

## Strategies to Successfully Transition from “K” to “R” Funding

Presenters: Sarinnapha Vasunilashorn, PhD and Nicholas Reed, AuD, PhD; moderated by Sharon Inouye, MD, MPH

Time	Section
01:10	<p><b><u>Introduction of Sharon Inouye, Fah Vasunilashorn, and Nick Reed</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sharon’s recommended reading: <a href="https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/10.7326/0003-4819-142-4-200502150-00009">https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/10.7326/0003-4819-142-4-200502150-00009</a></li> </ul>
11:09	<p><b><u>Question 1: Tell us about how you developed and refined the specific aims for your R01</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fah Vasunilashorn: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Presenting a timeline of her process from K01 to R01</li> <li>○ Took a writing workshop on this transition at Harvard and the first thing learned was “the day you start your K is the day you need to start thinking about your R.”</li> <li>○ Draft your aims, go through many drafts, meeting with NIA program offer and receive feedback, get continuous feedback from K award mentor, get feedback from other mentors, present aims to different working groups, present aims to external groups (not delirium groups) for additional feedback</li> <li>○ <u>Take aways:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Get feedback from any different people</li> <li>▪ Seek out opportunities (formal/informal)</li> <li>▪ Start early because there could be unexpected external events</li> <li>▪ Begin to build connections now</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
17:40	<p><b><u>Question 2: How did you think about timing of when you started working on your R01 during the course of your K award?</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nick Reed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Demonstrate independence early on with the K award, so then when R01 done you are ready</li> <li>○ One R01 timing was dictated based on a timeline of another study because they were proposing an ancillary project</li> <li>○ Another R01 was done early due to nerves; stated writing at least 1.5 years in advance of the targeted submission deadlines <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Set specific deadlines for himself and writing group goals</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ One of these grants was funded and the other was not—the difference was building the team out early (it’s really a team effort, not individual)</li> <li>○ Had many people look at the grant and got feedback, took advantage of external working groups, (similar to Fah) because if they couldn’t understand them, then something was wrong</li> <li>○ <u>Take aways:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ When you set deadlines, stick to them</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
26:34	<p><b><u>Question 3: How did you finally choose your deadline and how did you allocate your time and get yourself to stick to those deadlines?</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nick Reed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Working backwards to know the date you need to have funding in hand, so look at 3 cycles ahead (about a year), or more</li> <li>○ Spoke to Program Officer who gave advice on when to submit</li> <li>○ Sharon sharing the NIH table of cycle deadlines to help illustrate Nick’s point</li> <li>○ Talk to all your mentors about their style for writing/preparing grants and align yourself best with your own style</li> <li>○ Talk to your grants office about what their deadlines are (varies institution to institution)</li> <li>○ Set goals and check in weekly with a group to hold you accountable (social contracts)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
39:19	<p><b><u>Question 4: How did you assemble your team?</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fah Vasunilashorn: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ My R01: genetic risk scores and inflammation in delirium, cognitive decline, AD/ADRDD</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Datasets: Sharon Inouye expert on SAGES database; Program Officer gave feedback about finding other datasets to include to do study replication and enhance diversity → Miles Berger’s studies</li> <li>○ Genetics and AD: Doug Kiel (did not have time for co-investigator so he recommended his colleague Yi-Hsiang Hsu; Richard Mayeux (consultant)</li> <li>○ Biostatics: Long Ngo (co-investigator)</li> <li>○ Methodologic &amp; clinical research: Ed Marcantonio</li> <li>○ <u>Take aways:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Skillsets in all areas</li> <li>▪ Don’t be afraid to ask or ask for recommendations</li> <li>▪ Be persistent in your outreach</li> <li>▪ Start early</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	<p><b><u>Question 5: Looking back on the process, was there something that you would have done differently that might really help our benefit the audience [on the webinar]?</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fah Vasunilashorn: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Strict writing schedule timeline</li> <li>○ Building collaborative relationships in advance → it takes them time to be invested in you (relationships could take months to years)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Nick Reed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Getting spread too thin on external activities (sitting on grant review panels, joining committees, etc.) → learning to say no to some things</li> <li>○ Building supportive relationships</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
48:51	<b>Questions and Answers</b>