

Moving Forward: The View from Grant Review

September 2019

Richard Nakamura, Ph.D.,

Former Director, Center for Scientific Review, NIH
Former Deputy Director and Scientific Director, NIMH

Irreproducibility exacerbated by:

- Low grant success rates; high grant cuts.
- Long, busy waits for: research grants, protocol approval and publication
- Pressure to increase performance metrics on researchers and editors

Situation is improving

Where to check for reproducibility?

- As protocol in grant application
- In general strategy grant applications
 - * Promise to follow guidelines
 - * Reviewers evaluate published papers for reproducibility
- Protocol review by IRB or ACUC
- * Publication review by Journals – ensure adherence to guidelines

Use guidelines and
Coordinate for efficiency

Keep funding and publication
space available for exploratory,
discovery and replication
studies

Must have explicit measures of success to evaluate changes made to the science ecosystem. These could include workload, costs and replicability of important findings.

Use ORCID or similar CV database to systematically provide feedback on the science careers that are affected by our intervention

This is a systems problem so keep the whole system and all participants in mind.

End