

NFAR Infographic

Dr. Josh Feder's

READ THIS BEFORE
YOU SUBMIT YOUR GRANT!

GRANT



RANTS



THE OPINIONS IN THIS PRESENTATION ARE THOSE OF THE AUTHOR, NOT NECESSARILY OF NFAR— J. FEDER, M.D.

Hi!

I'm Dr. Josh Feder,
and I'm an NEAR
GRANT REVIEWER



WE KNOW YOU
ARE WORKING HARD
TO PUT YOUR IDEA
FOR A GRANT IN WRITING

We Love
Your ideas!
💡💡💡

THERE ARE A LOT
OF US HELPING OUT
AT NEAR


WE WANT YOU TO HAVE
AS MUCH HELP AS POSSIBLE
TO WRITE A SUCCESSFUL
GRANT PROPOSAL



YAWN...






GRANT REQUEST:



(PLEASE GIVE US \$)

We donate our time
to review your grants.

Your Ideas are Great!!



So why am I
worried about
your proposal?



Unfortunately,
many of the grant
proposals I see
have Big problems,
so big that I can't
recommend funding.





What do I need
to see?



But your ideas
are so good, and
I know you work
hard, and so I
want to help you
write a successful
grant proposal!

①

BUDGET



Don't ask for \$ for the WRONG reasons.
NEAR \$ are for program and research costs,
but NOT for salaries or app development.

2 REACH


GOOD PLANS
REACH LOTS OF
PEOPLE!

AND/OR
THEY
HAVE...

③


IMPACT

Outcomes
that
REALLY MATTER



④

SUSTAINABILITY





THEN: YOUR PROGRAM OUGHT TO BE SUSTAINABLE!

Figure out how that can work for your idea,
and tell us how you would do that.

SUCCESSFUL Ideas ARE SUSTAINABLE!


⑤ MEASUREMENT

So, does your  + \$ =  ??

REALLY?!?

PROVE IT!!!

Show us how you will MEASURE
whether the projector program actually helps.



...

2 KINDS OF MEASUREMENT!


⑥ DATA & REPORTS

SURVEY:


<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	😊
<input type="checkbox"/>	😐
<input type="checkbox"/>	😞

Comments:
Love it ♡

DO PEOPLE
LIKE IT?




Your plan for reports should include data, analysis & what comes next.



Sometimes your project, or your previous project, doesn't work

⑦ OBJECTIVITY

IF your results don't work out...




PEOPLE DIDN'T
LIKE IT...

AND
OR




IT DIDN'T
HELP PEOPLE...



... TELL US WHAT YOU'LL TRY NEXT TIME!

ACTION! ... oh no!





SWORDS!
TAKE 1

MY GREAT IDEA:
FIRST VERSION



NEW IMPROVED IDEA!

⑧ HONESTY
DO NOT EVER ALTER, 'CHERRY PICK', OR MAKE UP DATA.



You might not get caught, but you will HURT people,
and if you do get caught it will be hard to get funding again...

Sadly, cheating is all too common... Luckily we have watchdogs!



Share this:

Email Facebook Twitter

Written by Ivan Oransky
January 17th, 2017 at 4:24 pm

Posted in Uncategorized

Breast cancer studies by fired Pfizer employee retracted

without comments

Last year, Pfizer fired one of its scientists following an investigation that ended with requests for retraction of five of her studies. Now, two of the five papers, which were first flagged on PubPeer, have been retracted.

One notice cites the Pfizer investigation, which found that cancer researcher Min-Jean Yin had included duplicated images in all five papers. Yin is the last author on both retracted papers.

Here's the first notice from *Clinical Cancer Research*, which is most or all of the questioned images appear to be duplicates, and Pfizer — who sponsored the study and requested the retraction. [Read the rest of this entry »](#)



Written by Alison McCook
January 20th, 2017 at 9:30 am

Posted in [Comm. Research](#), [disputed data](#), [freely available objections to criticism](#), [psychology](#), [public health/safety](#), [sage](#), [united states](#)

Undisclosed conflicts of interest usually lead to corrections – but for some journals, that's not enough

with one comment

When authors are faced with filling out a journal's conflict of interest form, deciding what qualifies as a relevant conflict can be tricky. When such omissions come to light only rarely do they result in retractions – and certainly not author bans. But there are exceptions.

In October, the journal *Chest* retracted a 2015 review article exploring how mechanical ventilation can be used most effectively to manage acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) after finding that the authors failed "to disclose all relevant conflicts of interest." What's more, the journal initially planned to ban the two authors with undisclosed conflicts from submitting papers to the journal for three years, but ultimately decided against it.

The [Committee on Publication Ethics](#) says that retractions may be warranted in cases of interest, but in our experience, most notices that cite that reason mention other papers as well. Not this case – here, the only thing that seemed wrong with the paper was it mentioned their ties to a ventilator company. The authors requested a correction – the other journals they contacted – but to *Chest*, that wasn't enough.

Here's the retraction notice for "Mechanical Ventilation as a Therapeutic Tool to Reduce the Rest of this entry »

Select Language

Archives

Archives

Select Month

Retraction posts by author, country, journal,



Written by Ivan Oransky
January 21st, 2017 at 9:30 am

Posted in weekend reads

"We made big mistakes:" Gastric paper pulled with updates

without comments

Sometimes we come across a real head-scratcher.

That happened this week, when we saw a retraction notice for a 2015 paper on gastric cancer in the *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Medicine*, which only says the authors "made big mistakes" and contains two fairly significant typos.

Although there's no sign of a retraction on PubMed, the [table of contents for the latest issue of the journal lists the retraction](#) — but includes no hyperlink to the notice. The only way to see it is via a Web cached version. Here's the text:

[Read the rest of this entry »](#)




www.retractionwatch.com

17/24

9.


PROTECT YOUR PARTICIPANTS



- SAFETY
- PRIVACY
- RESPECT

THINK ABOUT WHAT IT WILL BE LIKE FOR YOUR PARTICIPANTS,
FOR STAFF, AND FOR FAMILIES. TELL US YOUR PLAN!

10. BUILD KNOWLEDGE



TELL US HOW YOU WILL SHARE YOUR RESULTS,
GOOD OR NOT SO GOOD, SO THAT OTHERS CAN
SEE WHAT YOU HAVE DONE & BUILD ON YOUR WORK.

⑪ REACH OUT FOR HELP




CONFUSED?
CONTACT US!



WE ARE HERE TO HELP.
WE LOVE YOUR IDEAS.
YOUR SUCCESS IS
EVERYONE'S SUCCESS!

GOOD LUCK!

WE BELIEVE
IN YOU!



WE ARE
GRATEFUL
FOR YOUR
HARD WORK!



NO ANIMALS WERE HARMED IN THE PRODUCTION OF THIS PRESENTATION.
THANKS TONFAK AND MICHAEL FEDER FOR YOUR HELP & SUPPORT! J. FEDER 2017

END.