

# **Grant Workshop**

## **To Revise or Not to Revise.....that is the Question**

**Advances in Skeletal Muscle  
Biology in Health and Disease**

**March 5-7, 2014**

**Charlotte A. Peterson**

# Rule #1:

Know your study section!

- They have to get it.
- Ideally, you want advocate(s) on the study section, but at the very least, the appropriate expertise must be represented.

Do some homework

Talk to a PO at the institute you plan to target.

Talk to the SRO.

## **No brainer:**

If your reviewers were enthusiastic about your idea and found fixable problems (meaning you got scored), revising and requesting the same study section is usually the way to go.

# It is possible to overcome a “Not Discussed”

- Are your individual criterion scores 3-4 or >6?
- Are specific, constructive comments provided that can be addressed?

# **ND, but good criterion scores**

If your scores are fairly good, but nothing specific is suggested to improve the scores, you're in trouble.

# **ND, across the board bad scores**

- Did the reviewers' expertise fit your topic?
- Were they knowledgeable about your methods?
- Did they understand the rationale for your research?

You have the option to revise and request a different study section (CSR does not have to comply)

OR

Rethink the project

## **ND, with only some poor criterion scores**

If one of your individual criterion scores is very poor, particularly for Approach, it may be possible to fix it.

- Was a fatal flaw identified that you can eliminate?
- Can you add clinical relevance?
- Can you add an expert to your team?

<http://www.niaid.nih.gov/researchfunding/grant/strategy/pages/6options.aspx>