



# Track Record & Applicant Response

Davina French

# Track Record

- An object lesson in statistics
- 25% weighting but no independent variance = no effect in the final rankings

## A distinctive track record

- Most applicants have a strong track record
  - For their career level and discipline
- How is yours different?
- Why are you the right person/team for the project?

## Aim to be

- **Distinctive**
  - The documentation is very cumbersome - help the reviewer to find your hidden gems
- **Objective**
  - Give information, not opinion
- **Positive**

## A distinctive track record

- Provide independent, objective evidence of reputation and achievements where they are **either** unusual for your career level **or** especially relevant to the project
- Relevant publications is a critical area

# What is special about you?

- ‘high ranking’ journals - give examples
- Highly cited papers
- Papers that were mentioned by the editor
- Work with strong international groups
- Invitations to leadership roles
- Prizes and awards

# Community Engagement/Translation

- Becoming more important
- Look for opportunities that provide objective evidence of outcomes

# Career disruption

- Look at your career objectively
- Provide a no frills account of events that everyone is familiar with - e.g. maternity leave



# Past grants

- Experience is always good to have
- Pilot/seed funding from small schemes shows commitment
- Some smaller schemes have very low success rates

# Grant experience

- Early career applicants may rely on a colleague for mentoring
- Papers leading directly from past grants - point these out if the output is especially impressive

# The team

- The best team is the right team for the job
- Everyone's contribution is important
- Tell it like it is
  - Relevant expertise
  - Availability
  - Commitment

# Applicant response

- Peer review - not expert review
- Remember that the panel members know who the reviewers are

# Changes to the research plan

- A reviewer states that you have chosen -
  - The wrong study population
  - The wrong control group
  - The wrong outcome measure
  - The wrong follow-up period
- Note that NHMRC uses the term rebuttal period, not revision period

# Applicant response

- Look for genuine questions
- Answer the questions
  - Even if you thought the original application was clear on this point
  - Even if you think the reviewer is wrong
  - Even if you think the question is trivial
- Take the opportunity to update your track record with relevant information

## Be respectful

- Remember that the panel members know who the reviewers are
- You are rebutting an anonymous reviewer, but they are seeing a ‘conversation’ between two named individuals