mechanism, only awarded grants require submission of IRB/IACUC protocols, saving much time.
- Scheduling flexibility for getting the necessary information.
- Saves time when submitting the application and allows for preparation of the requisite materials when there are less constraints.
- Focus on science Not wasting time if not funded
- It is helpful to save me time.
- There are no aspects that I particularly like.
- Putting off preparation of these materials allows me to focus on the scientific content of proposals.
- makes application easier
- Timesaver

F6 Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- Information is more relevant to the time of award. Don't waste time getting this info for a grant that might not be funded.
- Lack of requirement of detailed approvals during the review process.
- Information not needed at the time of preparation of the proposal.
- More current to the situation
- less overall work
- Time given to submit materials.
- The just in time feature results in fewer submissions of IRB and IACUC protocols that will never be done--and may keep scientifically flawed proposals from getting started before the NIH review results are complete. I've participated as a Co-Investigator on several submissions with responsibility for animal experiments. The just in time feature saves me from a great deal of paperwork for proposals that are never going to get funded.
- reduced IRB burden at my institution and on me as the investigator
- Allows some delay in submission of IRB materials allowing investigator to focus on application until deadline. I usually submit the IRB materials after deadline even before score because of concerns for a finite window between score posting and award and the time need for IRB approval.
- do not know what this refers to
- That these materials are requested only when actually needed. A tremendous savings of time and effort for the PI an the team.
- The removal of extra administrative duties during proposal preparation reduces stress in an already stressful process.
- Not having to provide every detail early.
- The extra time I get.
- I know almost nothing about just in time procedures
- with the low funding rates, saves time.
- avoid work if grant application isn't funded
- Its quick and up-to-date nature.
- I like the fact that the parts of the grant that are only required if funding is a possibility only need be done after the score. Giving the current funding environment, where multiple submissions are almost always required, this saves the investigator time.
- It is nice not to require these documents at the time of application submission. However, we generally start to submit materials to the university prior to notification from NIH that they may be needed, as it takes the university a while to process them.
- the time savings at point of submission

F6 Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- In principle, applications can be simpler, and this is true for Other Support.
- The fact that we submit only when needed.
- When I figure out exactly what is not needed at the time of grant submission, the just-in-time procedure saves time.
- Not having to spend an extraordinary amount of time negotiating with an IACUC or IRB on a protocol that may not get funded. Before the JIT, we had to start the approval process during the peak time allocated for writing the grant itself.
- don't have to prepare all the IRB material if the grant doesn't get funded.
- The on line request of material;
- I do not need to deal with these paper work until my application is or close to be funded.
- Time saved in grant preparation.
- Separates non-scientific from scientific concerns.
- Less work in preparing initial application.
- Very much appreciate not having to do IRB review until project is awarded.
- time savings
- Convenience to my grants administration staff.
- I can prepare the scientific aspect of the grant, and then do the administrative details after the rush.
- It is helpful to defer preparation of these materials until I learn that funding is likely. Although I can not wait until contacted to obtain IACUC approval, I can defer this step until I receive the score for the application. This saves considerable time if a new protocol is required, for the investigator and for the IACUC.
- It allows me to focus on the scientific aspects of my grant proposal.
- less stressful
- I used to it
- I can focus on just the grant during the submission phase
- Don't have to worry about filling out all the necessary forms and satisfy the local committees while trying to think about the "science" to write the application. Can deal with it as a separate entity once the application is submitted.
- There is not a big difference
- Not having to submit JIT at the same time the grant is due.
- I don't have to prepare the Just-in-Time procedures if the grant did not receive a fundable score, which could save a lot of time.

F6 Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- simplicity
- Does not require a great deal of time
- It allowed me to focus more attention on the scientific aspects of the proposal.
- The percentage of grants that can be awarded is fairly low. This requires a PI to 1) send in grants more than once having addressed reviewers suggestions and 2) do more work in the laboratory. Many of the items covered in the just-in-time relate to safety and assurances necessary to perform a study. If a grant is not to be awarded, there is no safety issue. Thus, the PI's time would be better spend writing and doing work in the laboratory.
- Saves me a lot of paper work where I only have to gain institutional approval for projects that I have funding for and will actually do. I have am also a member on committees dealing with IACUC and IRB paper work and this saves the committee a lot of time and allows them to concentrate on projects that will actually be executed.
- Saves me time when I am preparing an application
- Gives more time for the PI to concentrate on the research proposal. Allows last minute changes to the experimental design and plan before grant submission.
- Less paperwork to submit to my institution prior when preparing proposal.
- It saves time for concentrating on the scientific content of the grant
- Allows IRB approval in same year as grant starts.
- Saves time
- I am not so familiar with this procedure so I should not answer.
- I do not have to prepare ACURF's and rDNA forms for each grant I submit.
- not having to submit other support
- No strong feelings, but overall a benefit for not having to deal with local bodies prior to submission.
- Ability to concentrate efforts on the scientific aspects of proposal rather than administrative
- Requests for just-in-time information are always made on a "must have it now" basis. I am often traveling when these requests come in and it is almost impossible to comply in a timely manner.
- Having served on both the IRB and ACUC, the just in time allows these committees to work at a more balanced work load rather than being slammed around grant deadlines.
- Given that the overwhelming majority of NIH applications won't be funded, any time saved submitting documents that will be shredded is useful.
- Save time.
- No worry at submission time

F6 Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- Lets me focus more on the science
- eliminate paper work for submission deadline
- Never received fundable score, so I never completed the NIH process. The VA just-in-time is the same and is helpful, however at VA the time interval is short necessitating submission of IRB materials to institution ASAP.
- The fact that I didn't have to prepare these documents unless I am funded, when it matters.
- time savings at proposal submission time although some of this is still required by my institution at the time of submission.
- I appreciate the fact that the Just-in-Time procedures allow me to focus on the scientific content of the grant as the deadline approaches, rather than on administrative details.
- divorcing grant application and Just-in-time items
- Flexibility in IRB approval
- Excellent procedure as it eliminates unnecessary IRB and IACUC reviews for proposals that are not funded.
- Saving time before deadline, eliminate unnecessary work when not funded.
- It saves time during preparation of my application
- Saving time at the time a proposal is put together.
- At present chances of receiving funding after first submission is extremely low. Based on the score from the first submission, PI can apply for IACUC and IRB. It is lot work for both PI and institution to review a study, which will not be initiated because of lack of funding
- it's definitely easier not to have to deal with these details when finalizing the proposal
- Saves some time in preparing a grant proposal.
- I've never had a major problem with this procedure. IRB approval now takes so long that the IRB process needs to be started as soon as an application is submitted. Otherwise there will be no IRB approval at the time of the request for just-in-time information.
- I don't have to waste time preparing the JIT materials unless I'm close to being funded
- It seems to work.
- More time to get the information ready
- has not really made any difference in the amount of time and paperwork required by the university to get the same things accomplished, we are constantly repeating ourselves with annual reports, conflict-of-interest forms, IACUC protocols, personnel reports, other support, etc.
- Can put off doing things unless it is needed.

F6 Reasons for Liking Just-In-Time

- Changes made by NIH have forced my institution to make changes and become more efficient. As a new investigator it is very exciting to be asked for the JIT information so I have no complaints.
- The main thing is not having to have the IRB and animal care protocols approved at time of application. Especially regarding IRB protocols, our institution is so bogged down in reviewing this protocols, I don't think I would get anything in on time if IRB approval was required at the time of application.
- not having to do those chores while racing to meet the deadline for application
- Simplification of submitting the original proposal; minimizing efforts that are wasted if the proposal is not funded.
- avoids wasted effort if grant is not funded
- The flexibility to complete approvals etc. after the scientific project is planned vs. during the planning and grant writing.
- I don't need to work on those information before grant submission.
- There is plenty of time for me to submit the forms

F7 Reasons for Disliking Just-In-Time

F7 Reasons for Disliking Just-In-Time

- Too little flexibility on changing efforts of personnel from initial submission
- as an IACUC committee member, I am concerned that pressure could be put on the IACUC to expedite a review
- Time between the notification of the possibility of the award and the award date.
- If you submit before being asked, these get misplaced (Mostly my mistake)
- Can't think of any.
- Local approval can take so long that it is not available at award time..creating a potential problem.
- IACUC and IRB approvals can take more time than allotted
- The time between Council and notification of the JIT seems to vary substantially from grant to grant
- Short notice
- unclear notification of what is needed when
- The Institution generally requires us to complete the IRB and IACUC forms at the time of submission. This is very time consuming.
- short time for submitting these documents.
- Could be clearer
- it tends to be a bit of chaos in the University's Grants and Contracts office (not the responsibility or fault of the NIMH)
- Time from notification to need for the materials is too short to wait until then.
- We sometimes end up providing information more than once.
- Can't take advantage of this because my institution requires all these items before the grant goes out.
- Request immediately processing. It should give a reasonable time to process.
- It is sometimes not clear where things should be submitted. I sometimes receive multiple requests for the materials from NIH
- The somewhat of a rush if one is funded. IRB approval takes quite a bit of time these days.
- If one works mainly with animal models, like me, the just-in-time procedures don't apply. This is because I need continued IACUC approval to conduct my research - around -the - clock coverage.
- Some of the paper work might take time, especially the approval of IACUC protocol if it is not done in advance. This might delay the award.

F7 Reasons for Disliking Just-In-Time

- making sure all the details are correct and follow the NIH rules so we can expeditiously process the application and get the award.
- I have had no real problems with this procedure other than a somewhat short turn-around time.
- My university requires JIT materials at the time of application, so this is moot.
- Not really that important to me
- Turnaround time can be short, but I don't see a good alternative.
- None! It is great!
- Very little.
- I still have to prepare the Just-in-Time materials before the grant deadline because my institution demands it. After notification of the award, the Just-in-Time materials are sometimes lost or misplaced by NIH staff, resulting in delays in funding.
- The insufficient amount of time (occasionally on the order of hours) that the NIH staff provides you in getting JIT information to NIH prior to releasing the award
- Sometimes there is a tight deadline for JIT materials.
- Sometimes human and animal research that was approved at the study section level is questioned again by NIH staff.
- If the PI is traveling or otherwise heavily committed when the notice of award arrives, the time to provide just in time materials can be quite short.
- I do worry a little about the turnaround time required for my institution to review the materials. But that is so variable that I cannot make any helpful suggestions on how to improve the current procedure.
- I have to fit in a new deadline when contacted, but one generally has more time after the grant is submitted.
- In reviewing grants there are sometimes questions of overlap that are not fully addressed at the time of review.
- Sometimes notification comes at an inconvenient moment, but materials must be submitted ASAP.
- As a reviewer, I would prefer to have the other support information available when the grant application is reviewed. It gives a better picture of how effective the PI has been with the resources provided to him/her. In principle, the reviewers are limiting their review to the scientific merits of the application. In practice, however, it is essentially impossible to consider an application in a vacuum and I know from the reviews of my own applications, that the productivity of the investigator with regard to their current support influences the study section's recommendations. If this is the case, it is best to level the playing field and have the information available for all applicants.
- Sometimes institutional timelines are not ideal.

F7 Reasons for Disliking Just-In-Time

- Having to submit materials at the last minute with little time to prepare them
- I just by chance noticed on the Commons that I had a JIT request, and this was the first I heard of it. I only yesterday saw this and am still scrambling around to figure out what it means, whether I am too late to get funding, etc.. With a name like JIT they should give a very clear deadline and make very sure that the PI hears about it.
- Can be hard to respond to critiques in such a short amount of time.
- I recently recd an Email late on a Friday afternoon requesting a certification of IACUC approval by the following Monday so that "I wouldn't be passed over for funding." This is unacceptable pressure on the PI and the institution, but it is apparently not rare when end of the year funds become available.
- Sometimes I don't have enough time after getting the award to get IRB approval in a timely manner.
- I would expect to give us some more time between the NIH officials asking for the approval and actually we submit it.
- Time (delay) between providing information and getting award
- The sudden rush to send it in.
- some officials give short turn around time for submission of this information. would like to have at least a month to comply with request
- In some institutions you have to start the process of applying to Institutional Animal Care Facility as soon as you have submitted your proposal as it may take significant length of time for review.
- Sometimes is hard to get co-investigators to do their parts on short notice. IRB and IACUC still have to be done in advance.
- Can be bureaucratic delays
- I fact, the institutional requirements do not allow the flexibility that the NIH does, so, the just in time features are not as useful to PIs as they might seem to be from the NIH's vantage point.
- I did not know this procedure and I always ended up submitting these materials twice, once at the time of application and one more time before award.
- no clear indication when and how it will be funded.
- When you get the request for the paperwork, you may be out of town. Makes it difficult to comply.
- NIH staff have given me conflicting information about what is needed and when it is needed.
- Coordination among NIH staff is poor.
- Still have to get approval from my institution and there is insufficient time

F7 Reasons for Disliking Just-In-Time

- Usually, pre-award notification is so late that the turn-around time required is pretty tough, particularly if it is close to a grant submission deadline and our administrative staff are tied up with getting grants out the door.
- It's a well-intentioned program, but doesn't always work as smoothly as it should. It usually gets very hectic around JIT time. Also, the ERA Commons website sometimes incorrectly lists JIT as necessary, even though the institute has no intention of funding the grant.
- lots of paper work related to IACUC etc
- I know of other investigators who felt their funding was jeopardized and/or who had to pay for special accelerated review processes because of the timing of their JIT notification relative to institution review dates.
- Our University Grants and Contracts office is still not clear on the procedures for JIT and modular grants and sometimes confounds the purpose of the programs by requiring the detailed information for internal files before the NIH requires it.
- not having to have approval of IRB before submitting an application
- our university turnaround time is long and can inhibit funding
- That the university still requests most of these materials before submission.
- Not enough experience to comment at this time
- My institution makes me fill everything out in advance, so I am not sure I really save any time
- seems fine
- Would prefer a bit longer time to deliver these
- need more lead time to submit IRB materials
- The start of the grant may be delayed due to the slow processes of IRB and IACUC at my University.
- It is not especially relevant to me because I require neither Vertebrate Animal nor Human documentation forms.
- None. Just-in-time is terrific
- Recently, we experienced some mistakes and delays in getting information to the appropriate administrator at NIH. It was solved, but did cause some delay in the correct data being communicated. I believe in the end it was a misinterpretation of the regulations by PSUCOM.
- It is an extra layer of work for me, because I have to go back over the submitted budget with my office of sponsored projects.
- Some confusion as to it indicating fundability or intent to fund.
- To long ago to remember
- Rush to get regulatory approval within a few weeks

F7 Reasons for Disliking Just-In-Time

- No down side to my mind
- As Chair of the IBC, I am somewhat concerned that there is no specific request from NIH regarding IBC (biosafety) approval.
- Having to "round up" materials/approvals under time pressure.
- Somewhat short notification time, but now that I've been through it, I'll know what to expect next time.
- Perhaps the time frame for "just-in-time" could be a bit longer
- IRB and ACUC approvals should never be "just-in-time." Approvals need to be required before submission so that review groups only evaluate procedures that are judged appropriate by those committees.
- Human nature, once the grant is out the door, it is easy to let things slide.
- The materials for applications are not difficult to prepare. It is better to submit together with the grant application and done with it.
- None, please don't change it!!
- Like all aspects.
- SOME TIMES THE TIME FACTOR MAY BE CRUCIAL AS SOME OF THE LOCAL COMMITTEES MAY BE BACKED UP AND CAN NOT REVIEW THE PAPERS IN SHORT ORDER AND WHICH MAY NEED REVISIONS.
- The rush when we do go forward!
- Administrators at my institution still ask for IACUC approvals prior to pre-award notification
- Notification from NIH that I need to get the materials in is not always timely
- I have never understood what purpose other support pages serve. A simple declaration that there is no overlap with any other funding should be sufficient, unless there is another reason for obtaining the other support information.
- I would like to see a greater time period between notice of award and submission of application to animal care committees. Often, we have to prepare them in advance anyway since they take 2 or more months to be approved by institutional committees.
- Some aspects/materials should be delayed until the scientific decision has been made about the fundability of your proposal so that you don't have to prepare unless you know you will be funded.
- I have not done animal or human review procedures, but will soon and am dreading it.
- Trouble with paperwork coordination after being notified that I received award.
- As the chair of our IACUC and IBC, it puts a lot of pressure on us when folks need approval yesterday.
- You still have to fill out the forms

F7 Reasons for Disliking Just-In-Time

- To really be worth it, NIH must be willing to wait for institutions to review, revise, and approve animal and human use protocols. Then I think it would be great.
- can not think of any
- The need to have these documents "yesterday"
- It is perfect
- Once again, I wonder how review panels can make informed decisions without other support information.
- Time frame is not well defined, i.e., there should be a clear deadline for submission of the requested materials.
- As a reviewer, I don't get to see the details of other support. Often reviewers are the best ones to judge overlap.
- MANY TIMES THE UNIVERSITY IS TOO SLOW IN REVIEWING JUST-IN-TIME PROCEDURES IF THE PI WAITS UNTIL THE PRE-AWARD NOTIFICATION
- It is a major rush to get the materials through my institution and on to NIH.
- Lack of clear explanation of time frame and necessity for submitting these materials.
- The award notices are typically in fact a couple of weeks before or, in my experience, after the intended start date, so one can't really wait until an award notice. One has to guess based on the priority score.
- Not enough time to get administrative approval after it is requested by NIH, especially IRB
- MORE WORK
- Not enough time between confirmation of award and need for IRB/IACUC approval
- Short deadlines - very rushed.
- Difficult to get an IRB rapidly, so I do need to do this in the meantime while the grant is under review. There was a problem with coordination of NIH staff and we had to send in our just in time materials three times to different people!
- We still need at least 5 months to prepare the applications, since some committees only meet 4 times a year. We therefore submit the applications just after sending out the grant.
- Short time frame for preparation, although usually I start working on them before they are requested. Otherwise, I would never finish them in time.
- Do not know what just in time is.
- It does not help much since it's easier, for example, to complete an animal protocol at the time that the grant is being written.
- Internal needs for hard copies
- None - keep this approach!

F7 Reasons for Disliking Just-In-Time

- It would be fine, if my institution would adapt to it.
- I had an award delayed by one month because of difficulty communicating about an animal protocol.
- some delays at home institution
- The pay line is arbitrarily made lower to keep the number of RO1 high. This makes just-in time grants inherently more difficult to get funded/
- Because I have international subcontracts, the international approvals for animal care took much longer than anticipated and delayed the grant activation.
- It makes me a little lazy. I wait until the last minute to get protocols finished.
- NIH staff lacks sufficient understanding and coordination about what they are asking for and in what form. In particular, provisions about human subjects approval for use of anonymized specimens needs much greater clarity and guidance.
- Time allotted is insufficient to get IRB approval, so one has to do this ahead anyway
- Although not Just-in-time, the amount of tabulation of gender and ethnic data for human subjects research is excessive.
- The last minute rush once notified of the award.
- little lead time to submission
- I need to submit the IRB materials after deadline even before score because of concerns for a finite window between score posting and award and the time need for IRB approval.
- The time frame from notification to material due date is too short. Given the time required to prepare the material, particularly when memorandums from collaborating institutions have to be received, and to have the material reviewed by the institutional Sponsored Program office, the current Just-in-Time process causes unnecessary anxiety on the part of the PI and the institutional Sponsored Program office.
- Perhaps a little more time should be allowed.
- NOT a response to this specific question: Please note that an earlier question was written as "A5. Since completing your PhD" Although we are a dwindling species, there are also MDs who apply for NIH funding!
- The available information changes all the time and some information is not accurate.
- In principle, institutional procedures at my university necessitate early preparation of IACUC & IRB approvals, which negates any benefit to me.

F7 Reasons for Disliking Just-In-Time

- The instructions for what not to submit, and what to write in the blanks on the form that are provided for these not-submitted items, needs clarification. For instance, the animal study approval is not needed. Apparently (or so my institution tells me) I am supposed to write 'pending' in the blank for animal approval date, even though it is not pending and may already be approved. I have no idea if this is accurate advice on the part of the institution, but it is an example of the lack of clear instruction on filling out the forms. A solution would be to have modular forms that do not have questions for information that does not need to be submitted.
- Not really aware of any.
- Need better coordination with NIH Commons -- I've submitted JIT on eRA commons only to have staff tell me they didn't have it. Also, need better AUTOMATED EMAILS requesting JIT information!
- Necessity of providing more material once the award is promised. (I don't see a way around this either!)
- It is unclear the time frame for providing the required material; some information, such as Human Subjects or animal approval takes time.
- The time frame to get IACUC or IRB paperwork completed could be a little longer. While 30-45 days should be sufficient, the award notification often comes in between dates for internal review panels and the "real" time it takes to get the proposal into review is closer to 60 days. It's always an anxiety-producing race! Also, there is frequently contradictory information coming in from more than one NIH source about the required forms and their status.
- Process from scores received till actual funds arriving at the institution takes very long. This process needs to be shortened.
- In the NIH instructions it states that animal approval (the date of) needs to be submitted to NIH within 60 days of the grant application. According to this survey, and my university grants administrator, this is not true, but that is clearly stated in the instructions for the face page. Thus, it is confusing.
- Overall, I am very satisfied with the present JIT features.
- rushing...at last minute
- I don't see much benefit from this process - it takes just as long as before.
- There is some rush for evaluation of protocols by IRB and IACUC.
- the rush to complete Just-in-time materials in time to get approval from local committees in time for funding to start
- It would be nice to have a longer time window for JIT
- Institutional policies at my school
- The down side of doing this later is that by the time the information is requested the grant request has gotten "cold." The need to submit this information even when there is little chance of a grant being funded must annoy some people. Although I have not been in that situation.

F7 Reasons for Disliking Just-In-Time

- I have had confusion on the part of NIH staff regarding the other support pages, and sometimes more than one request for info.
- The more important problem, if not the only one, is the review process
- Sometimes cannot get IRB approval before start date of grant.
- My Institution still requires IACUC approval before allowing the grant to be submitted
- So far, I haven't run into any aspect of the procedures that I dislike.
- There is nothing that I don't like about Just-in-Time procedures. This has been a positive move.
- It seems that the request for just in time information is based on some arbitrary percentile ranking of the grant application that does not necessarily correspond to a likely probability of being funded. For example on a recent application, I had a reasonably good percentile score, but I was told that it would not be good enough to be funded (and it wasn't). However, I received a request for just-in-time information. It would be nice if we didn't waste our time sending in just-in-time information unless there is really a high probability of being funded.
- My institution has not fully streamlined its paperwork to account for proposals that do not need IRB approval prior to submission of the grant proposal to NIH.
- clear notification at one time of what is needed and when
- lead time is short, because IRB's are slow
- none, as long as I can reach NIH program people in time to answer any questions
- It is a little rush to collect those information.
- The need to do it.
- This adds more work to the proposal process. It is generally understood that you MUST submit Just-In-Time information in order to get funded. The JIT information supposedly shows that you are "gung-ho" and distinguishes you from the rest of the applicants. Without it, you appear disinterested in your own work.
- I would also include IBC approval in the Just-in-Time
- Allows me to procrastinate
- Always a delay in the date of requested funding (anticipation and planning) and the actual awarding of monies to institutes.
- The constant requests for administrative paperwork from NIH officials
- rush to compile documents after notification
- The information is requested without any assurance of funding.
- Saves time preparing unnecessary paperwork for grants that don't get funded.
- There is a real rush to get finished - due to the time some things take at my institution.

F7 **Reasons for Disliking Just-In-Time**

- My institution is slower than I would like in terms of approvals and seems to over regulate us in terms of compliance.