President's Message

by Yvonne Dragan

CTTSS Colleagues and Friends,

Happy Summer! With the SOT 2021 Virtual Meeting behind us, we can look forward to the New Year and the opportunities that it brings. The availability of vaccines for COVID-19 and the probability of a re-opening of our lives. While we are changed by this virtual year, we emerge with new ways of working with new colleagues and an abundance of ideas to implement. Last year, CTTSS accomplished a great deal because of the vision and drive of our Past President Sally and our entire Executive Team. We had a great number of symposia, workshops and informational sessions accepted into the annual meeting and even a CE course. Enjoy the summer and we will update you in greater detail on the CTTSS Meeting in the Early Fall.

The CTTSS had a tremendous impact on the SOT Annual Meeting Program in 2021 and we expect an even greater one in San Diego at SOT 2022. We are excited for SOT 2022 will be face to face. Influencing the programming of the Annual Meeting is one of the important roles of our Specialty Section and I am looking forward to some great sessions that span the translational science spectrum. There are tentative acceptances for a Symposium on Cyanide Poisoning Antidotes and one on CV Effects of Metals. In addition, the workshop on AI, Biomarkers and Beyond as a Workshop seems very exciting.

The section is ably run by the enthusiasm of our dedicated executive team and the contributions of our membership. I owe a debt of gratitude to Sally Bradberry, the immediate Past President and her predecessor, Jenn Burkey, who guided the section for the last several years growing its impact. Our VP, Kai Kehe organized the proposal evaluation process. We have added Hartmut Jaeschke as VP-Elect to our leadership team. Emma Bowers, our Treasurer and Secretary, provides not only the newsletters, but keeps the section financially on point. I would like to thank our Senior Councilor, Deidre Dalmas, and our incoming Councilor, Bill Mattes for their support to the section. This newsletter highlights an update from our Graduate Student Representative, Danielle Kozlosky. In addition, we have a nice update from our Postdoctoral scholar, Milan Prajapati. Furthermore, we have a conference insight section by Horst Thiermann on the recent EAPCCT Meeting.

The executive team looks forward to meeting each of you face to face at SOT2022 next March in San Diego. If you have any suggestions on the direction and program of the CTTSS, please feel free to reach out to me directly at Yvonne.dragan@takeda.com.

Have a great summer and let's discuss clinical and translational toxicology when we next meet.

Sincerely,

Yvonne Dragan, PhD
President, CTTSS
Guest note from the European Association of Poisons Centres and Clinical Toxicologists

Written by Dr. Horst Thiermann, President, and Dr. Davide Lonati, General Secretary, of EAPCCT

Ladies and Gentlemen, dear friends,

An extraordinarily busy time has passed since beginning of the pandemic. Covid-19 had a firm grip on all aspects of our lives, and we had to react accordingly.

The European Association of Poisons Centres and Clinical Toxicologists (EAPCCT) had to cancel its annual congress 2020 in Tallinn and in 2021 we held our first ever virtual congress; a big challenge for all involved. We continue to walk a path of trials and tribulations in the fall-out of this global event; for example, we had to update our constitution and review many embedded practices to enable the association to function well. This has been a rather positive experience in many senses. The interactions with our collaborators has improved in regularity and effectiveness, as has internal activity.

It goes without saying that our working groups and initiatives with, for example, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) of European Union (EU) did not stop but continues in successful ways. Noteworthily, our long international relationships collaborations with our sister associations like the American Association of Poison Control Centers, the American Academy of Clinical Toxicology, the Asia Pacific Association of Medical Toxicology, the American College of Medical Toxicology, the Middle East and North Africa Clinical Toxicology Association as well as the CTTSS of SOT turned out to be vital and fruitful in such difficult times. Finally, however, and much more remarkable was the change for the poison control centres in Europe.

The critical and dramatic situation that we have experienced (and are experiencing) permitted EAPCCT to identify a new role for clinical toxicologists during a pandemic. We faced a new and unknown medical condition and had to deal with reluctance for change. When studying and responding to needs we frequently had to scrutinise and readjust incorrect, inappropriate or misleading information. Poison Control Centers (PCC) and Clinical Toxicologists have been committed on several fronts: prevention, collaboration with governmental agencies, raising awareness of the population to reduce domestic incidents and to recommend the correct intake of drugs, control of false news, evaluation of the toxicity of experimental or non-experimental pharmacological therapies, toxicovigilance, etc. Some examples included prevention messages (using social media) about homemade methods for treating coronaviruses including drinking bleach (sodium hypochlorite) or management of poisoned patients that consumed alcohol adulterated with methanol. Our activity helped to stabilize the overwhelmed emergency system e.g. by toxicological triage of poisoned patients allowing the management of cases at home thereby reducing visits at hospitals as well as hospital admissions. These tasks contributed significantly to limiting the spread of the virus.

It appeared urgent and constructive to collect data from members and PCC directors, for monitoring and identifying specific needs of PCCs in these challenging times. In detail, an ad-hoc EAPCCT Covid-19 Working Group (continued on page 3)
was quickly established to evaluate the impact of Covid-19 on European PC activities. It was obvious that the epidemiology of poisonings during the pandemic in the EU would be a challenging issue. For this reason, a pilot study was performed in 4 European PCCs (Copenhagen, Pavia, Utrecht, Zurich) to assess critical points on methods, data collection and resources. The study was then extended to all European PCCs. In detail, the effect of the Covid-19 pandemic during the first wave on the activities of European PCC was investigated. Parameters as epidemiology of poisonings and changes in organization, such as work shift patterns, work practice and finances, were analysed during a 4-month period (March–June 2020) and compared with the data from the same period in the previous two years.

All European PCCs listed at the WHO directory of PCCs and WHO Regional Office for Europe were invited to participate in this study. Furthermore, all European members of EAPCCT and the PCCs directors of 65 PCCs were asked to participate in a survey on organization data changes in work processes of professionals active during the Covid-19 pandemic.

The first objective referred to the calls to PCCs only (excluding website consultations): total number of calls, total number of patients, type of caller (medical professional or public), type of exposure (accidental, intentional (all), intentional suicide attempt), and stratification of age groups. Furthermore, specific exposure data were collected for disinfectants, household cleaning products (according to the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) classifications) and drugs (especially drugs used in Covid-19 treatment, antivirals and specifically on chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine). Finally, 36 PCCs from 21 countries took part in the study (55% of EU PCCs) and 60% of the Heads of PCCs from 24 countries participated the online survey on organizations data referring to changes in work processes of professionals active during the Covid-19 pandemic. It turned out that only 20% of the directors declared an increase in length of shift while 42% declared an increase of total number of shifts at PCC. In fact, 25% indicate an increase of time on duties. For example, PCC personnel supported activities in the emergency departments (35%), intensive care units (12%), and nursing wards (9%). A striking finding was the fact that in more than 50% of cases no protocols were available to manage internal personnel limitations when colleagues became sick. Protocols for safe working during a pandemic were implemented for the first time in response to the Covid-19 threat. No centres reported receiving special funds for activities arising from the pandemic. European PCCs activities vary in different countries and for future some aspects became obvious for needing substantial improvement such as data harmonization, establishing a European database of poisoned patients (e.g. PCC calls, etc.) and a possible European hotline for global emergencies.

These effects show that the bonds built up over decades were strong and that we need to stick together. The pandemic showed clearly that a concerted approach is necessary for a way back to normality. Many of us were or still are fighting against the virus at ‘the front’ in intensive care units, hospitals or other places. We now have to deal with the knock-on effects on the health systems and poison control centres facing a different spectrum of inquiries and scenarios. Poisoning remains a major issue and our patients and the general public needs good, trustworthy independent information. Therefore we need to enhance our efforts. The toxicological community allows pooling of toxicological strength, taking up this challenge collectively and finding adequate and pragmatic solutions.

In this sense, the EAPPCT wishes all the best to the members of the CTTSS of the SOT.

-Prof. Dr. Horst Thiermann, President and Dr. Davide Lonati, General Secretary
Save the Date: Predictive Safety Testing Consortium 15-year Anniversary Webinar Series

Join scientists from PSTC member companies, health authorizes and other key opinion leaders during the 15-year Anniversary Webinar Series where they will share information about collaborative cutting-edge science and engage in discussion on the complexities and opportunities surrounding safety biomarkers and biomarker qualification.

For more information on upcoming webinars or to register visit http://bit.ly/PSTCWebinarSeries

PSTC 15-year Anniversary Webinar Series

May 26, 2021 – 10:00 AM US ET
Clinical Kidney Safety Biomarker Composite Measure

August 25, 2021 – 10:00 AM US ET
Alternative Solutions in Safety Assessment

September 29, 2021 – 10:00 AM US ET
Biomarkers of Effect: Safety Biomarkers as Disease Biomarkers

November 3, 2021 – 10:00 AM US ET
Data Sharing—Continued Dialog on Advancing Biomarker and Drug Development through Data Sharing: Industry, Academia and Regulatory Insights

January 26, 2022 – 10:00 AM US ET
Collaboration Begets Innovation—PSTC relationships leading the way for collaborations outside the consortium

PSTC 15-year Anniversary Webinar Series

Alternative Solutions in Safety Assessment

August 25, 2021, 10:00 – 11:30 AM US EDT

C-Path’s Predictive Safety Testing Consortium (PSTC) invites you to this free webinar, the second in its 15th anniversary educational webinar series, to explore the use of alternative solutions in safety assessment in drug development, including microphysiological systems (MPS) and In Vitro models. Pre-recorded presentations will provide an overview of current alternatives being used throughout industry, highlight how alternative solutions are being investigated for use within specific PSTC working group studies and collaborations, offer a regulatory perspective on these alternatives, and offer insights into emerging and future work in this area. On August 25 at 10:00 AM US EDT, presenters and panel members will engage in real-time discussion about these alternative solutions, the role of these emerging alternative play in drug development decision making, and the regulatory impact and future of alternative solutions such as MPS and various In Vitro models. Ample time will be provided for attendees to ask questions and engage in discussion.
Navigating the Predoctoral Path to Independence

A brief guide to preparing and submitting an NIH/NIEHS F31 Ruth L. Kirschstein Predoctoral Individual National Research Service Award

Written by Danielle Kozlosky,
CTTSS Graduate Student Representative

Disclaimers: This information is relevant as of July 2021; it is important to note that guidelines may change overtime. I collected the information herein while I went through my process, and now I want to share these recourses with you. I hope this helps your journey to becoming an independent research scientist!
Different Types of NIH/NIEHS Fellowships:
Before you begin to choose the fellowship grant you would like to apply for, you should first look at all the funding opportunities offered by NIH to see which one best fits your research and career path. By clicking here you will see a search engine that you may use to navigate a more personalized search. In most situations, you would want to select awardee, then use the drop-down menu to select Graduate/Clinical Doctorate and finish off by clicking ‘apply filter.’ On the subsequent page, you can take the time to go through all the fellowships offered to you for the upcoming year. By clicking “Details” you can learn more about the individual grants. The one I chose, and the focus will be on for the rest of this article, is the F31: Ruth L. Kirschstein Predoctoral Individual National Research Service Award.

Application Guidelines:
Before you consider applying for the F31 award, you should talk to your primary investigator (PI) – also known as your research mentor. Make sure you begin to think about the scope of your testable hypothesis with your PI to ensure a righteous scientific divergence from their key research. You also want to confirm that your PI is in agreement with your application for this award to aid in your overall career development.

The NIH credentials for F31 applicants can be found in brief on this webpage. Although the fellowship can grant up to five years of funding, I would recommend applying for the F31 after completion of most or all required classes as well as all aspects of your qualifying exams (if applicable). Typically, most of the former is completed within the first two years of your program. In this case, I would endorse applying in either the Winter or Spring of your third or fourth year for about two-to-three years of funding. This truly depends on the timing and quality of collected preliminary data, as well as advice from your PI. Specific information about F31 stipends, tuition/fees, and other budgetary information can be found here; however, there are sometimes exceptions to the regular processes (i.e., the COVID-19 pandemic). It is important to check the NIH site frequently to note any proposed alterations to the routine processes. Further, reviewing some common FAQs may help you make the final decision to apply.

Funding Opportunity Announcements:
This document is very extensive but has all the comprehensive information about the F31 fellowship award. This includes information on eligibility, application writing and submission, the review process, and so much more. For an easier read, the guidance booklet can help further explain all aspects of the F31 fellowship and truly guide you through the application process. Furthermore, some helpful links on this page, may assist as you prepare to apply, navigate through writing the application process, and through the final submission.
A checklist for the F31 Application

Letters of Support/Recommendation.
The very first thing I would recommend doing once you have decided to apply for an F31 is to think about your required letters of support and letters of recommendation. It is important to distinguish between the two – letters of support are from individuals who will be providing you with services for your research (collaborators, contributors, and consultants); whereas letters of recommendation are from respected individuals who can endorse your academic and leadership backgrounds, as well as promote your respect as a scientist. Information about letters of support can be found on page 69 of the guidance book, but combined, they cannot exceed a total 6 pages. For reference letters, you should try to get no less than 3 but no more than 5.

Applicant’s Background and Goals for Fellowship Training.
This 6-page section is where you can write about your resume and your future goals. Regulations on the personal background and fellowship goals section can be found on page 61 of the guidance book. Feel free to include tables, charts, flow charts, or any other helpful images that may help a reviewer read your application easily. If you choose to include visuals, the preferred application to use to create your images is Microsoft PowerPoint as it allows for an easy transfer to Microsoft Word.

Selection of Sponsor and Institution.
Your sponsor is typically your primary investigator (PI), and the institution is the department through which you are completing your research in. Your job in this section is to explain why you chose both your Sponsor/PI and the institution to complete your work through. Guidelines on writing the 1 page sponsor and institution section can be found on page 65.

Cover Letter.
The purpose of the cover letter is to address your reviewers and respectfully request (optional) for a specific NIH group to carefully review of your application for the F31 fellowship. You may want a particular participating organization, maybe one that is related to your work, to review your proposal in hope for a better understanding of your proposed research plan. Specific guidelines for the cover letter can be found on page 29. Overall, this should be about 1 page and written on university letterhead paper.

NIH Biosketch.
Your personal NIH Biographical sketch contains all of your previous academic achievements including past transcripts, past research experience, papers, poster presentations, positions you held/hold, etc... Additionally, all key personnel on your grant application should provide you with an NIH formatted Biographical sketch. Guidelines on how to write this can be found on page 49 in the guidebook and further on this webpage.

Respective Contributions.
In this section, you will write (~1 paragraph each) about the contributions you expect from each of the key personnel in your proposal, as well as those you will make yourself. Guidelines on how to write this 1-page respective contributions section can be found on page 65.

Responsible Conduct of Research.
You may want to research different ethical training opportunities to take before writing this section. These may be in the form of in-person classes, online trainings, workshops, or informal training. In this section, you will propose (1 page) the ethical training you deem necessary to develop your skills to become an independent scientist. Guidelines for the responsible conduct of research section can be found on page 66.
F31 Checklist Continued

**Specific Aims and Research Strategy.**
The research strategy is the most important part of your F31 grant proposal. This is the section where you describe your proposed research plan in two or three aims and provide background studies to prove the fact that your future research is important and will contribute greatly to the world of science. You should cite all that you state, and all references will be compiled into a bibliography/Reference cited (guidelines page 38) section in another portion of the F31 grant proposal. I would recommend using EndNote or a similar citation tool to help you keep track of all references while writing this section. You should also include graphs and other visual statistics to explain the significance of your work. In addition, you can use flow charts, picture abstracts, and diagrams (using Microsoft PowerPoint) to help your reviewers easily understand your proposal. This research strategy should be no more than 6 pages, following the guidelines listed on page 63. The specific aims section can be thought of as a summary of your research strategy without the references. This is where you briefly explain the background information, talk about your plans for your study aims, and about how your proposed research can advance your specific field. Guidelines for the 1 page specific aims section can be found on page 62.

**Project Summary Abstract and Project Narrative.**
You will continue to briefly summarize your proposed research plans in these two sections. The project summary abstract is a very brief synopsis (no more than ~30 lines of text) of your research strategy. Again, you will briefly describe the background information that led you to your research plan. You will also include an explanation on how your specific aims will help fill in knowledge gaps in your field of study. Guidelines to help you write this summary abstract can be found on page 37. The project narrative on the other hand is a very brief (< 3 sentences) to describe the central idea of your research. This may be one of the hardest sections to write, but it is best to keep your communication short, sweet, and to the point. Some guidelines on points to ensure to include in the project narrative are included on page 38.

**Other Sections**
Help from your PI. There are some sections that you may require help with from your primary research PI. These are generally about the institution that you work at and the various equipment that may be available to you that you may be unaware of at this beginning point of your project. These specific sections include: 1) Facilities and other resources (guidelines pg 39, 1 page), 2) Equipment (guidelines pg 40, 1 page), 3) Description of institutional environment and commitment to training (guidelines pg 2 pages), and 4) Resource sharing plan (guidelines pg 73). You will also need a letter from your PI as your Sponsor (guidelines pg 67), which is more elaborate than a letter of recommendation, through which he/she should describe their laboratory as well as explain your capability to perform the high quality research you are proposing.

Help from others.
There may be some sections that require aid from other individuals in your department. This includes the budget section (guidelines pg 78), as well as other additional sections that should be added if applicable - 1) Vertebrate animals (guidelines pg 71), 2) Human subjects and clinical trials information (guidelines pg 72), 3) Select agent research (guidelines pg 76), 4) Applications for concurrent support (guidelines pg 76), and 5) Appendix (guidelines pg 79). With the right extensive help, these can be completed thoroughly with the correct information.
Contacts:
Pre-application process. Many larger institutes offer several key resources and individuals for help with the entire application process. At Rutgers University (my parent institute) Dr. Aleksunes of the Toxicology & Pharmacology department hosts very helpful working groups for the application process through which a group of individuals applying for the F31 award come together and go through all parts of the application process, peer reviewing the different sections required. Most universities also have a group of individuals who can help you get set up on the eRA Commons website. This will be the site through which you will create a profile, and upload and submit all parts of the F31 application when the time comes.

Post-application process:
Once you submit your F31 application, you will be assigned a scientific program officer. This individual will be your NIH designated point-person throughout the post-application process. You will want to reach out to them time to time during the post-application process which can be lengthy. This individual will additionally let you know when there has been a review of your application and if there were any questions or comments that needed further clarification. This individual will also inform you of the score your application received as well as if your research proposal has been approved for funding.

Closing Remarks:
The information in this article is based off my personal experience with the application process. Many things could change due to alterations in the application or to your own personal research project. It is best to go through the links I provided through this article carefully to ensure your application is the best that it can be. I wish you the best of luck as you embark on the application process and your journey to becoming an independent research scientist!
Navigating the ‘pathways’ for independence:

A brief guide to K99/R00-NIH Pathway to Independence Award.

Written by Milan Prajapati, CTTSS Postdoctoral Representative

Disclaimers: NIH guidelines may change over the time. This information is current as of July 2021. I collected this information while I go through the process and cited the key resources – hope this helps your journey too!
Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA):
This is the first document that you want to take a look and understand the purpose of K99/R00 career development award. This is released by NIH and updated nearly once a year. It contains important information such as award description, due dates, eligibility, review criteria, administration information, and agency contact. The details about the FOA’s can be found here. The current FOA is ‘PA-20-188’ for research proposals that do not carry clinical trials (check the expiration date listed).

SF424 (R&R) – the application guide:
This document has comprehensive information about the award submission, aka the application guide. There are two key documents that you may want to follow- 1) General instructions – G and 2) Career Development Instructions – K. Together with FOA, these documents provide comprehensive information for submission.

Timelines:
NIH guidelines says- “The K99/R00 applicants must have no more than 4 years of postdoctoral research experience as of the relevant application due date regardless of whether it is a new or resubmission application.” The 4-years window starts from the date you received the Ph.D. diploma/graduation date, not your PhD defense date. There are some exceptions to this, such as Temporary Extension of Eligibility for the NIH K99/R00 Pathway to Independence Award During the COVID-19 Pandemic or ‘parental, medical, or other well-justified leave’. Please talk to your Scientific Program Contact (Who’s that? How do I find one? See below). Given a short (very short?) eligibility window, you want to prepare for this as soon as you get into the postdoc position (maybe even before!). Start thinking about the potential hypothesis that you want to test, its scope and most importantly talk to your primary research mentor early in the process so that he/she is aware that you’re thinking about this. Scientific divergence from your primary mentor’s research is a key aspect for this career development award. The ideal timeline would be to initiate first submission in the 3rd year (or earlier, if you’ve collected preliminary data) of your postdoc anticipating resubmission of the proposal as these are highly competitive awards. If you receive an award on the first submission that is great and carry on the exciting studies you proposed, if you do not receive the award then address the concerns raised by reviewers and resubmit the revised proposal within the ‘4-year’ window. Surely, this timeline is not etched, you may use the extensions discussed above to suit your needs.

Scientific Program Contact:
He/She will be your NIH designated person who is the point-of-contact regarding pre-application queries such as eligibility, suitability of your studies to the respective institutes or centers. You can find their contact information here. You want to reach out to them early in the process – they are usually available at the key conferences of your field. Try to meet them and get their opinions about relevance of the proposed project to program priorities. Be specific about your queries when you reach out to them as they are very busy.

Understand institute-specific submission guidelines:
Each major institute offer resources (office/person) to help you submit the proposal. For instance, Brown University (my parent institute) has the BioMed Research Administration office (BMRA) that serves as a central resource between you and the NIH while ensuring compliance with University and federal terms, and conditions. BMRA has specific timeline for the submission process - 5/3 day rule (completed proposal is due to BMRA five (5) business days before the sponsor deadline and an additional three (3) days to finalize the scientific components of the application). They also have established policies for due dates that fall on Sundays/holidays. Institutes usually use on of the available platform (ASSIST (NIH sponsored) or COEUS (private, I think!)) to process the grant submission, so it is a good idea to talk to your designated contact person at the local institute beforehand to avoid any last minute surprises. It is also recommended to make eRA commons account with your role as a ‘PI’. Your grant admin or department coordinators may help in this regard.
A checklist for the K99/R00 documents:

I’m happy to share my checklist below but this may change depending on your research and other factors. For example, my proposal heavily uses mouse models, so I have a required section on ‘Vertebrate animals’, you may not need this if you are proposing a project based on tissue culture work or non-vertebrates. There are good handbooks available to navigate these documents for NIH proposals. Two that I came across that have helped are 1) Handbook for Planning and Writing Successful Grant Proposals by AtKisson Training Group and, 2) The Grant Application Writer's Workbook. How to write each of sections for K99 grants requires a day worth of seminar or a 100-pages of a book, so I’m not going to go in nitty-gritty. Resources listed under ‘Useful links (blogs/videos/threads/NIH links)’ could be of use. Feel free to reach out to me if you have a specific question/s – I'll be happy to share my opinions. Others have Evernote K99 checklist that can be found here, but below are the major documents that you will need to prepare for K99 application.

- Introduction (1 page, only required for resubmission)
- Project Summary/Abstract (30 lines of text)
- Project Narrative (three sentences)
- Bibliography
- Facilities and other resources
- Equipment
- Reference letters submitted via eRA commons (understand the difference between reference letters vs. letter of support; 3-5 reference letters)
- Biographical sketches (5 pages each Bio-sketch): follow the new guidelines
- Budget Justification
- Budget
- Candidate Information and Goals for Career Development (see below)
- Specific aims (1 page)
- Research Strategy (this and candidate info page combined - 12 pages total)
- Training in Responsible Conduct of Research (1 page)
- Plans and Statements of Mentor and Co-mentor(s) - (6 pages)
- Support letters (6 pages max)
- Description of institutional environment (1 page)
- Institutional commitment of candidate's research career development (1 page; must be signed by the department Chair or the Dean)
- Vertebrate animals
- Resource sharing plan
- Authentication of Key Biological and/or Chemical Resources
K99/R00 Proposal Review Criteria:
K99/R00 career development awards are reviewed based on the five sections. Each will determine scientific merit and given a separate score. The five sections are – 1) Candidate, 2) Career development plan/Career goals and Objectives, 3) Research plan, 4) Mentor/s, Co-Mentor/s, Consultant/s, Collaborator/s 5) Environment & institutional commitment to the candidate. Additional review criteria that study sections will consider – Vertebrate animals, biohazards, training in the responsible conduct of research, select agent research, resource sharing plans, authentication of key biological and chemical resources, budget.

Useful links (blogs/videos/threads/NIH links):
I bookmarked over 50 of these resources but here are the key ones that I recommend taking a look over. Kudos to everyone who prepared these!
- NIH application due dates, review or award cycles, earliest project start date
- NIH page limits
- NIH format/writing guidelines
- Detailed guide by Anita Devineni
- Guide by Prof. Roman Voronov
- Guide by ChemicalBiology
- List of FAQ’s on NIH website that may answer your specific questions, here too.
- Samir Amin from the Jackson Laboratory for Genomic Medicine shared his experience here.
- Webcast by Mike Schmidt at NCI sponsored AACR conference.
- Kedar Aras has a four-part blog on K99/R00 writeup, documents, and a review process.