Michael Sesma: All right, so thank you for joining this session - Not Funded, Now What? Guidance from the Experts. I'm Mike Sesma, I'm a program officer at the National Institute of General Medical Sciences, and I will be the moderator for this 45 minute session, so I'd like to introduce our panel for today. They're all program officers in three different institutes and all colleagues of mine. Shawn Gaillard is a program officer at the National Institute of General Medical Sciences. Amanda Melillo is a program officer at NIDCR, and Kris Willis is a program officer at NCI. Our format today will be brief presentations from each of our panelists, and then we'll follow that with a Q and A with all three of them with me monitoring. So again, during the presentation we're going to have Q and A staff answering questions in that box, so let's get started. Here's a couple of premises that we want to engage you with, or begin the discussion with, and the question is should I revise and resubmit? Well, the critical points are that revised applications have a higher success rate than first time applications. And one thing you want to do is contact your program officer after the review, as soon as you receive your summary statement, and discuss your plans for revision. You may want to ask general advice. Remember that your revised application can include an introductory page where you summarize what you've changed in the revision. Remember that revised applications generally go back to the same review panel as before, but they may have different reviewers in that panel, not the same ones that reviewed it before. They do not see your original application. They only see the summary statement. So there are three basic issues that we're going to talk about. One is determine when it makes sense to submit an amended application. The second is to describe the important components that are needed in a resubmission, and then finally we're going to talk about common submission errors made with revised applications. So our first presenter will be Shawn Gaillard who will talk about when to submit and when not to. Shawn?

Shawn Gaillard: All right, thank you so much, Mike, and hello, everybody. Hope you're having a good day. So I'm going to give a couple of .. . Well, I actually have five key points. Five key takeaways, and after that then my colleagues will follow up. And my whole topic area is about when to resubmit, and when not. Let me say off the bat, overwhelmingly it's a good idea to regroup and resubmit. There are very few times when it really doesn't make sense to resubmit. Sometimes you just need to kind of start from scratch and do a whole new type of application, but we'll get to that. So out of my five big key points, number one is most urgent. I would say stop the presses, if you do nothing else, if you hear nothing else today, please hear this. Contact your program officer. We're from the government, we're here to help, so that's our mantra. So the program officers, our job is to actually be in the business of going to the review meetings, hearing the reviewers, understanding what they mean, reading summary statements, so what you want to do as an applicant, you've submitted your application, your application is reviewed. Then you'll get back a summary statement. That summary statement tells you what happened at the review. Because you're not invited to that party, right? So the only way that you know what actually happened in the review is to get your summary statement. Contact your program officer to have a discussion. Hey, what did they like, what didn't they like, what should I change, if anything? What about funding? Is this likely to be funded? So all of that can be discussed with your program officer. Let me also say, I said the word contact, I didn't say call. Please don't cold call your program officer. The reason why I say that, we're all busy. So if you send an e-mail and that program officer's contact, the name, and the contact information, phone number, e-mail address, is going to be at the very top of your summary statement, but sending that program officer an e-mail just to set up a time when you'd like to talk. And then you can even put in your e-mail, and I'm not so sure about this, that or the other, so that it gives the program officer time to prepare for your discussion. And during that discussion with your program officer, then you can discuss the IRG, the initial review group's critiques. What did they really like about your application? And what were the constraints? In a resubmission you would address the constraints and keep all the strengths the same. So number two out of the top five things I want you guys to walk away with today is the concept of when to resubmit or not. Well, first, you must have your summary statement back if you're going to resubmit. That's part of the NIH rules. But also it's really advisable for you, because the summary statement tells you what were the strengths and what were the weaknesses, so you know actually what to address in a resubmission. So you need that summary statement back, and often times someone will send me an e-mail and say I just got my score, can we talk about my review? And I say no, not until you get your summary statement back. A lot of times the SROs will give you back your score, but you haven't gotten the written critique yet, so you need to wait for that, have the discussion with your PO, and then after that you can resubmit. I mentioned .. . So this topic, resubmit or not, it's usually best. I would say nine times out of 10 it's good to just regroup and resubmit, aptly addressing the previous reviewer's critiques. When there are substantial weaknesses, the environment, the significance, the investigators, the innovation, the approach, when everything that the reviewers are looking for in your application is a weakness, then maybe that's when you go what are they trying to tell me? Are they trying to tell me that what I'm proposing is one, not significant, or I'm not in the right environment, or the way I want to approach this won't work. So big ticket, are they telling me that I really need to maybe start over on a new project? Again, I find that to be much less, nine times out of 10 a resubmission would make sense, but in a case like that, maybe you need to have a brand new project and a brand new application. The other thing to keep in mind, if a lot of time has passed from when you originally submit an application, and let's say a year later you want to now resubmit, think about it. Science moves at warp speed, so you're going to need to go back and think about well, what has the field done since I was last submitted this application. And so address, make sure you stay up to date with your field. The worst thing to hear in a review is when the reviewers will say something like, gee, this isn't even my field and even I know that such and such has done some work in this area, but the applicant didn't say it. The applicant didn't express that, so that doesn't engender confidence in review that you really are savvy, that you've kept in touch with all that's going on in the field. As we mentioned, have a discussion with your program officer to help you to determine if you should resubmit that application again, as an amended application, or should you not resubmit and just come in with a whole new concept. A whole new application itself. The last thing I'll say here, on whether to resubmit or not, is to note that to submit a new application, brand new, like a first time submission, you can't do that if you're switching from one particular program announcement to a request for application, or if you're switching from like an R01 to an R15. So you'd have to just keep that in mind. So number three out of the five key things I want you guys to takeaway today is .. . I love this phrase. You have to be in it to win it. The only way not to get funded is not to apply, and we actually have .. . There's a paper here that actually says what are the behaviors that people who get funded? Well, they apply. They keep applying, and addressing any concerns from the previous critiques. The fourth thing I would say is to really seek wise counsel. Have your own internal review before it gets to NIH. So ask your colleagues, your mentors, hey, could you take a look at this application? I plan on resubmitting it, here were the previous reviewer's critiques, do you think I've done a good job at addressing those critiques? So seek your own internal wise counsel, and the last thing I'll say is please, read before you write. Read that funding opportunity announcement again and again before resubmitting. A lot of times the funding opportunity announcements have like a 3 year shelf life in general, so things could have changed, and so you want to make sure has anything changed from the last time when you submitted from the announcement or not? And there are even some announcements that don't even allow a resubmission. The only way to know that is to read the funding opportunity announcement. So with that I'll turn it over to Amanda.

Amanda Melillo: Thanks, Shawn, and now I'm going to walk you through some important components in resubmission. So next slide, please. So some tips for a strong resubmission application would be number one, to capitalize on your strengths. And by that I mean to revise parts of the application that the reviewers felt were weak. And again, go back and check your specific aims and make sure that they're really lined up with your hypothesis. You also want to respond point by point to the reviewer's comments and suggestions. So stating how you dealt with the criticisms in the summary statement and your program officer may be able to help you with that. So like Shawn said, always reach out to them. The introduction page should be included in an A1 application. So in that resubmission, I'm calling it an A1 here, you'll see that suffix at the end, you always want to include that introduction page. And if possible with your introduction you should address the comments point by point. And you also want to be sure to summarize the issues and the criticisms in your responses in the introduction. Summarize any substantial additions, deletions or changes. And the introduction is limited to just 1 page. Additionally you want to update the research plan, and elsewhere in the body of the application as needed to address the comments from the summary statement in that resubmission. So next slide, please. So you don't want to drop important details in favor of making space to address the reviewer's comments. Even though you feel like you don't have enough space or you want to put more in there, make sure that you keep important details in the application in that resubmission. You also want to identify any changes by outlining them in your introduction. I can't say that enough. And then add new findings and your own improvements. You may have new preliminary data, new findings since your first submission, you should certainly include those if they will strengthen the application. You can get advice from your colleagues, especially people who have more experience with submitting NIH applications, and see what worked for them. And then you always want to be respectful, even if you disagree. So if you disagree you can explain why, and provide additional information if possible, and even better, you want to change your proposal. So for example, if the reviewers don't like the approach, you could propose a different one. Even if you don't agree, you could just make some changes there. And just to reiterate this again, contact your program officer, as we can help guide you. So next slide, please. Other things that you may want to consider. This is for non-RPG. So like not your R01 applications, this is for other types of applications, like a multi project application, which would be like a P. Start with a P rather than an R. You must submit an introduction with the overall component, but the introduction for each of the individual components of that more complex application are optional. And for career development and fellowship applications, you must arrange for the resubmission to have three reference letters required for those programs. Next slide, please. So finally, just a few additional items to consider, you're going to want to submit the resubmission application within 37 months of the new renewal or revised application that it follows. And you also, while you can mark changes within the application, they are no longer required by NIH to mark them in the application, but your application will still be accepted. You should highlight those types of changes in the introduction, as I've said. And finally, you should use the most recent version of the FOA and forms even if those aren't the versions that you submitted the original application with. You always want to go back and double check that that FOA you submitted it under is still good, or is still active and it hasn't expired. And if not, you just need to find a more up to date version of that FOA. So now I will turn it over to Kris.

Kristine Willis: Thanks, Amanda. So my colleagues .. . Thanks, Amanda. My colleagues have given you guys some great advice about things that you should do, and now I'm going to try to say a few words about things that you should probably try to avoid, and those are common errors that can occur on resubmission. Next slide, please. Okay, so one of the things that we can give you as program directors is our expertise and our experience in seeing literally thousands of applications. And when you see thousands of applications that come through the system, you can start to see patterns in the data of what works well and what doesn't. So the first point I want to make is something that you've heard many times now, which is not contacting your program director. Even if you're not discussed, you should still call or e-mail, and this is something that surprises me and continues to surprise me is people who say oh, my program director isn't going to want to talk to me, I didn't get a very good score, it's not worth talking to my program director because I didn't get discussed. And that could not be farther from the truth. I think in some senses, if you don't get discussed, that's when it's the most important to call us and talk through what you can do better next time. And it is certainly possible and all of us have seen an application go from not discussed on the A0 to scored in the fundable range on the A1. So don't give up just because the original application got a not discussed. So the second thing that you should avoid doing is failing to respond thoroughly to reviewer comments. Don't rush, it's better to wait for the next receipt date than to send an application back prematurely. You also want to make sure that you're actually engaging with what they have asked of you, and that's point three, which is don't mistake the forest for the trees. This is also something that is really common, and I think it represents a difference between responding to the review of a paper, which everybody has experience with, and responding to review of a grant. So when you respond to a review of a grant, you want to make sure it's very important, as it is when you respond to the review of a paper, to address all of the technical details, and to really make sure that you get all of the specifics and the approach nailed down and respond adequately to those. But that's not enough in a grant review. You also have to be able to see the bigger picture that the reviewers are communicating to you. And again, this is where your program director can help because we see so many summary statements, and we actually hear the reviews. We can often provide you with some insight into what the reviewers are actually asking you to respond to. So maybe it doesn't come across clearly to you when you read the summary statement, but for example, maybe the reviewers are saying we have concerns about the significant of this project. Or I just don't think this approach is the right one. And if you focus only on those really small technical details, then you may miss the forest for the trees, and also fail to respond thoroughly to the reviewer comments. So finally, the fourth on this slide, common resubmission error that I want to talk about is panel hopping, and this is something that's often very frustrating to watch. As applicants, instead of taking the criticism to heart, will try to focus on getting a different audience instead of improving your application. And while it is true to some extent that your audience matters, and that especially if you're trying to get your reviewers to understand the significance, appreciation for that topic may vary a little bit from study section to study section. But what's more important is that the grant is well constructed and well presented. And if you show a well constructed, well presented grant to any study section, regardless, then it will do well. Next slide, please. So there are also two resubmission errors that I wanted to talk about that are common in first submissions as well. And the first one of those is undervaluing visual communication. So make sure that you leave good white space in your application. Make sure that your figure legends are large enough to read, and that the figure labels are accurate and clear. Use bold text strategically to bring the reviewer's eye to important points, but don't overuse it, because then it makes it difficult to read. And make good use of paragraph breaks. It seems like it's a silly point, but I always say a paragraph is five to seven sentences connected by a theme at the beginning. And those are all things that reviewers will comment on during study section because it makes it difficult for them to understand the proposal, or difficult to read. And then the second point that's common between errors in first submissions and errors in resubmissions is not speaking to your audience. So you really want to try to make sure that you're communicating to the reviewers why this project is significant, and really the most important thing that you can do, and sort of job one is to communicate your excitement for the project to your reviewers, and why the reviewers should be excited as well. So that's the most important thing that you can do as an applicant. The key to good grant writing is communicating that idea in a way that excites the panel. Okay, next slide, please? And that brings us to the questions part of this seminar.

Michael Sesma: Okay, so thanks Shawn and Amanda and Kris. That was really a good introduction. I think we're going to start addressing some of the questions that our colleague hasn't been able to address. So let me .. . This is one we always get, and we've all answered it. I'm confident we've all answered it in the same way. Does a resubmission ever make sense if an application was not discussed? Who wants to tackle that one.

Shawn Gaillard: I'll say this. Kris just mentioned it, and absolutely, and she mentioned .. . And we have all seen literally going from not discussed to an application being in the fundable range. I think I took my camera off, there we go. An application being in the fundable range. So like I said, nine times out of 10, it's really in your benefit, in your best interest to regroup and resubmit. It's very rare that it makes sense just not to resubmit. We're not saying don't come back, leave us alone, go away from NIH. We're not saying that. What we're saying is be very intentional, and if there's so many problems with the discussion with your mentors, your colleagues, your program officer, you may want to think about just doing a new type of application. So that's the difference, but please come in. We're from the government, we're here to help. We want you to apply, and as program staff we really do want to help you to actually be successful.

Michael Sesma: Anybody have anything to add?

Kristine Willis: I would .. . Yeah, I want to emphasize that Shawn is absolutely right. I said it before and I'll say it again, do not give up if it got not discussed. We have absolutely seen things go from not discussed to the second percentile. And in fact, I think Mike Lauer has some data on his blog, "Open Mike," where he talks about the frequency with which this happens. So do not quit just because it got a not discussed. I always say to people, it's not that they don't like you. Don't take it personally. It's not that they don't like your science, they just didn't like this particular arrangement of words on the page.

Michael Sesma: Yeah, grantsmanship is pretty important. Often some of the most critical comments have to do with grantsmanship, and that opens the reviewer up to .. . Invites the reviewer to find other weaknesses. Here's another one we often hear. What advice would you give to an investigator who believes they received an unfair review? Amanda, you want to jump on that one first?

Amanda Melillo: Sure. Well, again, I would contact your program officer to start, and we can walk you through that. And so in some cases, if the PO had been listening, maybe we can help clarify a few things. Maybe that's not the case, but there are instances where that does occur, and NIH does have a mechanism if there is .. . It's very specific. You can appeal the review. It has to fall in very, very specific criteria in order to do that. It can't be a difference of scientific opinions, so .. . Which many times is what the case is. But there is a mechanism for that if it comes to it. Otherwise I think just contact your program officer, we can help walk you through these kinds of concerns. And it may just be that you can revise the application. Even when .. . One thing I'll just add, too, is read the summary statement and then maybe take a few days and then go back again. Because it's your science in that case, and you're close to it, and it might make you .. . You can take it personally, I think someone already mentioned, and that's understandable. But try to look at it objectively and we can help walk you through that. Please, if anyone else has anything to add.

Shawn Gaillard: Yeah, I'll just say this too, Amanda mentioned the appeals process. We have a second level of review, counsel, so the initial review, what they're doing in the second level is looking at the fairness of the initial review. So that's why we have this two step process, so if you actually have something that you think was just inappropriate and not fair, I'll give you an example. I had an application like this, and it was an appealable case. Literally the applicant said Shawn, I don't even think they were reading my application. Look. They talked about some other title, some other .. . It was totally out of the woods, it wasn't what the person wrote about. It wasn't his title, it wasn't his work, it was .. . So clearly something went a little awry. So that's an appealable case. But let me give you this warning, with an appealable case, what's going to happen, it's going to go before counsel, counsel's not going to then say oh, yeah, it wasn't fair. Go ahead and fund it, NIH. That's not their job. What they're going to say is oh yeah, the first review wasn't quite fair, wasn't up to snuff. Let's take this application as it was originally proposed and just send it back to review. So actually you might be a little better off if you just submit an amended application instead of .. . Because you have time to then fix other things that you might've seen. So even though there is a process, sometimes it actually benefits you just to go back, regroup, and submit another application again, a resubmission.

Michael Sesma: So we've all been through this, and I think you kind of have to rely on our advice. It's ultimately your decision, but we can pretty much tell you how things are going to go. So that's why you talk to your program officer. And the other people you want to talk to are your colleagues at your institution who might have had similar experiences or have been on a review panel, and ask them to review your summary statement and show them your application too. Okay, here's another one. Do you have any suggestion as to how to address questions from two reviewers who don't agree with each other? My gosh, a difference of opinion from study section members. Kris?

Kristine Willis: Thanks, Mike. This happens all the time. And I think I often get applicants who are confused, they don't understand, how can there be a difference of opinion. This doesn't happen. No, this happens all the time. So how to address it probably depends on the specifics. So I think you always have to address both parts, but it may be that in one case you have to very gently disagree with the reviewer, which is a perilous thing to do. So you want to do it respectfully, always, and say okay, I take the reviewer's point and I see that this is a serious issue, but I think I may have not communicated clearly. Let me try to communicate more clearly. That's a really good way to present it, I think.

Michael Sesma: Sometimes the resume and summary of discussion actually reflect the disagreement among the panel, and so it's important to recognize that.

Kristine Willis: Oh, I was just going to say I think, too, it's important to keep in mind that while the reviewers will get your summary statement, there's no guarantee that any of the three original reviewers will get the A1 amended proposal. So that's worth keeping in mind when there's a disagreement as well.

Michael Sesma: Okay, here's another one. Is the resubmission period of 37 months extended because of COVID? We did not submit because our clinical trials were suspended during the pandemic, so we're not sure if we would be able to recruit patients for the clinical trial that was submitted, but it was not funded the first time in 2019. The pandemic is still ongoing, so anybody want to tackle that one? Go ahead, let me just add, the 37 month limit has always applied. That's always been the case. So go ahead and .. .

Amanda Melillo: Yeah, so I was just going to say that regardless you can submit a new application and I think if it has been that long of an amount of time from your last submission the science is going to have changed regardless of things being slowed from the pandemic or not. And so you probably want to just .. . I think it's in the benefit of the applicant to submit a new application if it's been over 37 months anyway. Or even close to that, because you're just going to want to update kind of the data and the preliminary .. . But even if you don't have any preliminary data, just the field of science that's evolved over those months since your last submission.

Michael Sesma: Okay, so this one's a little bit sensitive I think for all of us as program officers. So I'll just read what it says. I've had mixed experiences in getting quality feedback from POs. Most have been great and seem generally interested in my success, and another one has been the opposite. I did e-mail and send a draft of specific aims prior to requesting a meeting and she did agree to meet but seemed very curt, with brief responses. Any suggestions on the best way to deal with this? Do I find a different FOA with a different designated PO?

Shawn Gaillard: Do you pull your hairs out trying to find somebody to help you? I'm going to say it again. We're from the government, we're supposed to be here to help. So let me start with that premise. I would say overall, and I'm glad you said that overwhelmingly you have run into people who have been helpful, but guess what, everybody's human. So you might but up against that person who you find a little too curt, or a little less courteous or helpful. At the end of the day, you need the information that you need, and so I would .. . Don't give up, ask again, politely, of course. But if you still are not getting the information you need, maybe there's somebody else. And you can ask that person, is there somebody else that you would recommend that I speak to because I'm still not kind of clear. And I think just being very candid with what your needs are. That you have a question about a particular issue, the review, you weren't quite certain of things, you don't know if you should resubmit, whatever the issues are. You need to get your answers addressed, and if you're butting up against somebody that is not as helpful as they probably should be, NIH has thousands of folks. So I would say okay, let me go to somebody else.

Michael Sesma: Okay. Sometimes the criticisms focus on the lack of preliminary data or feasibility. The question is can NIH support young researchers to provide small funds who have preliminary data, or is this not an option? We're three different institutes. Maybe your institute has an option to deal with that.

Amanda Melillo: Yeah, so I'm at NIDCR, the dental and craniofacial institute, and we actually have an R03 that's specifically for new investigators for this exact purpose. It's only open to new investigators, but it is only an NIDCR FOA. So if your science doesn't align with us. So it does depend on which institute you're applying to. But there is a general R03 too, which is the parent R03, which many institutes sign onto, which isn't specifically for new investigators, but it is a smaller research grant that could help exactly do the same thing.

Shawn Gaillard: And I would say there are a lot .. . The NIH has a lot of different mechanisms in the training career development space. So a lot of times people will take a K award, and the research that they did on their K award, that will then .. . There's enough data from that they will parlay into an R01 or an R21 or what have you. So definitely check out the endless array, alphabet soup of different mechanisms that NIH offers at the early stage careers so that people can build up, have your own, and use that data to apply for a main kind of like an R01.

Michael Sesma: Kris, did you have anything to add?

Kristine Willis: Yeah, if I can. So I think another thing to look for is that we are starting across NIH to offer a very limited number of programs that prohibit unpublished preliminary data, so again, talk to your program director and see if you might be a candidate for one of these. Now I want to point out that these are very specifically focused on certain topics, so it may be that there's just not one that fits you very well, and I also want to point out that just because it doesn't require unpublished preliminary data .. . But it doesn't allow unpublished preliminary data, that doesn't mean that you don't have to substantiate your premise. You still, and in fact, there may even be a higher burden that you can argue that your premise is strong based on the literature. So something to think about.

Michael Sesma: Okay, this one's a little bit about how you prepare your resubmission. The NIH instructions say do not include mark ups, but I've heard from heads of study sections that they mark down resubmissions if those aren't included, and have received guidance from POs to include mark ups. Is there a way to make sure this is standardized? Who wants to handle that one?

Kristine Willis: I can try. So I think again, call your program director, because if you've seen one institute of NIH, you've seen one institute of NIH. If you've seen one study section, you've seen one study section. So your guide to the particular behavior of your study section is going to be somebody who has seen and dealt with that study section.

Michael Sesma: That's a good one. I think, remember that you get that one page introduction in which you can explain what you've done in revising your application, and if it's a substantial revision, like you've completely rewritten it, there's hardly any point in marking it up. So this goes back to when I was submitting grant applications 30 years ago the procedure was different, but you also had 25 pages instead of 12. So I think that's different. Anybody else want to add anything? Okay. We were recently notified by a PO that our application would have been funded last year, but they were waiting to set pay lines for FY22 due to the continuing resolution. Any idea when we'll know availability of funding? Should we prepare to resubmit, or just wait and hope we're within the FY22 pay line? What does your institute do? Again, we've got three different institutes here.

Shawn Gaillard: Who do you want to go first, Mike?

Michael Sesma: Doesn't matter. Somebody can jump in.

Shawn Gaillard: Well, we keep going back to the same .. . I feel like we're a broken record. Contact your program officer, because Kris said it best. If you've talked to one program officer and one institute, or center, you've spoken to one. There are 27 NIH institutes and centers, 24 of which dole out the money. So it's just like your departments in your universities. The chemistry department may do things totally different from the biology department, so you kind of got to go and speak to folks there. So at our institute we don't set pay lines, I'm at NIGMS, General Medical Sciences, and Mike also is there as well. So we don't set a pay line, and the budget thing, continuing resolution, this is standard fare across NIH. You will find this will become a part of your understanding as submitting a grant, grant application, our fiscal year begins on October 1st, but we may not actually have a budget and be on a continuing resolution. I've seen it go as late as March and April of the next year, so that's a long time. And so we don't know, we get our money from Congress. When we get our money because we all pay taxes, so it's just a part of the process. I think the best thing to do is to have .. . Contact the program officer, get the information and say okay, when should I contact you again? When might you have a status update? So I can know for my particular application what's the likelihood of it getting funded.

Michael Sesma: Okay. All right, I think we're going to wrap it up here, but I have one last question. I have submitted a grant application, it had a fundable score, but there was not enough money, and I answered the reviewers and submitted again, but it went to another study section. This time the score was not fundable. What should I do? Who wants to jump into that one? I wonder if they contacted their program officer to discuss where it was going to go when it was resubmitted.

Shawn Gaillard: Somebody wrote in the chat sorry for that, and I agree. Sorry about that. I will say the onus of this whole thing about grantsmanship, the onus is on the applicant that in my hands, what I want to propose, what I want to do is an important problem. I have the right expertise, I'm in the right environment, the approach I'm taking is right. It's all the review criteria, so that's what you're looking at. But this process is very subjective, it's not just you spit it into a computer and out comes something. You're relying on people, we're relying on people who will then judge have you met that review criteria. So it is so super frustrating to get something the first time and it gets a pretty good score and to do it again and the score goes the wrong way. You don't get as fundable. I will say this, that paper that I showed actually showed research behind the fact that you can't give up. The best way not to get it is just to give up, walk away, I'm done, NIH doesn't like me. That's the worst attitude to take. Keep at it. You may not get it initially, but eventually the hope is that you'll learn enough through the process that you will be able to get funded.

Michael Sesma: Okay, I'm going to wrap it up now. Thanks, Shawn, Amanda and Kris, and all the participants who asked questions for a very informative session. I hope we were able to answer your important questions, including one of our colleagues who was answering questions in the chat. I encourage you to visit our exhibit hall booth for chats and one-on-one opportunities with program officers from all the institutes. You can always find contact information in the help section of our grants.NIH.gov site. And also, your feedback is very important, please take a moment to let us know what you thought about this session and our presenters. Your feedback is very important. Click on the session feedback button located with the description of the presenters on the auditorium list of sessions. When you're completely done with the seminar, please also complete the overall survey form in the navigation bar at the top of the page. Thank you again for your attention and all your questions. Good luck, and remember, if you want a grant you don't get one unless you apply first. That's the first step. Then read the instructions and again, and again, and again. And contact someone like us, your program officers. Thank you very much.

Shawn Gaillard: Bye, everybody.

Amanda Melillo: Thanks, bye.

Michael Sesma: Bye, bye.

Kristine Willis: Bye, everybody.