

Dear colleagues on the NIH ACD Next Generation Researchers Initiative Working Group:

As the Next Generation Researchers Initiative (NGRI) Working Group of the Public Affairs and Advisory Committee (PAAC) of the American Society of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology (ASBMB), we would like to follow up our April 25 lettewith comments on the repostsued at the 116<sup>th</sup> meeting of the ACD(June 1415, 2018). We hope to continue our fruitful dialog with the NIH as you identify and propose policies to ensure the sustainability of the biomedical research enterprise. In particular, we wish to provide feedback regarding proposed policies for the next generation of scientists and for atrisk investigators with the common goal of supporting the futuration barrows and supposed to the futuration of the previous elicity of the supposition of the supposition of the futuration of the previous elicity of the supposition of

However, of the two proposed options for the status clock, we favor the second, as it better accovariability in training paths, including notinaditional paths and paths in different disciplines within biomedical reearch. The first definition using a 125 year windownay be too short for investigators in multidisciplinary fields requiring multiple postdoctoral training appointments and, at the same to may be too long for investigators in fields where shorter constructions are sufficient. We favor using time from the start of the investigator in the position as the anchor date, requiring institutions to certify eligibility for designations as is common practice for scholar awards. This appoach is successfully utilized for awards from the Pew Charitable Trust, the Cami and Henry Dreyfus Foundation, the Cottrell Scholars Collaborative, and the National Science Foundation CAREER program to support investigators who are in a similar danger as NIH ESIs.

## ESIs and multi-PI grants

Major theme 1, Slide 16: We agree that shifting the focus to meritoriorist antivestigators is critical. We also agree that the approach to have ESIs maintain their ESI status while receiving support multi-PI grants is helpful to their scientific development and pursuit of an independent research program. However, before changes are made in study section format, we would like to see data indicate that clustering of ESIs and rist investigators together during review leads to a fairer review process.

Methods to identify and support ESIs and-ask investigators

Major theme 2, Slide 17: We agree it is important to develop grant mechanisms to support ESIs risk investigators. We encourage NIH to expand their current efforts. While awards such as the IDP5 are valuable mechanisms for supporting outstant slimited number of awards made be these programs limits impact. We applaud the goals of the more widely used NIGMS MIRA R35 encourage NIH to more broadly implement similar programs.