

NIH Grant Application: 101

National Institute of Biomedical
Imaging and Bioengineering



Why Is Good Grant Writing So Important?

- Reviewers are very busy people
- Committees review many grants
- Reviewers have a very limited amount of time to make the case for *your* grant
- Even in times of plenty, there are more meritorious applications than can be paid



Getting Started

- **Start Early!!!!**
- **Contact scientific program staff to ensure your application is appropriate for Institute goals and mechanism before writing**



Write Your Application Early

- **Contact references and/or collaborators early**
- **Leave plenty of time for colleagues review your draft**
- **Leave plenty of time to get your institutional signatures**
- **Leave plenty of time to react to new electronic processes**



Cover Letter - Optional

- **Include a cover letter with application**
 - **Request Institute assignment**
 - **Based on conversation with scientific program staff (cite name)**
 - **Request specific study section, if appropriate**
 - **Mention scientific expertise needed to review your application**
 - **Do not list specific names of reviewers**



Organize Your Application

- **Read ALL Application Instructions Carefully**
 - Use proper font size, margins, page numbering
- **Use Section Headings, Table of Contents & Budget Pages (as instructed)**
 - Application should be easy to follow



What reviewers REALLY want to know

- **WHAT** are you proposing to do?
- **WHY** is this important?
- **Can YOU** do it?



WHAT are you proposing to do?



Clearly Explain All Concepts

- **State rationale of proposed investigation**
- **Include thorough literature review**
- **Never assume that reviewers “will know what you mean”**
- **Include well-designed and informative tables and figures**
- **Present an organized and lucid research plan**



Help The Reviewers Do Their Jobs

- Give your application a “reviewer-friendly” format
- Reviewers will not likely read your entire application in one sitting
- Present the application in “bite sized bits”
 - Use section headings, bold type, etc.
 - Clearly identify ideas, experiments, outcomes, interpretations, implications, etc.
- Walk the reader through the experiments
 - Don’t just present a list of methods
- Have an Explicit Timeline



Don't Be Sloppy!

- **Use spell check AND carefully read the final version**
- **Include all required sections**
 - e.g., Animal Welfare, Human Subjects
 - present in the order and with the section headings used in the PHS 398 (or PHS 416-1) kit.
- **Clarity counts. Watch grammar. Avoid jargon.**



Solicit (and Heed!) Constructive Criticism

■ Obtain Feedback

- From someone who has an NIH grant
- From colleagues/mentors whose opinion you respect

■ Revised Applications

- Respond to ALL reviewer critiques
- If you disagree, provide a THOROUGH justification
- Put your ego aside



WHY is this important?



Acknowledge the Realities of Peer Review

- **The competition is tough**
 - It is not enough to reach the minimum standard
- **A good idea, interesting preliminary findings, and promising investigator are not enough**
 - **YOU NEED TO PRESENT A SIGNIFICANT AND/OR INNOVATIVE IDEA!!!!**



Can YOU Do It?



Highlight Your Strengths

- **Propose experiments that make good use of YOUR training, YOUR expertise, and YOUR environment.**
- **Maximize these through a multidisciplinary team of collaborators, consultants, mentors, etc.**
 - **Include appropriate clinical or technical expertise as part of research team**
- **If research team does not have experience or knowledge in a needed field, reviewers will notice**



Don't Be Overly Ambitious

- **Present focused specific aims**
 - Make sure every aim is clearly related to the overall goal of the application
- **Include adequate resources and collaborators**



Demonstrate Command of Relevant Material

- Cite the appropriate literature
- State rationale and/or hypotheses explicitly
- Include preliminary data, where appropriate
- Identify limitations of techniques or technologies
- Identify alternative hypotheses or uses of the technology



Common Weaknesses

- Lack of new or original ideas
- Unfocused or vague research plan
- Lack of appropriate expertise on the research team
- Lack of sufficient experimental detail
- Lack of knowledge of published relevant work
- Unrealistically large amount of work



Additional Suggestions

- For junior/starting investigators
 - Collaborate with a more senior colleague on your application
 - Over ambitiousness - do not propose to do too much
 - Apply for a reasonably sized budget early in your career
 - Make sure you check the new investigator box on the face page if appropriate
 - If you are invited to be on a review panel, try hard to accept
- For more senior investigators
 - You still need to write a strong grant
 - Do not “rest on your laurels”
 - Bring your junior collaborators into the grant writing process and mentor them



Easily Avoidable Problems

- Use appropriately sized font
 - Print out and measure your characters per inch, 15 cpi or less
 - Use 12 point font if at all possible
- Going over the page limit
- Human subjects
 - Address the four points in the humans subjects section
 - Address the inclusion of women, minorities, and children
 - Include the targeted/planned enrollment table
- Animal subjects
 - Address the five points concerning the use of vertebrate animals



Writing Styles

- Monitor for blatant self-promotion
 - “world-class”, “uniquely positioned”
 - “one of only three labs”, “pioneered”, “discovered”
- Avoid writing arrogantly, especially in revisions
- Be appreciative of reviewers comments and remember the work they did on your review
- When you must disagree, do so politely and professionally



The Revision

■ Fixable

- Pilot data
- Methodology
- Collaborators/Expertise
- Environment/Institutional Commitment

■ Fatally flawed

- Significance – could be fatal, could be fixable due to poor writing
- Identical to other work being done

■ Unscored does NOT mean fatally flawed

■ Study Section will receive previous summary statement



Take Home Message

CLEARLY tell reviewers what
they **REALLY** want to know

- **WHAT** are you proposing to do?
- **WHY** is this important?
- **Can YOU** do it?

