

1 What Factors are Important to the Success 2 of Resubmitted Grant Applications in 3 Health Research?

4 A Retrospective Study of Over 20,000 Applications to the Canadian 5 Institutes of Health Research

6 Short title: Factors Important to the Success of Resubmitted Grant Applications

7

8 Wrightson, J.G.¹, Lasinsky, A.², Snell, R.R.³, Hogel, M.³, Mota, A.³, Khan, K.M.^{1,2,3}, Ardern,
9 C.L.^{4,5,6}

10

- 11 1. Department of Family Practice, Faculty of Medicine, University of British Columbia,
12 Vancouver, Canada.
- 13 2. School of Kinesiology, Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver,
14 Canada.
- 15 3. Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR), Ottawa, Canada.
- 16 4. Department of Physical Therapy, Faculty of Medicine, University of British Columbia,
17 Vancouver, Canada.
- 18 5. Centre for Aging SMART, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada
- 19 6. Sport and Exercise Medicine Research Centre, La Trobe University, Melbourne,
20 Australia

21

22 Corresponding author:

23 Dr Clare Ardern

24 City Centre 1 Building

25 13737 96 Avenue

26 Surrey, BC V3V 0C6

27 Canada

28 clare.ardern@ubc.ca

29 Abstract

30 Background

31 In this retrospective study, we investigated the outcomes (funded/not funded) and factors related
32 to the funding of resubmitted applications to the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR)
33 Open Operating Grants Competition and Project Grant Competition between 2000 and 2022.

34 Method and Findings

35 The primary outcome was the proportion of resubmissions and new applications that were
36 funded. Using a random forest model, we explored the importance of variables related to the
37 success of resubmissions. A higher proportion of resubmissions (~23%) were funded compared
38 to new submissions (~12%). The most important variables related to resubmission success were
39 the rank (%) and score (/5) given to the preceding (initial) application and the number of the
40 number of CIHR-funded grants where the PI was a named team member.

41 Conclusion

42 Resubmitting applications to the CIHR Project Grant Competition was beneficial, particularly for
43 projects that were previously highly ranked and received high scores. These results may offer
44 guidance for researchers who are deciding whether to resubmit rejected applications.

45

46 Keywords: CIHR, research funding, grant resubmission, peer review, biomedical research,
47 funding success rates, retrospective cohort study, random forest model.

48 Introduction

49 Few biomedical grant applications are successful [1]. When an application is rejected, applicants
50 are typically encouraged to revise and resubmit their applications [2,3], an expensive and
51 time-consuming task [4,5]. Given the low chances of success, researchers may question whether
52 it is worth resubmitting the grant application [3]. Here, we describe the outcomes of resubmitted
53 applications to the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) Open Grants competitions.

54

55 In the U.S., resubmitted applications to the National Institute of Health (NIH) programs are more
56 successful than new applications [2,6], though success rates remain modest [2]. Researchers
57 require clear actionable information to help them decide whether to resubmit a rejected grant
58 application [7], without which they may face multiple rejections from the same competition [8].
59 For NIH competitions, quantitative results (e.g. scores, ranking) from the peer review of the
60 rejected application are related to whether someone decides to resubmit [9,10] and the success of
61 the resubmission [11]. There is little data for other programs and countries, and it is not clear

62 whether data from the NIH can be generalized to other funding systems [12]. Other factors such
63 as applicants' sex/gender, their previous funding success, and reviewer and review panel
64 characteristics may also be related to whether a grant is funded [13,14]. Some of these factors
65 may be related to how CIHR project grants are assessed [14]. However, to date, the factors
66 related to the success of resubmissions to the CIHR project grant competition have not been
67 explored.

68

69 Biomedical science and its benefits to society depend on successful applications for public
70 research funding [15]. Substantial resources are wasted on repeated unsuccessful applications
71 [4]. To help researchers decide whether to resubmit their rejected grant application, this
72 exploratory study analyzed two decades of resubmission data from the CIHR Open Operating
73 Grant and Project Grant competitions. The aims were to i) identify success rates of resubmitted
74 CIHR operating and project grant applications and ii) explore the factors related to resubmission
75 success.

76 Method

77 This is a retrospective cohort study of observational data collected by CIHR between 2010 and
78 2022. The methods are reported in accordance with the relevant requirements of the Minimum
79 Information about Clinical Artificial Intelligence Modeling (MI-CLAIM) checklist [16]. A
80 completed checklist can be accessed online on the Open Science Framework
81 (<https://osf.io/pw45z/>). The Behavioural Research Ethics Board at the University of British
82 Columbia approved the study (H23-00719; March 31st, 2023).

83

84 Context

85 The CIHR Open Grants competition—which currently accounts for approximately \$750 million
86 of CIHR's \$1.3 billion annual funding budget—is open to independent researchers at any career
87 stage who seek funding to support their proposed fundamental or applied health-related research.
88 The Open Grants competition comprises both the Open Operating Grants and the Project Grant
89 competitions, data from which were extracted for 2010 to 2015 and 2017 to 2022, respectively.
90 Each Peer Review Committee ranks the applications it considers in a competition, and an
91 approach intended to account for varying ways that grant applications are scored by the
92 approximately 60 different Peer Review Committees in each competition. The application rank,
93 and not its score, dictates funding decisions.

94 How CIHR handles resubmitted grant applications

95 An applicant may submit a previously unfunded application in a subsequent Open Grant
96 competition round. There is currently no limit on the number of times an unsuccessful
97 application can be resubmitted. Although applicants can provide a response to the previous
98 application's feedback, CIHR instructs peer review committee members to consider a
99 resubmitted grant application as a new application (i.e. relative to all others in the current
100 competition) and states that "...addressing previous reviews does NOT guarantee that the
101 application will be better positioned to be funded...". A resubmitted application can be reviewed
102 by a different peer review committee than the previously unfunded application and committees
103 do not have access to the previous version of the resubmitted application, though members are
104 asked to read and evaluate the applicant's response to the previous review. [17]

105

106 Study design and dataset

107 Applications submitted to the Open Grant competition were surveyed to identify those that were
108 new applications, unsuccessful, and followed by resubmission to the same program by the same
109 Principal Investigator (PI). Data were extracted from 50138 applications to the CIHR Open
110 Operating Grant and Project Grant competitions. Applications submitted to the 2016 Open Grant
111 competitions were not included in this study because different reviewing and adjudication
112 methodologies were used at that time. For the random forest model (see Data analysis, below), a
113 randomly selected subset (20% of the data) was held back for model testing ("Test dataset"), and
114 the remaining 80% of data were used for model training ("Training dataset").

115

116 Consent

117 Every researcher who submitted an application to the CIHR Project Grant Competition
118 consented to the CIHR Policy on 'Use of Personal Information'. CIHR maintained a record of all
119 grant applications and the assessment records (including information from the Canadian
120 Common Curriculum Vitae) of researchers who applied for funding. Our study included an
121 objective of quality assurance and quality improvement of CIHR's programs and thus fell under
122 Article 2.5 of Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans.

123

124 Data analysis

125 We performed an exploratory analysis [18] to 1) Describe the proportion of new and resubmitted
126 applications that were funded and 2) Identify the importance of variables related to the outcome
127 (funded/not funded) of resubmissions using a random forest model. The primary outcome was
128 the proportion of successful resubmitted and new grant applications (%).

129 Data wrangling

130 The PI's sex was hypothesized to be a significant explanatory variable [13]. Applications where
131 the PI had not self-identified their sex ($n = 37$) were excluded. Applications were identified as
132 resubmissions if they included a response to a previous review and could be paired with a
133 preceding unfunded new application submitted by the same PI. The unit of analysis was
134 application pairs. Resubmissions that could not be paired with a previously unfunded application
135 ($n = 9310$) were excluded from analyses.

136

137 Variable importance

138 We used a 10-fold cross-validated random forest model to identify the importance of candidate
139 variables related to the outcome of resubmissions. Random forest is an ensemble learning model
140 that combines multiple decision trees, makes few assumptions about distributions and
141 inter-relationships between variables and can describe the relative importance of explanatory
142 variables [19,20]. Plots showing the results of hyperparameter tuning are shown in the
143 Supplementary Material, Figure S4. The parameter values selected maximized model sensitivity
144 (true positive classification) and specificity (true negative classification) ($mtry = 3$, $nodesize = 1$,
145 $ntrees = 1000$).

146

147 The relative importance of each explanatory variable was calculated using the mean decrease of
148 Gini impurity (a method for assessing how effectively the explanatory variables split the data
149 based on the primary outcome) aggregated across the folds. The primary aim of the analysis was
150 explanation not prediction [21]. For completeness, the prediction accuracy of the model was
151 established using the unseen (Test) dataset.

152

153 Explanatory variables


154 The secondary outcome was the Gini importance of each of the candidate explanatory variables
155 related to resubmission success. Candidate explanatory variables were selected from the factors
156 related to grant resubmissions identified in our recent scoping review [12], other work
157 highlighting possible biases in grant peer review selection [13,14], and from factors related to
158 resubmissions in other funding competitions [9]). Two variable categories were identified: i)
159 characteristics of the applicant (the named Principal Investigator (PI)) and ii) factors related to
160 peer review. Variables included in the final model were: self-identified applicant sex (male,
161 female), previous total CIHR funding awarded in CAD\$M to all projects where the PI was a
162 named team member ('PI \$ Funding'), the number of CIHR-funded projects that contributed to
163 'PI \$ Funding' at the time of application ('PI # grants'), whether the applicant had chosen

164 English or French as the application language, whether the resubmitted application was reviewed
165 by the same peer review committee (true, false), whether the resubmitted application was
166 reviewed by one or more of the same peer reviewers within the peer review committee (true,
167 false), and the score ('Previous Score, /5') and ranking ('Previous % Rank') of the preceding
168 application.

169 Results

170 Proportion of successful applications

171 The dataset included 40791 applications, 26142 of which were new applications and 14649 of
172 which were resubmissions. During the study period, 3034 (~12%) new applications and 3415
173 (~23%) resubmissions were funded. Figure 1 shows density plots and median values for the
174 scores and rankings for both new and resubmitted applications.



175
176 Figure 1. Density plots for the scores (panel A) and rank (panel B) for new and resubmitted
177 applications. Circles and intervals represent the median \pm the 66% and 95% quantiles
178

179 Variables related to resubmission success

180 Table 1 shows descriptive statistics for the explanatory variables related to the Resubmission
 181 outcome (funded vs. unfunded) in both the Training and Test datasets. Relationships between
 182 candidate variables are shown in the supplementary material, Figures S1-S3. See ‘Explanatory
 183 variables’ above for a description of the variables entered into the model.


Table 1. Explanatory variables related to resubmission outcome (funded vs. unfunded)

	Test Dataset		Train Dataset	
	Funded N = 683	Unfunded N = 2246	Funded N = 2732	Unfunded N = 8988
Language (N)				
English	676	2189	2686	8825
French	7	57	46	163
Sex (N)				
Female	248	856	1037	3296
Male	435	1390	1695	5692
PI # Grants (Median[IQR])	8 [12]	6 [10]	7 [12]	6 [10]
Shared Reviewer (N)				
False	268	1241	1027	4998
True	415	1005	1705	4000
Shared Committee (N)				
False	112	471	339	2102
True	571	1775	2393	6886
Previous Score (/5, Median[IQR])	4.1 [0.38]	3.8 [0.41]	4.0 [0.38]	3.8 [0.41]
Previous % Rank (/100, Median[IQR])	71 [22]	50 [39]	69 [25]	48 [38]
PI \$ Funding (\$CADM)				
\$0	38	231	185	818
\$1 - <\$1M	156	616	599	2418
\$1M - <\$5M	236	804	1030	3308
\$5M - <\$10M	130	293	453	1182
\$10M+	123	302	465	1262

PI # Grants (Median[IQR]); the number of PI’s CIHR-funded projects at the time of application, PI \$ funding (\$CADM); previous total CIHR funding awarded in CAD\$M to all projects where the PI was a named team member.


184 The Gini variable importance data (from the training dataset) is shown in Figure 2. The percent
 185 rank assigned during peer review to the previous submission was the most important explanatory

186 variable, followed by the previously assigned score (Figure 3). Application language (English,
187 French) was the least important feature of the model.



188

189 Figure 2. The candidate features entered into the random forest model, ranked by the mean
190 decrease in Gini impurity (“Gini importance”). PI # Grants (Median[IQR]); the number of PI’s
191 CIHR-funded projects at the time of application, PI \$ funding (\$CADM); previous total CIHR
192 funding awarded in CAD\$M to all projects where the PI was a named team member



193

194 Figure 3. Density plots for the previous application's score (Panel A) and rank (Panel B) for
195 unfunded and funded resubmitted applications (combined for Test and Training datasets). Circles
196 and intervals represent the median \pm the 66% and 95% quantiles

197

198 Prediction performance

199 The confusion matrix for the performance of the model in the Test dataset is shown in the
200 Supplementary Material, Figure S5. The model classification accuracy was 0.76. As would be
201 expected with such large class imbalances, the model was more accurate at predicting which
202 resubmitted applications would be unsuccessful (specificity = 0.92) compared to which would be
203 successful (sensitivity = 0.22).

204 Discussion

205 Our results add to the literature on biomedical grant funding and peer review in two ways. First,
206 we show that resubmitted applications to the Canadian Institutes of Health Research Project
207 Grant Competition were funded more often and ranked and scored higher than new applications.
208 Second, we show that the peer review ranking of the previous application was the most important
209 variable related to whether a resubmitted application was funded. Applicant sex, application
210 language and peer review continuity were the least important. Applicants who are considering
211 resubmitting an unsuccessful application should feel encouraged by improved peer review

212 outcomes for resubmissions, and may wish to consider the ranking of their previous application
213 when deciding whether to resubmit a grant application to the CIHR Project Grant competition.

214

215 Matching data from the U.S. NIH [2,6], here we found a greater proportion of resubmitted
216 applications were funded than new applications, and on average, resubmissions received a higher
217 rank and score. We suggest three potential drivers of improved outcomes: First, it is possible that
218 those who chose to resubmit were those who could adequately respond to the peer review
219 feedback. Second, because CIHR treats resubmissions as new applications and instructs
220 reviewers to compare them only to their present cohort, those who resubmit may be those whose
221 application was more likely to be funded anyway (i.e. the application may be good but not quite
222 good enough compared to the previous cohort it was initially judged against). Finally, a
223 proportion of applicants whose applications received unfavourable reviews may choose not to
224 resubmit, increasing the proportion of resubmissions which are likely to be funded.

225

226 Unlike journal peer review, providing applicant feedback is a lower priority of grant peer review
227 committees [1,22]. However, applicants are recommended to, and do, use feedback to help with
228 grant resubmission [7,10,23]. High-quality feedback helps researchers decide whether to submit
229 their application [7]; low-quality feedback can confuse applicants [24] and may lead to multiple
230 unsuccessful resubmissions [8]. CIHR has clear guidance for reviewers to promote high-quality
231 reviews [25], which may have contributed to the improved success of resubmissions seen here.
232 Unlike journal peer review [26], there has been little scientific evaluation of the impact of grant
233 peer review feedback quality (but see also Derrick et al. 2023 [7]) perhaps due to the continuing
234 opacity of many grant peer review systems, despite increasing calls for transparency [27–29].
235 Given the substantial time, effort and financial costs to applicants and society of grant
236 applications, revisions and resubmissions [5,8,30], more research is warranted on how reviewer
237 feedback impacts the volume, quality and success of subsequent grant applications.

238

239 Here we show that the most important factor related to the outcome of a resubmitted CIHR Open
240 Grant was the rank given to the previous application. While many applicants may have *assumed*
241 that the result of the previous peer review was related to the binary outcome of a resubmitted
242 application, this is direct evidence of the relationship. The importance of rank compared to score
243 may surprise some applicants, especially given the relevance of previous scores for
244 resubmissions in other funding systems [9–11]. For some applicants, knowledge of the
245 relationship between the previous applications' rank and resubmission success may help them
246 make an informed decision about whether to resubmit a grant application. We found that

247 self-reported applicant sex was not an important factor related to resubmission outcome,
248 mirroring the results of recent re-examinations of gender/sex bias in grant peer review [31,32].

249

250 The number of CIHR-funded projects the PI had been awarded was the third most important
251 factor, after previous application rank and score. This result could be interpreted in at least two
252 ways. The first is that grant writing is a skill [33], and one might assume that researchers may
253 become more skilled in responding to reviewer comments with experience, especially with
254 successful grants (Guyer et al., 2021). An alternative interpretation is that the result reflects the
255 ‘Matthew effect’ in grant funding wherein previous success begets future success. A small group
256 of previously successful researchers, rewarded more often on that basis, would threaten the
257 assumed meritocracy of research funding systems [35]. Our observational data do not allow us to
258 disentangle these explanations, though we speculate that both may be true. Recent innovations in
259 grant peer review including ‘funding lotteries’ [36] and double-blind peer review processes [37]
260 have been designed to reduce inherent bias in grant selection and peer review. Future research
261 should examine whether the relationship between past success and the outcome of resubmissions
262 still exists in applications to competitions that use these mechanisms designed to reduce bias.

263

264 This is an exploratory cross-sectional study, which precludes causal inferences about the
265 relationship between the applicant and peer review characteristics, and grant resubmission
266 success. We echo previous calls for further examination of grant peer review systems, including
267 randomized controlled trials, to examine the causal factors that influence funding success
268 [29,38,39]. We were unable to study the influence of many oft-reported biases in grant systems.
269 For example, racial disparity in grant peer review and awards is well documented. However,
270 because these data were not routinely collected by CIHR during the timeframe under
271 consideration, we were unable to include self-identified race or ethnicity as factors in this
272 analysis.

273

274 Conclusion

275 Resubmitted applications to the CIHR Project Grant competition were, on average, funded more
276 often and ranked higher than new submissions. The most important factor related to whether a
277 resubmission was funded was the percent rank assigned to the previous unfunded application.
278 Resubmission may be worthwhile, as long as the initial application was well reviewed and
279 applicants can adequately respond to reviewer feedback. These data help increase the
280 transparency of grant peer review and strengthen recent calls for increased scientific analysis of
281 scientific funding systems [38–41].

282 Code and data availability

283 Upon publication, the notebook containing the analysis code will be available on the Open
284 Science Framework (<https://osf.io/pw45z/>). The data used in this analysis are held by CIHR and
285 are not publicly available due to privacy and legal restrictions. Researchers wishing to obtain
286 access to these data need to contact the Vice-President of Research Programs-Operations at
287 CIHR (christian.baron@cihr-irsc.gc.ca) to obtain approval to access de-identified data on
288 operating grant funding program applications submitted between 2010 and 2022. Data for
289 unfunded applications cannot be shared.

290 Competing Interests

291 Authors AM, MH, and RS are CIHR employees. At the time of submission, author KK was the
292 scientific director of the CIHR Institute of Musculoskeletal Health and Arthritis (CIHR-IMHA).

293 Funding disclosure

294 This work was funded in part by the CIHR Research Operating Grant (Scientific Directors) held
295 by Karim Khan.


296 References

- 297 1. Guthrie S, Ghiga I, Wooding S. What do we know about grant peer review in the health
298 sciences?: An updated review of the literature and six case studies. RAND Corporation;
299 2018 Jun. Available: https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1822.html
- 300 2. Lauer M. Are You On the Fence About Whether to Resubmit? 28 Oct 2016 [cited 30 Dec
301 2023]. Available:
302 <https://nexus.od.nih.gov/all/2016/10/28/are-you-on-the-fence-about-whether-to-resubmit/>
- 303 3. Crow JM. What to do when your grant is rejected. *Nature*. 2020;578: 477–479.
304 doi:10.1038/d41586-020-00455-0
- 305 4. Gross K, Bergstrom CT. Contest models highlight inherent inefficiencies of scientific
306 funding competitions. *PLOS Biol*. 2019;17: e3000065. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.3000065
- 307 5. Herbert DL, Barnett AG, Clarke P, Graves N. On the time spent preparing grant proposals:
308 an observational study of Australian researchers. *BMJ Open*. 2013;3: e002800.
309 doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2013-002800
- 310 6. Nakamura RK, Mann LS, Lindner MD, Braithwaite J, Chen M-C, Vancea A, et al. An
311 experimental test of the effects of redacting grant applicant identifiers on peer review
312 outcomes. Zaidi M, Isales C, editors. *eLife*. 2021;10: e71368. doi:10.7554/eLife.71368
- 313 7. Derrick GE, Zimmermann A, Greaves H, Best J, Klavans R. Targeted, actionable and fair:
314 Reviewer reports as feedback and its effect on ECR career choices. *Res Eval*. 2023;

- 315 rvad034. doi:10.1093/reseval/rvad034
- 316 8. von Hippel T, von Hippel C. To Apply or Not to Apply: A Survey Analysis of Grant
317 Writing Costs and Benefits. *PLOS ONE*. 2015;10: e0118494.
318 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0118494
- 319 9. Boyington JEA, Antman MD, Patel KC, Lauer MS. Toward Independence: Resubmission
320 Rate of Unfunded National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute R01 Research Grant
321 Applications Among Early Stage Investigators. *Acad Med J Assoc Am Med Coll*. 2016;91:
322 556–562. doi:10.1097/ACM.0000000000001025
- 323 10. Hunter CJ, Leiva T, Dudeja V. The unfunded grant, now what? Advice, approach, and
324 strategy. *Surgery*. 2024;175: 317–322. doi:10.1016/j.surg.2023.09.057
- 325 11. Lauer M. Resubmissions Revisited: Funded Resubmission Applications and Their Initial
326 Peer Review Scores. In: *NIH Extramural Nexus* [Internet]. 17 Feb 2017 [cited 4 Jan 2024].
327 Available:
328 <https://nexus.od.nih.gov/all/2017/02/17/resubmissions-revisited-funded-resubmission-applications-and-their-initial-peer-review-scores/>
329
- 330 12. Lasinsky A, Wrightson J, Khan H, Moher P, Kitchin V, Khan KM, et al. If at First You
331 Don't Succeed: Biomedical Research Grant Resubmission Rates, and Factors Related to
332 Success—A Scoping Review. Rochester, NY; 2024. doi:10.2139/ssrn.4803560
- 333 13. Guthrie S, Ghiga I, Wooding S. What do we know about grant peer review in the health
334 sciences? *F1000Research*. 2018;6: 1335. doi:10.12688/f1000research.11917.2
- 335 14. Tamblyn R, Girard N, Qian CJ, Hanley J. Assessment of potential bias in research grant
336 peer review in Canada. *CMAJ*. 2018;190: E489–E499. doi:10.1503/cmaj.170901
- 337 15. Yin Y, Dong Y, Wang K, Wang D, Jones BF. Public use and public funding of science. *Nat*
338 *Hum Behav*. 2022;6: 1344–1350. doi:10.1038/s41562-022-01397-5
- 339 16. Norgeot B, Quer G, Beaulieu-Jones BK, Torkamani A, Dias R, Gianfrancesco M, et al.
340 Minimum information about clinical artificial intelligence modeling: the MI-CLAIM
341 checklist. *Nat Med*. 2020;26: 1320–1324. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-1041-y
- 342 17. Canadian Institutes of Health Research. Project Grant Program: Application Process. 30
343 Aug 2016 [cited 12 Feb 2024]. Available: <https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/49806.html#a2.2>
- 344 18. Tukey JW. We Need Both Exploratory and Confirmatory. *Am Stat*. 1980;34: 23–25.
345 doi:10.2307/2682991
- 346 19. Breiman L. Random Forests. *Mach Learn*. 2001;45: 5–32. doi:10.1023/A:1010933404324
- 347 20. Jones ZM, Linder FJ. edarf: Exploratory Data Analysis using Random Forests. *J Open*
348 *Source Softw*. 2016;1: 92. doi:10.21105/joss.00092
- 349 21. Shmueli G. To Explain or to Predict? *Stat Sci*. 2010;25. doi:10.1214/10-STS330
- 350 22. Gluckman P, Ferguson M, Glover A, Grant J, Groves T, Lauer M, et al. International Peer
351 Review Expert Panel report: A report to the Governing Council of the Canadian Institutes
352 of Health Research. purpose; 2017 May. Available: <https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/50248.html>
- 353 23. National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases. Revise and Resubmit an Application.
354 16 Nov 2023 [cited 5 Jan 2024]. Available:
355 <https://www.niaid.nih.gov/grants-contracts/revise-resubmit-application>
- 356 24. Gallo SA, Schmaling KB, Thompson LA, Glisson SR. Grant Review Feedback:
357 Appropriateness and Usefulness. *Sci Eng Ethics*. 2021;27: 18.
358 doi:10.1007/s11948-021-00295-9
- 359 25. Canadian Institutes of Health Research. Review Quality. 12 Jan 2018 [cited 5 Jan 2024].
360 Available: <https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/50787.html>


- 361 26. Superchi C, González JA, Solà I, Cobo E, Hren D, Boutron I. Tools used to assess the
362 quality of peer review reports: a methodological systematic review. *BMC Med Res*
363 *Methodol.* 2019;19: 48. doi:10.1186/s12874-019-0688-x
- 364 27. Bouter L. Why research integrity matters and how it can be improved. *Account Res.*
365 2023;0: 1–10. doi:10.1080/08989621.2023.2189010
- 366 28. Gurwitz D, Milanesi E, Koenig T. Grant Application Review: The Case of Transparency.
367 *PLoS Biol.* 2014;12: e1002010. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1002010
- 368 29. Horbach SPJM, Tijdink JK, Bouter L. Research funders should be more transparent: a plea
369 for open applications. *R Soc Open Sci.* 2022;9: 220750. doi:10.1098/rsos.220750
- 370 30. Schweiger G. Can't We Do Better? A cost-benefit analysis of proposal writing in a
371 competitive funding environment. *PloS One.* 2023;18: e0282320.
372 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0282320
- 373 31. Ceci SJ, Kahn S, Williams WM. Exploring Gender Bias in Six Key Domains of Academic
374 Science: An Adversarial Collaboration. *Psychol Sci Public Interest.* 2023;24: 15–73.
375 doi:10.1177/15291006231163179
- 376 32. Schmaling KB, Gallo SA. Gender differences in peer reviewed grant applications, awards,
377 and amounts: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Res Integr Peer Rev.* 2023;8: 2.
378 doi:10.1186/s41073-023-00127-3
- 379 33. Weber-Main AM, McGee R, Boman KE, Hemming J, Hall M, Unold T, et al. Grant
380 application outcomes for biomedical researchers who participated in the National Research
381 Mentoring Network's Grant Writing Coaching Programs. *PLOS ONE.* 2020;15: e0241851.
382 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0241851
- 383 34. Guyer RA, Schwarze ML, Gosain A, Maggard-Gibbons M, Keswani SG, Goldstein AM.
384 Top ten strategies to enhance grant-writing success. *Surgery.* 2021;170: 1727–1731.
385 doi:10.1016/j.surg.2021.06.039
- 386 35. Bol T, de Vaan M, van de Rijt A. The Matthew effect in science funding. *Proc Natl Acad*
387 *Sci U S A.* 2018;115: 4887–4890. doi:10.1073/pnas.1719557115
- 388 36. Heyard R, Ott M, Salanti G, Egger M. Rethinking the Funding Line at the Swiss National
389 Science Foundation: Bayesian Ranking and Lottery. *Stat Public Policy.* 2022;9: 110–121.
390 doi:10.1080/2330443X.2022.2086190
- 391 37. Qussini S, MacDonald RS, Shahbal S, Dierickx K. Blinding Models for Scientific
392 Peer-Review of Biomedical Research Proposals: A Systematic Review. *J Empir Res Hum*
393 *Res Ethics.* 2023;18: 250–262. doi:10.1177/15562646231191424
- 394 38. Grant J. The allocation of scientific grants should be a science. In: *Times Higher Education*
395 *(THE)* [Internet]. 15 Jun 2017 [cited 30 Dec 2023]. Available:
396 [https://www.timeshighereducation.com/opinion/allocation-scientific-grants-should-be-scien](https://www.timeshighereducation.com/opinion/allocation-scientific-grants-should-be-science)
397 [ce](https://www.timeshighereducation.com/opinion/allocation-scientific-grants-should-be-science)
- 398 39. Severin A, Egger M. Research on research funding: an imperative for science and society.
399 *Br J Sports Med.* 2021;55: 648–649. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2020-103340
- 400 40. Azoulay P, Li D. Scientific Grant Funding. National Bureau of Economic Research; 2020.
401 doi:10.3386/w26889
- 402 41. Bendiscioli S. The troubles with peer review for allocating research funding. *EMBO Rep.*
403 2019;20: e49472. doi:10.15252/embr.201949472

Supplementary Material




406

407 Figure S1. Relationships between continuous explanatory variables. The derivative variables
408 'Change in final score' and 'Change in % Rank' are included for information only, they were
not candidate variables for the random forest analysis





409

410 Figure S2. Relationships between continuous and categorical explanatory variables. The
 411 derivative variables 'Change in final score' and 'Change in % Rank' are included for information
 412 only, they were not candidate variables for the random forest analysis.



413

414 Figure S3. Relationships between categorical explanatory variables.



415
 416 Figure S4. Effect of node size and *mtry* tuning on model sensitivity and precision for a model with 500 trees (left panel) and 1000 trees
 417 (right panel)
 418

		YES	NO
F1 Score	YES	149	162
	NO	534	2,084

F1 Score	0.30
Precision	0.50
Recall	0.21

419
 420 Figure S5. Confusion matrix for the random forest model performance in the Test dataset