

## **TRANSCRIPT OF AFSP GRANT APPLICATION ROUNDTABLE JULY 2021**

### **USE Ctrl+F to search for topics of interest to you**

00:18:02.000 --> 00:18:16.000

Hi everyone, I'm Jill Harker Friedman, the Vice President of Research at the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention, and I want to welcome you to our first ever research application Roundtable.

00:18:16.000 --> 00:18:34.000

And our goal today is to help you apply for research grants and do it in the best possible way. So we're going to start by initially I'm going to give a presentation, and then our panelists who will introduce in a second or who will introduce themselves

00:18:34.000 --> 00:18:36.000

will tell you a little bit about themselves.

00:18:36.000 --> 00:18:51.000

Then after my presentation, each of our panelists will talk a little bit about their experience with the review process and then we're going to open it up to questions, and our main goal is to answer your questions about the grant application process.

00:18:51.000 --> 00:19:08.000

So you can put your questions in the q amp a box at any point, and we will try to get to all of them. And if we don't, we'll try to follow up with you do want to let you know that there is live captioning happening it's through otter so it's about 80%

00:19:08.000 --> 00:19:22.000

accurate and ALCS to your bottom right that there's an option for live transcript. You can either get the live transcript or show captions. So, please feel free to use that along the way.

00:19:22.000 --> 00:19:29.000

And so first I want to start by introducing all the people that you see but in a very brief way.

00:19:29.000 --> 00:19:39.000

Well actually I will let them introduce themselves so let's go by my screen, Naomi, why don't you go first.

00:19:39.000 --> 00:19:52.000

Dr Naomi Simon I'm a psychiatrist, Professor of Psychiatry at NYU Grossman School of Medicine, Director programming, anxiety, stress, and prolonged grief disorder.

00:19:52.000 --> 00:20:09.000

And I've been working very closely for a long time with the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention both as a grantee in a suicide

survivors project that was a multicenter project and doing reviews for them and currently I serve as the head of the

00:20:09.000 --> 00:20:16.000

research grants committee which you'll hear more about. So thank you for joining us. Thanks Naomi.

00:20:16.000 --> 00:20:17.000

Eva.

00:20:17.000 --> 00:20:19.000

You want to go.

00:20:19.000 --> 00:20:21.000

Remember to unmute.

00:20:21.000 --> 00:20:24.000

Okay. Sorry. Good.

00:20:24.000 --> 00:20:39.000

Hi everyone, my name is Emma says, I am an assistant professor working in Department of Psychiatry at the University of Michigan and I'm part of the youth and young adult depression and suicide prevention program in the department psychiatry there.

00:20:39.000 --> 00:20:49.000

And in my role today I'll speak as a former and as a current guarantee of a VC funded projects.

00:20:49.000 --> 00:21:05.000

And Mark marks in your and also a psychiatrist and then associate professor at the University of Toronto and my research and in suicide generally focuses on population level strategies with a bit of intervention work, and I've been lucky enough to hold

00:21:05.000 --> 00:21:16.000

a couple of young investigator grants and now a standard research grant from the FSP. And I also sit with Naomi on the research grants committed, and welcome everybody.

00:21:16.000 --> 00:21:18.000

Carl.

00:21:18.000 --> 00:21:36.000

Hi everyone I'm Carl and the gel ski I'm the AFP director of grants and research or development, and this is my friend Rochester aka Rocky, he'll be helping me out today, I am the first point of contact for most issues related to our grant application

00:21:36.000 --> 00:21:40.000

process, and really excited to see you all.

00:21:40.000 --> 00:21:41.000

And Chris.

00:21:41.000 --> 00:21:50.000

Hello everyone, I'm, London, I'm the research grants administrator here is just Carl on the grant cycle.

00:21:50.000 --> 00:21:59.000

You don't have much contact with me there but on the other end once here wonderful research is finished, I help with dissemination, very excited to be here thank you guys for coming.

00:21:59.000 --> 00:22:05.000

Thank you all. And as you can see we have a very distinguished panel and a very experienced panel.

00:22:05.000 --> 00:22:23.000

And I just want to make note that both mark and ever started as young investigators. And so if you have questions about that, please do ask. I'm going to go ahead and start with the presentation just giving you the general features of our research grants

00:22:23.000 --> 00:22:30.000

program and, hopefully, answering some questions along the way.

00:22:30.000 --> 00:22:34.000

Okay, let's see, we go.

00:22:34.000 --> 00:22:48.000

So, this is our new branding in it. Just to let you know you know our goal is to connect research with practice. Now that doesn't mean that your study has to have a direct immediate link to practice.

00:22:48.000 --> 00:22:53.000

But eventually, We hope that everything will lead to suicide prevention.

00:22:53.000 --> 00:23:08.000

So a little bit about IFSP. We have a vision of a world without suicide, and our position in the field is lead the fight to prevent suicide and we're the largest private funder of suicide prevention research.

00:23:08.000 --> 00:23:22.000

Are we did set a bulk goal in 2015 to reduce the rate of suicide in the US by 20% by 2025. And we have a whole project you can go to our website [afsp.org](http://afsp.org).

00:23:22.000 --> 00:23:30.000

And learn more about Project 2025, as, As you learn about us.

00:23:30.000 --> 00:23:47.000

Our role is really an our approach is really comprehensive so you know I guess about the part that we fund scientific research in fact we were founded by researchers and people who had lost someone to suicide, and their goal was, hey, we have to learn

00:23:47.000 --> 00:24:03.000

something about suicide. In order to prevent it, so that other people don't have to experience the pain that we've experienced, and that was in 1987 and we did give out \$11,000 in 1987, tell you more about where we're at now.

00:24:03.000 --> 00:24:13.000

We also offer educational programs for professionals, and we work to educate the public about causes prevention, and anything related to suicide prevention.

00:24:13.000 --> 00:24:25.000

We have a policy of advocacy office in Washington DC and we promote policies and legislation, both at the federal and the state level we now have state mental health days in.

00:24:25.000 --> 00:24:38.000

Yeah, in all 50 states.

00:24:38.000 --> 00:24:50.000

opportunities for involvement for those bereaved by suicide, people at risk of suicide and their families. So, anything connected to suicide you could probably find a home with us at a SP.

00:24:50.000 --> 00:25:01.000

And in fact, there's a lot of overlapping work that happens because suicide, you know, is the well with coven has become the 11th leading cause of death.

00:25:01.000 --> 00:25:11.000

It also about half of people have lost someone to suicide. So, this is a problem that's touched all of us.

00:25:11.000 --> 00:25:30.000

So, what we do everything we do actually starts from research. So over here, research guides our education, which is all evidence base that guides our public public awareness, which then guys are advocacy and also our outreach and support and all of that,

00:25:30.000 --> 00:25:38.000

that, then goes to fund and support our research. So, we're, we're all in this together.

00:25:38.000 --> 00:25:51.000

You should know that if you engage in research and, and you have findings, they will make their way to our volunteers are advocates to your legislators and all around the world.

00:25:51.000 --> 00:26:03.000

So, we have a strategic plan for FSP, and the first goal is that strategic plan is to advance the scientific knowledge needed to reduce the rate of suicide.

00:26:03.000 --> 00:26:13.000

So how are we going to do that, we're going to significantly increase investment in research and as I mentioned, our first grant year, we gave out \$11,000.

00:26:13.000 --> 00:26:30.000

We also want to expand the scope of a F's peace fund funded research across the whole spectrum of suicide prevention, and we want to increase the impact of FSB funded research by improving quality breadth depth and communicating results.

00:26:30.000 --> 00:26:46.000

So what that means is that this webinar, and the other webinars that we have held, which you can always go to our website and resources for researchers section, and look at the other webinars we've had but we're now on a mission to help build a research

00:26:46.000 --> 00:26:48.000

community.

00:26:48.000 --> 00:27:04.000

So, this year. We've just funded 6.43, what really is for for \$3. million. A new scientific research, we're funding 35 new innovation grants and to focus grants.

00:27:04.000 --> 00:27:22.000

Oh, this is that these numbers will run I changes but they seem to reappeared. This is not accurate in fact 40% of our funding grants this year are re submissions, and I'm going to talk more about feedback and re submissions as we go along, and also our

00:27:22.000 --> 00:27:34.000

current portfolio. This is also wrong computer glitches is actually about \$22 million, and we have about 100 active studies at this time.

00:27:34.000 --> 00:27:50.000

So, it's a funny story because if you talk to biology biological researchers they're going to tell you that AFSP only funds psychosocial research. And if you talk to psychosocial researchers they're probably going to tell you that a FSB only funds biological

00:27:50.000 --> 00:28:04.000

research. So I come here to tell you that we fund, any kind of resources related to understanding and preventing suicide. So these are some six main categories but we're open to new ideas.

00:28:04.000 --> 00:28:20.000

And so we fund neural biological studies genetic studies psycho social studies clinical treatment studies community intervention studies survivors of suicide last studies, and also studies about how to best educate the clinicians in, and in the field.

00:28:20.000 --> 00:28:27.000

So many of our studies actually overlap across these different categories.

00:28:27.000 --> 00:28:30.000

We have seven types of grants.

00:28:30.000 --> 00:28:47.000

They're all available in detail, you can learn about them more specifically on our website@afsp.org slash research, but I just want to say a word about them, our distinguished investigator grant is for investigators who either get very experienced and

00:28:47.000 --> 00:29:01.000

suicide prevention research or a senior investigator who is now coming to the field of suicide prevention research. So a good example of a distinguished investigator grant.

00:29:01.000 --> 00:29:14.000

dR Aaron Ben, you got to distinguish investigator grant, because he wanted to develop an intervention for suicide, that relies on and is based in CPT now of course that was many years ago and we all.

00:29:14.000 --> 00:29:26.000

Well, maybe not all, but we all know about CVTSP which is cognitive behavior therapy for suicide prevention. And that started as a distinguished investigator grant.

00:29:26.000 --> 00:29:45.000

The next kind of grant is our standard research grant. And this grant, in a sense is equivalent to an NIH r1. It's an independent investigator grant usually for investigators who haven't some record of research, and some portfolio, preferably with suicide

00:29:45.000 --> 00:29:52.000

but you might be coming into the field but not at the distinguished investigator level. These are about \$100,000.

00:29:52.000 --> 00:29:54.000

For two year period.

00:29:54.000 --> 00:30:08.000

Our next grant categories, the young investigator grant, and I'm happy to say that we actually funded 20 do young investigator grants this year. So, this is a great this is like a dream come true.

00:30:08.000 --> 00:30:18.000

This is a for young investigator, this is a grant where it's an independent grant for the investigator, however you get to pay a mentor to mentor you.

00:30:18.000 --> 00:30:25.000

It's not a training grant, it's an independent researcher grant, but you have a mentor on board.

00:30:25.000 --> 00:30:41.000

Our postdoctoral fellowship research grant is funding, you to learn and develop your research career, and also to have a mentor, but the post doctoral research grant also has a training component.

00:30:41.000 --> 00:30:56.000

The pilot grant is a \$30,000 grant is the only grant that could be for one or two years, all our other.

00:30:56.000 --> 00:31:09.000

Are you gonna intervention or a new technique for looking at something real genetics related to suicide or something. It's really for these kind of breakthrough ideas, where we can be a little less.

00:31:09.000 --> 00:31:15.000

I want to say less stringent were always stringent about methodology, but a little more open to innovative work.

00:31:15.000 --> 00:31:34.000

And I linked standard research grant is a grant where two or more sites collaborate, they partner. There's an administrative poi and there's a PCI and each site, and each site contribute something unique to the study, so that the study could only be done

00:31:34.000 --> 00:31:46.000

if those two sites come to.

00:31:46.000 --> 00:32:03.000

We haven't got we have our essays for these three areas. One is short term risk so this is, if there's an intervention or an assessment. That seems promising in terms of identifying people at short term risk or intervening, that's what that grant is for

00:32:03.000 --> 00:32:08.000

so it's for the person who you're sitting in the office with someone.

00:32:08.000 --> 00:32:27.000

And you've got to either figure out what level their risk is intervene, or both is really short term three six months. The reaching 20% by 2025 is consistent with our project 2025 and focuses on intervention, implementing interventions that it brought

00:32:27.000 --> 00:32:47.000

to scale could reduce the rate of suicide significantly doesn't have to be 20%, but it contributes significantly, and the four areas of our project 2025, or large hospital systems particularly primary care, and mental health emergency departments, the

00:32:47.000 --> 00:33:03.000

gun owning community and correction system. So take a look at that grant. That's, I would say is for for really seasoned people. And then those are blue sky grant, which is this one it says it's for an incredibly novel idea that actually couldn't be done

00:33:03.000 --> 00:33:20.000

at the level of our innovation grants. And that doesn't mean just adding enough people so that you can you need more money but it actually has to require that kind of money so one of the grants that we have a blue sky grant is looking at a combination

00:33:20.000 --> 00:33:27.000

of genetics and imaging and psychosocial data together in a large data set.

00:33:27.000 --> 00:33:37.000

So, as you know, we fund to and could potentially fund three of these in focus grants.

00:33:37.000 --> 00:33:50.000

So, I want to say a word about our process because one of the things that our grants do is they're not definitive okay they're not big enough to really decide on something but what they really are.

00:33:50.000 --> 00:34:09.000

is the big enough to get to give some gravitas to an idea that then you could use our grants to go on and get a larger grant from a funding agency so for us grants that we funded actually about 70% of our grantees have gone on to secure federal funding

00:34:09.000 --> 00:34:20.000

or larger grants. And so we really see that as our capacity to fund super novel ideas that have never been done before.

00:34:20.000 --> 00:34:32.000

But our process is rigorous as you can see, I guess you can see from this cartoon most scientists regarded the new screen line peer review process is quite an improvement.

00:34:32.000 --> 00:34:50.000

We're really not beating you up, we're really trying to do is fun, the best research possible. So, our review process starts August one, our application portals, open so if you started something please go back and August one just double check that it's

00:34:50.000 --> 00:34:53.000

still there and, and or entered again.

00:34:53.000 --> 00:35:08.000

First we look at the grants to make sure they're all research grants you know occasionally there's a grant that is not really research it might be organization wants to evaluate their own work, or sometimes people mistake these other kinds of grants like

00:35:08.000 --> 00:35:25.000

like supporting a program, but for the most part people have submitted research grants that those grants so for example we got 217 applications last year, 216 of them went on to be assigned to outside expert reviewers.



00:35:25.000 --> 00:35:35.000

They could be from all over the world where an international grants program as you can tell, Mark is from Canada, but we fund grants are all over the world.

00:35:35.000 --> 00:35:38.000

This year we're funding and grants in Nigeria.

00:35:38.000 --> 00:35:49.000

We're very excited about that we're funding and granted a Paul so we really want to see all kinds of research here. So, the research goes to two outside experts.

00:35:49.000 --> 00:35:58.000

Sometimes one, you know, your grant may include several different areas of one person might be from one area and the other might be from another.

00:35:58.000 --> 00:36:13.000

Then the top scoring grants from that which is usually about half the grants goes on to be assigned to a member of our research grants committee and in fact our focus grants are assigned to to research grants committee members.

00:36:13.000 --> 00:36:24.000

And then about the top half of those get brought forward to our research grants meeting which is an April So you started in November one November 15 we're now in April.

00:36:24.000 --> 00:36:40.000

You can see why it's a very complex process. And those grants get discussed and reviewed in our research grants meeting. Those are the only grants that are actually where the applicants will receive a score, because that's the most rigorous review.

00:36:40.000 --> 00:36:57.000

If you make it to the research grants committee that's great, even if you don't get funded, that that's excellent. But even if you don't, you will actually get feedback, every applicant will give feedback from their reviewers.

00:36:57.000 --> 00:37:18.000

And we allow for up to two submissions, so we we give this extensive feedback to help grow and improve the field. And if you address that feedback. And if it's a promising study, you have, as you can see 40% of our grants this year were re submissions

00:37:18.000 --> 00:37:22.000

from previous years, and even on a third recent mission.

00:37:22.000 --> 00:37:35.000

Just as an example but not for me SSP. I got my NIMH r1 after on the third Greece submission so if it's really a Bible study. Don't give up.

00:37:35.000 --> 00:37:53.000

What happens after the grants are scored is we, we have a list we rank the grants from based on their score. And then we take our money and we go down the list until we either run out of solid grants worth funding or, dollars, somehow miraculously, it's

00:37:53.000 --> 00:37:56.000  
almost always at the same spot.

00:37:56.000 --> 00:38:15.000  
I don't know how that works, but usually we run out of, you know, fundable grants and find funding at the same time, we do allow up to two submissions, and you have an opportunity to address the reviewers concerns.

00:38:15.000 --> 00:38:20.000  
In a letter at the beginning of your application. So this is our grant cycle.

00:38:20.000 --> 00:38:28.000  
August 1, we open the portal, and they're do all the innovation grants or do November 15.

00:38:28.000 --> 00:38:33.000  
We do have a letter of intent for focus grants, that's do August one.

00:38:33.000 --> 00:38:38.000  
And then you may or may not be invited to apply for the focus grant.

00:38:38.000 --> 00:38:46.000  
And we have a letter of intent for our link standard research grant. That's do September 15.

00:38:46.000 --> 00:39:02.000  
These are not scientific reviews of your grant. We're just trying to make sure that you actually meet the criteria of the mechanism you're applying for because it would really not be fair to have you go through the entire process and then we say well

00:39:02.000 --> 00:39:12.000  
that's not really a focus grant you shouldn't have applied for that. So we want to you know in the beginning, give you an indication of whether or not it's at the level of those funding mechanisms.

00:39:12.000 --> 00:39:29.000  
As I said, we go through the review process in the spring, and in May, the grants first go to our scientific Council and then to our board for approval and July, our fiscal year starts so any grant that is approved, will be, you can start your grant,

00:39:29.000 --> 00:39:37.000  
July, 1, or later, we don't find grants, until the IRB approval is secured.

00:39:37.000 --> 00:39:46.000

And you have about six months to get your grant together and and get it up and running. So, we can talk more about that process.

00:39:46.000 --> 00:40:02.000

So it's a long process it's almost a year. It takes a while to give you the feedback, because they are individual letters that are generated from the feedback from the reviewers and we kind of tidy it up to make sure it's usable for you, so please if

00:40:02.000 --> 00:40:08.000

you've already applied and your resubmitting bear with us, they usually will all be out by September.

00:40:08.000 --> 00:40:24.000

So what's the ideal study well, innovative, we're looking for something that's going to move the needle. It includes a suicide outcome measure, but just to clarify if you have a group of people who've made a suicide attempt, and a group who hasn't and

00:40:24.000 --> 00:40:29.000

you're comparing them. that's considered your suicide outcome measure.

00:40:29.000 --> 00:40:36.000

Ultimately, somewhere down the road. It has to have potential for impact on suicide.

00:40:36.000 --> 00:40:39.000

Sound methodology is a must.

00:40:39.000 --> 00:40:58.000

Feel free to review our methods courses that are on our resources for researchers also investigators should have relevant expertise. You don't have to have all that expertise but your team should have expertise, including a, an established suicide researcher

00:40:58.000 --> 00:41:11.000

who can provide the guidance necessary as well as think about having a statistician, and then also any other areas that you're studying you're welcome to have co investigators and consultants.

00:41:11.000 --> 00:41:25.000

The study has to have evidence of feasibility. In other words, can you recruit the people that you say, maybe you don't have any pilot data but if you could show that you can get that pilot data because let's say you've done another study in the same

00:41:25.000 --> 00:41:44.000

facility, or you have run other genetic studies, whatever it is, just to show us that you can actually get it done. And by the way that includes if you're using data that's out there, a letter of approval, that you can have access to the data, if you're

00:41:44.000 --> 00:42:01.000

using sites that are not part of your facility. Then you ought to include letters of agreement to participate in the study from the sites you're using the investigators have a research track record and of course the various with the different mechanisms

00:42:01.000 --> 00:42:09.000

and expertise as well representative on your investigators and it adheres to the grant procedure manual.

00:42:09.000 --> 00:42:23.000

The manual is your guide as to everything about applying for a grant the expectations of your grant mechanism, and also a word about what to do once you get your grant.

00:42:23.000 --> 00:42:36.000

So everything you need to know can be found@fsp.org slash research. And if you have questions please feel free to contact us at grants manager@afsp.org.

00:42:36.000 --> 00:42:46.000

So, our mission is to save lives, lives and bring hope to those affected by suicide, and we hope you'll join us on that journey.

00:42:46.000 --> 00:42:52.000

At the end of the presentation part I hope that generated some questions.

00:42:52.000 --> 00:43:00.000

But before answering the questions was, we're going to save till the end. I'm going to turn everything over to our panel.

00:43:00.000 --> 00:43:03.000

Naomi we're going to start with you.

00:43:03.000 --> 00:43:07.000

Great, thank you. Can you hear me okay.

00:43:07.000 --> 00:43:09.000

Yeah. Okay.

00:43:09.000 --> 00:43:11.000

Perfect.

00:43:11.000 --> 00:43:26.000

Well that's probably a lot of information to digest all at once and, you know, I think a few highlights I just wanted to make. Having served on and now I'm leading the research grants committee that come up over and over again and some kind of pointers

00:43:26.000 --> 00:43:41.000

about how you think about this. I think the first to highlight is that many young investigators are funded through a variety of the mechanisms from the postdoctoral fellows to young investigator grants and also sometimes the pilot programs which are the

00:43:41.000 --> 00:43:57.000

\$30,000 grants can also be used by young investigators who are kind of doing initial proof of principle studies. I think the other point just to highlight again is that you don't necessarily need pilot data.

00:43:57.000 --> 00:44:12.000

And that these are really an incredible pathway towards feature larger grants, but you do need to be able to convince the review committee and the reviewers, that you can be successful at what you're saying you're going to accomplish.

00:44:12.000 --> 00:44:29.000

So maybe we don't know what your results will be but if you can't do this thing that you're putting forth, then that is a problem. So you do need to be able to show visibility, or provide enough support that someone reading your grant would think you're

00:44:29.000 --> 00:44:46.000

able to do what you're setting out to say you're going to do, so I think sometimes people leave that out. And I would say along those lines. Another issue that we sometimes see is the kitchen sink approach is not always better so more is not always better

00:44:46.000 --> 00:44:58.000

right well what we want and this is really true for all grants is to be able to follow what it is you're trying to do and see the story how you're getting from A to B, and why you're doing that.

00:44:58.000 --> 00:45:13.000

So, you know, I would say grant said don't do well throwing the kitchen sink, without any clarity about why they're doing that, just because you have access to more things doesn't make it better projects are more likely to be funded.

00:45:13.000 --> 00:45:27.000

And then I would say the most obvious things is really being sure that this is relevant to suicide or suicide survivors and believe it or not even with all of the things that are in the documents we do get grants where it really isn't.

00:45:27.000 --> 00:45:32.000

So if you just add one question about suicide. That isn't enough.

00:45:32.000 --> 00:45:48.000

I would say another thing is if you're going to be adding measures relevant to suicide to make sure that you look, you know, learn about what those measures are yourself and with a mentor, so that you select ones that are validated.

00:45:48.000 --> 00:45:59.000

Because the committee will look at that, like, you know, do you understand what you're measuring or how to measure it kind of thing and so it's not that hard to get the answers to those kinds of things.

00:45:59.000 --> 00:46:12.000

But those are things that I would keep in mind telling a clear story, you know, repeat your main points a couple of times that's better than knowing being able to figure out what you're trying to do sometimes simpler is better.

00:46:12.000 --> 00:46:28.000

Don't be afraid to do higher risk things because that's what a FSP is about as long as there is impact and you can do what you're, you're laying out to do in terms of what you're proposing to do in the project, even if we don't know if it will work or

00:46:28.000 --> 00:46:47.000

not, there was maybe one other, quote, another point I just wanted to also highlight, and perhaps this is also an issue near and dear to me is that we, year after year have not been getting a sufficient number of Sudafed survivor grants to consider and

00:46:47.000 --> 00:46:57.000

so I would really encourage anyone who is thinking about that area to think about that for a FSP submissions.

00:46:57.000 --> 00:47:12.000

Grant oh yeah And the final thing I would say is that, you know, another really wonderful thing and Jill maybe doesn't emphasize that enough, but by going through the committee are, you are getting an incredible amount of feedback so even if you don't

00:47:12.000 --> 00:47:30.000

get those, you know some high enough scores to get discussed on your first round you will still be getting to reviews and Jill does all of the work to pull back feedback for grants and if you do come to review, you're getting three, and even in for if

00:47:30.000 --> 00:47:31.000

it's the focus grants.

00:47:31.000 --> 00:47:42.000

Experts looking at your grant and providing feedback and another thing that's really wonderful about that is you actually get that feedback which doesn't always happen and foundations.

00:47:42.000 --> 00:48:00.000

It is a huge amount of effort and dedicated time. And it's important to attend to that feedback because if you think about it, it's gone through, especially if it's discussed, there's a room full of at least a dozen experts, talking about and reviewing

00:48:00.000 --> 00:48:15.000

providing feedback if you're discussed so take that feedback seriously, and if you do a read submission, you know really think about how you might want to change your brand and make sure you're responding point by point to each of those comments.

00:48:15.000 --> 00:48:29.000

Great, I do want to say something about the feedback first of all it's a team effort. First of all, from the reviewers. And then from Chris, and then myself but it is the reviewers feedback, it's not our feedback per se.

00:48:29.000 --> 00:48:48.000

You know I had this realization that, how many people are involved in just, you don't. This process. When we think about, we have the P eyes. The investigators, we have 220 scientific advisors, we have 17 people in our research grants committee, we have

00:48:48.000 --> 00:48:50.000

our tiny little team of three.

00:48:50.000 --> 00:49:09.000

Then you all have your institutions that have had people weigh in on every aspect of your grant the finances the institutional review board. So this endeavor really ends up taking thousands of people's effort to make it work and we realize how much it

00:49:09.000 --> 00:49:12.000

takes and so even the grants that are funded.

00:49:12.000 --> 00:49:29.000

That almost always get some little tweaking minor changes requested to make sure that it's it's the best possible grant that it could be. And you know I speak with so many applicants, either before, before the process or once they get the feedback to

00:49:29.000 --> 00:49:39.000

help problem solve around that and I sit in the meeting but I don't get a vote. So I'm here to help you Carl's here to help you as well.

00:49:39.000 --> 00:49:47.000

Okay, so let's say ever you want to say some give some points as both a young investigator and the shift to standard research.

00:49:47.000 --> 00:50:05.000

Sure, sure. I don't have anything like super prepared but I'll try to stay off the cuff, little bit about my experience applying and the benefits of applying to pray for speed grants, so I'll echo everything that's been said in terms of this being a frisbee

00:50:05.000 --> 00:50:16.000

really providing an incredible pathway for researchers and especially young career researchers who want to establish a research program and suicide prevention.

00:50:16.000 --> 00:50:28.000

I have been very fortunate to receive a postdoctoral Grant 315 2015, I applied for it. During my last year of my graduate school.

00:50:28.000 --> 00:50:45.000

And I think most importantly, it gave me you know the gift of time and as we know in research and academia, time is really a rare commodity so to be able to have two years to really develop research ideas instead of dabbling things.

00:50:45.000 --> 00:50:58.000

And also meet new collaborators and mentors has really, like, fundamentally, I feel like that that's really what has been the most helpful piece of this.

00:50:58.000 --> 00:51:13.000

And I would say for the postdoctoral grant especially to, I would advise people to give yourself a lot of time to develop a research idea one that you're excited about, to, to communicate with different people who can give you feedback and who can sort

00:51:13.000 --> 00:51:19.000

of pick apart, the idea so that you're feeling good about it you feel confident about it.

00:51:19.000 --> 00:51:28.000

I also ended up reaching out to people with whom I didn't necessarily work so my primary mentor was somebody with whom I have worked for a number of years.

00:51:28.000 --> 00:51:43.000

Cheryl king who was my graduate advisor and she's really a prominent figure in youth suicide prevention which is my area of research. I really wanted to dive into intervention development science, and so working with continue to work with Cheryl really

00:51:43.000 --> 00:51:55.000

makes sense. And at the same time I reached out to other people who became consultants, on, on my Prosecco grants who sort of expanded the scope of their work.

00:51:55.000 --> 00:52:07.000

And let me dive into some, some new areas, which for me was, assessing using ecological monetary assessment and do these surveys to to track how adolescents are doing after services.

00:52:07.000 --> 00:52:21.000

So I would just think creatively about what you're excited about and thinking about who already you have in your circle that you'd like to be your mentor, but also who maybe outside of that circle will bring additional expertise and help you develop in

00:52:21.000 --> 00:52:23.000

other areas.

00:52:23.000 --> 00:52:41.000

And then I'll just put an additional plug for the program because I felt like it really was such a turning point for me personally in terms of



having time to work on writing a career development grant that I submitted to NIMH which I was fortunate to

00:52:41.000 --> 00:52:56.000

get funded and that sort of really helped me extend that work that I that I initiated with a FSB so I feel if it, you know, if not for this be I'm not quite sure if I would have the time the pilot data, the collaboration so I established that would help

00:52:56.000 --> 00:53:12.000

me put together a strong NIMH application. and then very quickly I'm sure others will speak to that, with a senator grant I applied for senate grant. Last year, no 2019 I feel like time is escaping me nowadays.

00:53:12.000 --> 00:53:31.000

So in 2019 the project started last year in 2020 and we're still collecting data that project is veering away from intervention science more into assessing short term suicide risk using ama and using sensor data and that's a little bit of a kind of an

00:53:31.000 --> 00:53:51.000

old stomping ground with the AMA piece, but new with the sensor sensor data that's more of a new newer area for me so again I feel like a plus b has allowed me to kind of dive into, you know dabble in something new, something different that is an important

00:53:51.000 --> 00:53:57.000

area for for research in the field of suicide prevention.

00:53:57.000 --> 00:54:13.000

Great, thank you so much, and I am going to ask answer one of the questions that's here which is about the young investigator grant, and whether or not it's the same criteria as NIMH so our criteria are that you're within six years of your degree.

00:54:13.000 --> 00:54:25.000

And that your assistant professor or, or under I didn't like to say below, or less than that for you.

00:54:25.000 --> 00:54:42.000

Yeah, I think, was it will just after that your advisor however does have to be associate professor or full professor, or if it's equivalent, and they can only advise to two mentees at a time because we really want them to give you the attention that

00:54:42.000 --> 00:54:44.000

would be helpful.

00:54:44.000 --> 00:54:53.000

So Mark you want to go ahead. Yeah, thank you. And I guess just to be a, maybe a bit of a broken record I echo what everybody else has said.

00:54:53.000 --> 00:55:01.000

I think it's all really good advice and I'll say that I just I feel very very lucky to have gotten the grants from the FSB because frankly they really launched my career.

00:55:01.000 --> 00:55:14.000

And so, maybe what I could do is just sort of say things in two ways one give you sort of the overarching view and then, and then drill down onto some specific advice about a decade ago I was graduated from my residency, becoming an independent researcher,

00:55:14.000 --> 00:55:19.000

obviously, I was very interested in this topic but didn't have a lot of experience in it.

00:55:19.000 --> 00:55:33.000

I ended up identity, I became quite interested interested for a bunch of reasons that are too long to go into into why media reporting may have a big impact on suicides and identify the key gap in terms of understanding what we really don't fully understand

00:55:33.000 --> 00:55:41.000

the mechanism of how that works. And so I put in a grant, which was unsuccessful as a young investigator grant I'll tell you in a second why why it was unsuccessful.

00:55:41.000 --> 00:55:56.000

But I put in a grant that I got tons of really great feedback from the FSP about, and I put it back in the next year and was funded, and then did that and, you know, I think we learned a lot from it and actually identified another key gap which is that

00:55:56.000 --> 00:56:06.000

it turns out social media became a big thing and we didn't really know how it worked in social media so there was another key gap that I then put in another young investigator grant for which I was lucky enough to get funded for.

00:56:06.000 --> 00:56:17.000

And then in the midst of all that work. I ended up really, you know, we created a program in Canada for training and teaching the media but how to do a better job.

00:56:17.000 --> 00:56:18.000

Talking about suicide.

00:56:18.000 --> 00:56:29.000

And then the question was What did that do is that sort of thing effective if you do it in a country of our size and so that's what my current standard research grant is along with some other key questions, but the details are not that crucial the gaps

00:56:29.000 --> 00:56:32.000

that I identified may be very different from the ones that you do.

00:56:32.000 --> 00:56:45.000

But I think the key thing is that you have an idea that really will propel the field forward in some way. And then you kind of leverage it to try to figure out, well, how do I write a grant or a series of grants that may ultimately help, and actually

00:56:45.000 --> 00:56:56.000

all of that, because it's very hard to get granting in Canada instead of NIH we have this thing called ci HR, but all of that, productivity ultimately a year ago allowed me to get a very large kind of grant from our national granting agency.

00:56:56.000 --> 00:57:10.000

And so, I, none of that would be possible without the FSP and I would you know hope and suggest that if you guys are keen essentially try to follow that kind of model because it for me has been very successful and I've been very grateful for it.

00:57:10.000 --> 00:57:16.000

In terms of kind of going back to what was the issue with my original young investigator grant.

00:57:16.000 --> 00:57:30.000

I mean, first of all, as described you need to have a you know a good idea but you want that idea to be really methodological tightly written, you know, even though the FSB is not, you know, a large national you know like the NIH kind of governmental

00:57:30.000 --> 00:57:42.000

organization that the requirements are still quite rigorous in terms of making sure that things are methodological tight, and I did get a lot of feedback that first summer about how to tweak that grant and make it better.

00:57:42.000 --> 00:57:54.000

And one of the other things just as a key if you end up submitting and not being successful. Initially, is you want to make sure that you take that feedback and address absolutely everything that the committee tells you and very careful detail is the

00:57:54.000 --> 00:58:05.000

thing that's a big red flag on the, on the review is, we gave a bunch of comments and then they didn't really do anything with them so I spent a lot of time really trying to make that a much more polished grant and that was actually for me and my learning

00:58:05.000 --> 00:58:13.000

and my growth a very very useful experience. So if you get rejected, don't panic, maybe assume that actually that that's going to happen if you're lucky enough to get it great.

00:58:13.000 --> 00:58:16.000

If not, it's just an opportunity to learn and make your grant better.

00:58:16.000 --> 00:58:28.000

And then the other thing that I think might be very specific that could be helpful for people to know is I think initially, you know, not for any kind of negative reason but I made a bit of an error in terms of the mentor that I picked.

00:58:28.000 --> 00:58:40.000

I work in a, in a one of the largest teaching hospitals in Canada with a very high, sort of, also lucky with many many mentors who have more experience than I do.

00:58:40.000 --> 00:58:50.000

And I had one in the department who, you know, was a very, very key mentor for me who had published a few studies on suicide and wasn't but wasn't really a big name in the field.

00:58:50.000 --> 00:58:59.000

And I thought that it would be helpful to actually, you know have him as my main mentor. And I think in the way, in a way, it was actually an error to Eva's point.

00:58:59.000 --> 00:59:11.000

I think the FSB really wants the mentor to be someone who is a very kind of you know someone who's entrenched within suicide and really has a lot of experience within the suicide frame.

00:59:11.000 --> 00:59:24.000

And so what I ended up doing in the area of media reporting probably arguably sort of the the sort of the best known researcher, or one of them anyway with Jane purpose from Australia that I messaged her, and she said I'd love to be your mentor you have

00:59:24.000 --> 00:59:36.000

a great idea. And that's the other kind of piece of feedback I would give you, which is, you know, people in suicide are pretty friendly actually, you know I don't know all of them but it's from the ones I know everybody is really pretty nice and pretty

00:59:36.000 --> 00:59:46.000

kind. And so if it turns out that you have an idea and it fits with somebody who's in a different institution, reach out to them, or reach out to a couple of people I'm sure you'll find someone who's who's interested to try with you.

00:59:46.000 --> 00:59:58.000

And then of course what you want to do is then have strategic partners I still needed the mentorship locally and I still needed you know different kinds of expertise, independent of what Jane was able to provide for me, and I included all of those people

00:59:58.000 --> 01:00:05.000

as co investigators and in the end it really really strengthened my, my grant and that was why I was successful, and maybe I'll just stop there but I wish everybody.

01:00:05.000 --> 01:00:07.000  
Good luck.

01:00:07.000 --> 01:00:19.000  
You know, I want to say something about the feedback, which is what we've learned is that some people have taken the feedback that we've given and actually secured federal grants, without funding.

01:00:19.000 --> 01:00:40.000  
With that funding. So, it's meant to help you. You know it's meant to grow the field. The other thought is about young investigator grants that it's often a great either adjunct or pathway to K award to a career development award.

01:00:40.000 --> 01:00:50.000  
So keep that in mind as well. It doesn't keep you from getting a career development award, and it can supplement, a career development award.

01:00:50.000 --> 01:01:02.000  
I think we lost Carl is just going to ask him some questions. But let's take some of the questions from you guys really appreciate you asking and we're really here this is our goal to answer your questions.

01:01:02.000 --> 01:01:17.000  
So one question is are there any types of grants that are appropriate for graduate students, and we've funded several graduate students on with pilot grants, because that's usually the level of funding that's needed.

01:01:17.000 --> 01:01:33.000  
But if you're doing that, be sure not to say this is my dissertation I would be doing this anyway. And I just want to get funding for it, because that's not our goal is that you are invested in becoming a suicide prevention researcher, and that you really

01:01:33.000 --> 01:01:35.000  
want to do this study.

01:01:35.000 --> 01:01:46.000  
So, but yes we've, we've had several people with their masters and maybe pre doctoral getting particularly pilot grants, so I would encourage that.

01:01:46.000 --> 01:01:58.000  
Another question came up which is how do you evaluate studies which come from social science backgrounds, for example, study which uses retrospective data and evaluates policies.

01:01:58.000 --> 01:02:17.000  
So we do fund secondary data analysis, but only if you're creating a new data set by merging or linking different databases, so we're not going to fund you to take the data you have and sit around and analyze it, but we would fund you if you integrated

01:02:17.000 --> 01:02:34.000

several databases, like, you know, medical records database with death record base, that would be an example so you're creating a new database. There's that innovation uniquely for this study, or going forward, you know, we'd love for you to have let

01:02:34.000 --> 01:02:37.000

other people have access to it.

01:02:37.000 --> 01:02:49.000

But our advisors are so diverse that we've got someone who works in the field that you're in. But then, you're the main expert in your grant.

01:02:49.000 --> 01:02:55.000

But they will be able to give you feedback and evaluate it fairly.

01:02:55.000 --> 01:03:11.000

Yeah. So, then another question came up. I hope I answered that question if I didn't write back in the q amp a and let me do our pilot feasibility studies appropriate for young Investigator Award, or would you recommend the pilot award instead.

01:03:11.000 --> 01:03:20.000

Wondering what is recommended and how to choose the best fitting mechanism. So, it's okay with the group I'm going to answer that one too because more technical.

01:03:20.000 --> 01:03:27.000

First of all, in a way, all our studies of pilot studies, except the focus grants.

01:03:27.000 --> 01:03:41.000

Right, so we know that you're going to what you're going to hopefully use your study for is to ask a new question, and then get some idea sort of like a proof of concept about whether or not it's worth pursuing.

01:03:41.000 --> 01:03:57.000

So in that sense, a young investigator grant Oh pretty much all our grants are pilot studies, and we do tell our reviewers, not to rely solely on statistical power for deciding whether or not a grant is worth funding.

01:03:57.000 --> 01:04:13.000

And again we do that because we know we're not funding large enough studies sometimes for certain questions. But what I will recommend to you is if you don't have enough power, acknowledge that and indicate how you will know that you have a signal worth

01:04:13.000 --> 01:04:15.000

pursuing.

01:04:15.000 --> 01:04:16.000

Okay.

01:04:16.000 --> 01:04:29.000

Because, if you're going to go through all that you don't have enough power, then how do you know it's worth pursuing so include that in your grant application, you know, there, the reviewers and Naomi mark you can speak to this.

01:04:29.000 --> 01:04:44.000

They're looking for your thought process and how you got to what you got to, and it doesn't make sense. And so two other tips about that one is destroy you have a conceptual model for framing your study.

01:04:44.000 --> 01:04:57.000

Don't you know if you just say, I'm going to collect these data and I'm going to answer these questions, the reviewers left with wondering, well, how come like what's the big deal, what's your framework, how can we chose these measures and not those measures

01:04:57.000 --> 01:05:14.000

and they kind of go down that rabbit hole so have at least some theoretical or conceptual model for the reason you're studying what you're studying and let the reviewer know that you know that there are other approaches, and a little bit about your thought

01:05:14.000 --> 01:05:19.000

about how come you chose this model or model sometimes you have more than one model.

01:05:19.000 --> 01:05:35.000

I think Jonathan one one thing and follow up to this and some of the questions is like, it is important to realize, and if this is true most review boards, but especially for AFSP because we do consider such a broad range of research that you know you

01:05:35.000 --> 01:05:48.000

may have some members reviewing and you know they grants committee reviewing your grant, who aren't an expert in your area, be it genetic social science anything else so it's especially important to be clear.

01:05:48.000 --> 01:06:06.000

That's why you really need to be able to explain simply I mean you don't have to explain every level of detail, a core concepts have to be presented clearly enough and with not so many acronyms that only those who are experts in that one specified tiny

01:06:06.000 --> 01:06:12.000

niche would be able to read your grant. So I think that's also an important point.

01:06:12.000 --> 01:06:14.000

Mark.

01:06:14.000 --> 01:06:27.000

Yeah, I would just add that along those lines. I think a very, this is true, by the way, not just for EFSP but in general, I think it's really

helpful also true for papers, you know, write your grant, set it aside for a day or two, and then pick it up

01:06:27.000 --> 01:06:40.000

and pretend that your reviewer who has general knowledge has never heard of this story before and read through it and try to figure out where you get stuck, or where other people might get stuck and to Joe's point about acknowledging things, put yourself

01:06:40.000 --> 01:06:47.000

into the head of someone who's reviewing one of these grants. What you don't want if somebody says well there's five problems with this grant and they don't even mention it.

01:06:47.000 --> 01:06:54.000

It's different if you say Well listen, we know that there are these issues that exist and Nevertheless, this is a useful.

01:06:54.000 --> 01:07:05.000

You know granted in future studies will be able to account for it in the following ways, at least we say okay well this person's thought of everything and, you know, we can at least make a decision about, about whether that's reasonable.

01:07:05.000 --> 01:07:17.000

Yeah, I think that's, that's really helpful because your research is only, you know, we, you know, we all come to this with like big ideas about how we're going to answer things but real research is a process.

01:07:17.000 --> 01:07:24.000

And it's a step by step. And so, you run into trouble if you're quote overly ambitious.

01:07:24.000 --> 01:07:38.000

And so, two or three specific games, you know I wouldn't have more than that, because then you're biting off more than you can chew be really clear and I will go a step further from Mark and say give it to someone who knows nothing about what you're talking

01:07:38.000 --> 01:07:55.000

about, and get their feedback, and the other point I would make is get a copy of somebody else's grants if you can look through our abstracts are not the most detailed abstracts because the for the layperson, but get an idea of how, you know, how grants

01:07:55.000 --> 01:07:57.000

are written.

01:07:57.000 --> 01:08:13.000

But, assume that you might have to reviewers and they each know a part of your grant but nobody knows the whole thing. And the other pieces. Give your reviewer the words they need to support and and and really defend your grant.



01:08:13.000 --> 01:08:33.000

So like you want to write. What's innovative about this study is x, you know, the impact it will have is why my next step will be z. And really, really spell it out for them so they don't have to work real super hard to try and figure out how they could

01:08:33.000 --> 01:08:38.000

present this to the review committee.

01:08:38.000 --> 01:08:40.000

Any other thoughts about that.

01:08:40.000 --> 01:08:55.000

Okay, so there's another question, to what extent can distinguished Investigator Award be pursued by a senior faculty member with a strong track record and an area tangentially related to suicide prevention, but not suicide prevention or is it a mechanism,

01:08:55.000 --> 01:09:13.000

only for those already working in suicide prevention shifting areas of focus within the field that we welcome distinguished investigators from other fields to branch into the field of suicide research so you do have to have a strong track record of research,

01:09:13.000 --> 01:09:31.000

and you are up to have a suicide researcher on your grant to support you. If you're not that person. But no, we'd love to have you in the field, and just including your grant whoever you need to make it, you know, really there are certain issues that

01:09:31.000 --> 01:09:40.000

are related specifically to suicide so we'd love to bring out new researchers into the field.

01:09:40.000 --> 01:09:49.000

Let's say I might have missed this but please let us know the proportion of standard research grants, compared to focus grants that are funded.

01:09:49.000 --> 01:09:59.000

And whether you need pilot data for these submissions so I think this is the difference between the focus grant and the standard and I'm going to answer this because this is again a more technical question.

01:09:59.000 --> 01:10:16.000

So the focus grants really are for things that have already been demonstrated and now you're at the point of implementation, at least for the short term risk, and the reaching 20 by 2025, the blue sky grant is for extremely novel ideas that absolutely

01:10:16.000 --> 01:10:30.000

could not be done in the, in the innovation grant categories. So, I can't tell you what proportion of studies are standard research grants because every year it's different.

01:10:30.000 --> 01:10:46.000

Again, because each category of grants is reviewed together so all the distinguished investigators are reviewed together the standard research grants, so that we keep the same level of evaluation but of course the young investigator grants well rigorous

01:10:46.000 --> 01:11:00.000

or at a different level than what you'd expect from a distinguished investigator. But when it comes to funding it's really like lining up the scores and like all scores are equal and lining up the money.

01:11:00.000 --> 01:11:06.000

So we've had years like this year we don't have any distinguished investigators grants another year we had six.

01:11:06.000 --> 01:11:22.000

So I can't tell you what proportion but I could tell you that we are funding 35 innovation grants and to focus grants, the focus grants are highly competitive and you know we can't actually fund more than two and sometimes three, depending on the other

01:11:22.000 --> 01:11:34.000

grants, so you really, you know, we want those focus grants, but we don't want them just for an attempt to get more funds

01:11:34.000 --> 01:11:43.000

is FSB open to applications from social science field example evaluating the impact of social or environmental conditions on suicide mental health. Absolutely.

01:11:43.000 --> 01:11:53.000

Absolutely. We are open to anything related to suicide we've actually funded grants that look at allergens and pollution and relation to suicide rates.

01:11:53.000 --> 01:12:00.000

If there is a reason to believe that it has an association or impact on suicide or understanding suicide.

01:12:00.000 --> 01:12:18.000

We're interested but if you're not sure, contact us and we can have a conversation about whether or not you know it's it's consistent with a FSB. The other thing I would say is if you have a couple of ideas and you're not sure which one to do one thing

01:12:18.000 --> 01:12:24.000

to do first before you contact us is decide which one you want to spend your time doing.

01:12:24.000 --> 01:12:30.000

That's probably the better way to go, but we can always help you with that.

01:12:30.000 --> 01:12:45.000

You think it's a good point just to underscore that because I see a lot of technical questions that you can. This isn't your only opportunity to ask the technical questions so if you have them as you're working through like you're not sure if this person

01:12:45.000 --> 01:12:55.000

qualifies for that one. you can send those questions through the contact information, and a FST it's really amazing it, giving back to.

01:12:55.000 --> 01:12:58.000

We're here to help you.

01:12:58.000 --> 01:13:02.000

I hope you guys have found that out.

01:13:02.000 --> 01:13:09.000

At least our panelists you know that we're on your team we want you to get funded we want these studies to toe.

01:13:09.000 --> 01:13:16.000

So, just check in with us, or to if you know also somebody else has been funded, you can talk with them.

01:13:16.000 --> 01:13:26.000

I don't know if you all know about the international summit for suicide research that's going to be. It's going to be virtual this year. So in two years we'll go to Barcelona, It's going to be fantastic though.

01:13:26.000 --> 01:13:40.000

We have great topics and we have a whole like virtual area where you connect have conversations with people. So I do recommend that it's a great time to connect with people and also learn about new research.

01:13:40.000 --> 01:13:56.000

The other thing we're going to have a symposium to encourage research on survivors of suicide last September 23 will have a notice going out about it so if you're thinking about it, you know, attend this webinar, which will talk about both reasons to

01:13:56.000 --> 01:14:10.000

study survivors of suicide loss but also methodological and grant application considerations for that area. So again, we're really here to help you.

01:14:10.000 --> 01:14:16.000

And rails want to have a make a comment, for I go into the next question.

01:14:16.000 --> 01:14:20.000

And I might just say some of these questions are reminding me to that.

01:14:20.000 --> 01:14:42.000

I think that there are, you know, very rich clinical programs may not have researchers embedded in them that work to find researchers to

support their work and that is a wonderful thing that can be really terrific but it can also, if not set up in a grant

01:14:42.000 --> 01:14:52.000

properly lead to a lot of questions like how is this going to work, like, do you have a mechanism to do research at your site and how are you going to coordinate.

01:14:52.000 --> 01:15:08.000

So, if you do that, which can be a fabulous thing to do. If you have a large patient population, it's very important to work ahead of time with your collaborator and in research to think about that like how are you going to get IRB approval, who is going

01:15:08.000 --> 01:15:25.000

to keep the data in a way that's protected and protecting confidentiality like to make sure you think about the feasibility questions because we will end up you know with those issues coming up frequently in those types of situations.

01:15:25.000 --> 01:15:44.000

Yeah, yeah. Link grant that you are on Naomi actually was an interesting one because they had an NIH grant to study complicated grief and treatment, and we funded them to collect a sample of people who were survivors of suicide loss with complicated grief.

01:15:44.000 --> 01:15:56.000

And so, you know, it was kind of in a way piggybacked on to the grant but it was really a separate grant. And so we've talked about. We like supplemental grants, that's a great example.

01:15:56.000 --> 01:16:11.000

We don't a supplemental grant isn't to give you extra money to supplement what you're already doing. But to take advantage of something that you're already doing to study something unique for your study so in that case it was having a specific group of

01:16:11.000 --> 01:16:21.000

survivors of suicide loss. And so we learned a tremendous amount in the field from that study, just those I think there was 72 people.

01:16:21.000 --> 01:16:27.000

And this is just incredibly informative so that's a good example of a supplemental study.

01:16:27.000 --> 01:16:37.000

Someone asked a research should apply even if they're not affiliated with an organization, or we do not have any researchers on staff but we were spoken with many who are willing to help.

01:16:37.000 --> 01:16:47.000

Yes partner with a researcher, we find all kinds of studies that are in nonprofit clinical settings.

01:16:47.000 --> 01:17:04.000

There's no researcher there, and we can even help match you up sometimes if we if we know where you are. We know researchers doing that so it's great to partner with a researcher, you do need in a way an institution that has an intern, institutional review

01:17:04.000 --> 01:17:05.000

board.

01:17:05.000 --> 01:17:16.000

And because you're going to have to get IRB approval. But, yeah, partner with a researcher and, you know, facilitate their coming in, restructuring with you.

01:17:16.000 --> 01:17:21.000

That's great option.

01:17:21.000 --> 01:17:22.000

Okay.

01:17:22.000 --> 01:17:36.000

If you already halfway through an NIH career development award, are you beyond the young investigator also young investigator Do you have to be six years from your terminal degree or six years, from the end of your postdoc, that's a good question.

01:17:36.000 --> 01:17:43.000

So six years in your current field I mean we've had people who were in other fields and went back to school.

01:17:43.000 --> 01:17:58.000

And then, now they are they're new to this field of study but it's six years from your, your last your last degree is I think the way to think about it.

01:17:58.000 --> 01:18:12.000

Of course if you if you're like a lot of people are for instance MDS are PhDs and they go back to get an MPH. But you've been working in the field for a long time no that's that probably doesn't qualify you as, as a young investigator.

01:18:12.000 --> 01:18:30.000

We're happy to fund young investigators during the course of their career development grant. So, that is not a problem for us as long as you're really clear about how is it different from your career development crap.

01:18:30.000 --> 01:18:39.000

Okay, any guidance on the most important aspects beyond those listed in the guidance to touch on for focus grant letters of intent.

01:18:39.000 --> 01:18:55.000

So, letters of intent. We literally have a checklist of the, of the RFA, and we go through everything that's in the RFA you know do is are they assessing people who are at suicide risk for suicide.

01:18:55.000 --> 01:18:59.000

That's a, that's a big one for the short term risk.

01:18:59.000 --> 01:19:17.000

Is it an established assessment or intervention tool like it's not for developing new tools, it's for testing and doing implementation science on tools that are already developed so we literally have a checklist for each RFA that just takes the RFA and

01:19:17.000 --> 01:19:26.000

everything we say, and then to have us review it to make sure it meets and again the big question is isn't really a focus grant.

01:19:26.000 --> 01:19:30.000

Now, if we say no, this isn't really a focus grant.

01:19:30.000 --> 01:19:44.000

This is likely that will recommend and welcome you to apply for an innovation grant. So, if you're lLoY is an approved to apply for that for the focus grant, it doesn't preclude you from applying with one of the other mechanisms.

01:19:44.000 --> 01:19:48.000

I hope that answer that question.

01:19:48.000 --> 01:19:57.000

Okay. Can you elaborate on what is considered suicide measure for example does recruit the sample population with a history of ideation count.

01:19:57.000 --> 01:20:03.000

Maybe one of you want to take that question because I think you should know the answer that.

01:20:03.000 --> 01:20:11.000

It does have to be suicide or could it be suicidal ideation or people have made an attempt.

01:20:11.000 --> 01:20:30.000

So I can just speak to the the studies that I that I applied the grants that I apply to. So, some of the outcomes in my studies where we're not suicide because it's relatively very bad it's really difficult to study we need a very large sample size, but

01:20:30.000 --> 01:20:45.000

something like thoughts of suicide rate of suicide ideation or suicide attempt or the the broader outcome of suicidal behavior that encompasses things like a border interrupted or or actual suicide attempt would could work, and I would just think about

01:20:45.000 --> 01:20:59.000

it relates to the research question, and the framing of the study and what makes sense in terms of the study that that you're proposing for the the more the more pilot studies.

01:20:59.000 --> 01:21:15.000

We may not be necessarily powered, even to study things like suicide attempt outcomes, but certainly you could collect that data and and or preliminary fashion event to show that it's a feasible approach to collect such data.

01:21:15.000 --> 01:21:20.000

But certainly, things like citation could be studied as well.

01:21:20.000 --> 01:21:34.000

I think the main point is that it still has to be a central point of your grant related to something related to suicide or people who experienced suicidal ideation.

01:21:34.000 --> 01:21:47.000

So, you know, I found a simple answer like if you said well we were just going to take people who have any time in their life. One said a brief passing thought but it's really about weight loss or something else, like you'd have to make enough of an argument

01:21:47.000 --> 01:22:05.000

why that's important to suicide and suicide prevention, or the experience of suicidal ideation and or risk factors understanding risk you have it has to be related to this topic and not just thrown in there as an incidental issue.

01:22:05.000 --> 01:22:07.000

Yeah.

01:22:07.000 --> 01:22:21.000

Yeah, so so we understand that people have suicidal ideation that that's a sign of distress. And that most people who have suicidal ideation will not go on, I feel like I'm quoting you mark because you have we have you saying this on a video.

01:22:21.000 --> 01:22:29.000

Most people who have suicidal ideation will not go on to make an attempt, and, and, or die by suicide.

01:22:29.000 --> 01:22:37.000

But because it's also the case that 60% of people who died by suicide die on their first attempt.

01:22:37.000 --> 01:22:46.000

We can't just focus on suicide, and we understand that suicidal ideation is a distress in its own right.

01:22:46.000 --> 01:23:02.000

Now, if you're using ideation as a criteria for inclusion in a study, we most often will ask you to include people with moderate to severe ideation because you won't be able to measure a change in ideation.

01:23:02.000 --> 01:23:18.000

If they don't really you know they have very mild or infrequent ideation So, but having suicidal ideation as your outcome measures perfectly fine, or including people who have suicidal ideation.

01:23:18.000 --> 01:23:21.000

Okay.

01:23:21.000 --> 01:23:29.000

Another question do you find qualitative studies as well are you interested in immigrant populations as well yes we're finding a new study on immigrant populations.

01:23:29.000 --> 01:23:44.000

Sorry, I got excited about that one. To study understudied and underrepresented groups example that next Asian Americans etc. I think collecting the rich data from those groups members very much, such as interviews or observations.

01:23:44.000 --> 01:23:56.000

So, if you take a look at our priorities, you'll see that diversity is in fact, one of our research priorities, which wasn't my slide deck, but because my computer crashed in the middle, and clearly disappeared.

01:23:56.000 --> 01:24:17.000

Clearly disappeared. So, Naomi you're nodding you want to say I would say, you know, we definitely do get grants that use qualitative methods and really there isn't like a method specific criteria, but any method that you use needs to be a rigorous method,

01:24:17.000 --> 01:24:33.000

and you need to, you know, show that you're, you know going to be developing usable information through that method and provide some support for why that is a reasonable approach to what you're trying to do.

01:24:33.000 --> 01:24:37.000

So I would say that would be to like in a qualitative grant.

01:24:37.000 --> 01:24:50.000

You know there is a field of qualitative research so as long as you're aligning with that type of approach and the state of the evidence and explaining why this is a helpful approach, there's something that would say it would do any worse than any other

01:24:50.000 --> 01:24:53.000

approach

01:24:53.000 --> 01:24:55.000

argues qualitative data.

01:24:55.000 --> 01:25:08.000

Yeah, I'm actually all of my studies have use qualitative data and I guess, you know, back to just, I think repeating what's already been said



I think the key thing is just that suicide is somehow central to the question and there's a, there's an advanced

01:25:08.000 --> 01:25:16.000

I mean, just sort of think about how our meeting works we take a whole bunch of, you know, people on the ground committee who have all their different backgrounds you read all these different grants.

01:25:16.000 --> 01:25:28.000

And the question is, is this a really well designed study that will propel the field forward. And so it doesn't doesn't matter what that kind of study is, that's really the key question and so you don't have a leg up, based on your area I don't think

01:25:28.000 --> 01:25:45.000

just based on what you've put together and whether we buy this it'll, it'll push things forward, to not scare people off based on that comment right like you know in a smaller grant, we wouldn't expect you to have a huge impact.

01:25:45.000 --> 01:26:01.000

That will be implemented and disseminate write it but what is the story, why is this important how, what is the potential to move the field for Yeah, I think, to keep that in mind because I think sometimes people edit themselves out, and don't put in

01:26:01.000 --> 01:26:04.000

higher risk high reward.

01:26:04.000 --> 01:26:18.000

If they don't feel they can get the final answer and we don't need the final answer we need to story why this is an important line of work and how this would make a step forward and, you know, I saw some questions like, it has to make a bigger step for

01:26:18.000 --> 01:26:32.000

it if you're focused grant, of course you need a better argument because that's a much larger amount of money. If you're a small grant, then you know you don't need to have as much of an immediate impact but your, your goal needs to have an impact.

01:26:32.000 --> 01:26:43.000

Yeah. Maybe I should qualify myself I'm sorry didn't mean to scare anybody off what I mean I'm putting things forward I guess the idea is let's say you you know you're starting today and you really want to get too deep.

01:26:43.000 --> 01:26:55.000

and can we sort of see that that linkage will take us to somewhere, or is it really not going somewhere I think that's really the question doesn't have to be that it's the be all and end all. And I think the other thing maybe just to highlight that you said is we do look

01:26:55.000 --> 01:27:11.000

said is we do look at, like, how is this different from what's out there so if people never read the literature, and you're the you know 2000 person just because you have a sample of convenience that you can show again, that won't be seen as having a

01:27:11.000 --> 01:27:19.000

large impact because it's a well known piece of information so I think that's the other part maybe Mark what you're getting at.

01:27:19.000 --> 01:27:22.000

Yeah, we don't actually fund replication studies.

01:27:22.000 --> 01:27:42.000

The closest we come is in the, in the RFA is for short term risk, and for treating reaching 20% by 2025 in their implementation studies but then you have to, you know, use the principles of implementation science which we had a webinar about last week,

01:27:42.000 --> 01:27:54.000

so you check on our website, it will be up soon. The other thing is out, I can tell you that we've had a number of studies with envy DRS national violent death reporting system.

01:27:54.000 --> 01:28:10.000

And they're often asked so that's a database. They're often asked is there any way that you could bring in some qualitative data by interviewing and gathering qualitative information so it's definitely valued and then the other part of this question is

01:28:10.000 --> 01:28:26.000

about underrepresented populations. And that is one of our priorities we have three priorities that are set and you can read them on our website. One is diversity, either funding grants about underrepresented populations or by members of the underrepresented

01:28:26.000 --> 01:28:37.000

population, or both. And the second one is technology really from an implementation science point of view which is that we have thousands of apps.

01:28:37.000 --> 01:28:40.000

Not so much for suicide prevention but.

01:28:40.000 --> 01:28:59.000

But do we know if it works or not. And so we need to move that field forward. And then the third is survivors of suicide loss. Now our priorities are not the goal the priorities is to stimulate research in understudied areas, but it doesn't mean that

01:28:59.000 --> 01:29:11.000

we're not interested in your study that's not an a priority, we're interested in all possible studies, but we call those areas to tension because we want to stimulate more research.

01:29:11.000 --> 01:29:26.000

So, and it's works, we found we set the priorities we stimulate research and then that moves the field forward to. So, we're funding five studies that involve technology and 11 that involve underrepresented populations in the next year.

01:29:26.000 --> 01:29:34.000

And that doesn't mean they're about that. They may just for instance include an underrepresented population.

01:29:34.000 --> 01:29:36.000

In some aspect.

01:29:36.000 --> 01:29:49.000

So, it's fine if you're not applying for a priority area but if you are, you know, just mentioned that in your first paragraph.

01:29:49.000 --> 01:29:54.000

Please let us know the difference. By the way, you're welcome to sit thank you for the discussion.

01:29:54.000 --> 01:30:09.000

The difference between a link standard Richard grant and a standard research grant. Okay, so a link standard research grant is when you have two or more sites, each site, contributing a unique aspect of the study.

01:30:09.000 --> 01:30:22.000

And then, preferably that all participants aren't collecting data so I'll give you an example we funded three researchers in the days when it wasn't so you didn't get \$450,000.

01:30:22.000 --> 01:30:28.000

So we funded three researchers to study cognition across the lifespan, in relation to suicide.

01:30:28.000 --> 01:30:45.000

So all three investigators use the same measures. One was a child researcher one a general adult researcher one geriatric researcher, and so they all collected data using the same measures, and they all, they, they collected the bulk of the data from

01:30:45.000 --> 01:30:55.000

their area, but added to it, I believe it was 10 people from the other two areas, so that you didn't just have a site differential.

01:30:55.000 --> 01:31:14.000

So that's an example of link grant and gun near you can go to our website and look at our grants, and you can sort by type of grant get an idea, a standard research grant is an independent investigator or, and you build your team but it's, it's, it's

01:31:14.000 --> 01:31:21.000

your grant without that partnership where there's two p eyes, one for each site.

01:31:21.000 --> 01:31:23.000  
Hope that answers.

01:31:23.000 --> 01:31:32.000  
Can you distinguish for two what will and won't fund get won't fund regarding programming do fund research to develop a program through the pilot grant.

01:31:32.000 --> 01:31:47.000  
We have developed the. Just so you know, we've developed, we have funded the development of DVTCVTSPABFT, a program for reinstating kids back in school after a suicide attempt.

01:31:47.000 --> 01:32:03.000  
So yes, the pilot grant is a great way to develop for instance a manual, and test it and revise it, and then do another pilot with it, without, you know, having to do a full RCT.

01:32:03.000 --> 01:32:19.000  
So, yeah, not sure if this is what they were getting at, but what what we don't fund through these research mechanisms are the development of clinical programs that are not including research.

01:32:19.000 --> 01:32:23.000  
That's what they were getting out by program, I agree.

01:32:23.000 --> 01:32:39.000  
I think we will we will fund the development of a clinical program, but it has to have a research, the development has to be based in research, but it may ultimately be applied in clinical settings.

01:32:39.000 --> 01:32:50.000  
But what we did we all find a clinical setting to evaluate their program, so that they can make their own program better, it has to be generalizable

01:32:50.000 --> 01:33:08.000  
clinical program like if someone didn't have CVT available in their area. This way I can let some wouldn't just be there to make a CBP clinical program without any research on that so I might have misinterpreted that but I thought, well, they're treating

01:33:08.000 --> 01:33:14.000  
the two of us we've covered the basis on that so can't hurt right. Thank you.

01:33:14.000 --> 01:33:27.000  
Can you talk about the blue sky method, mechanism would you consider a study of school based suicide prevention program as appropriate for this mechanism mechanism if it's highly innovative, you know these really have to be considered on a case by case

01:33:27.000 --> 01:33:41.000

basis, if the thing that makes it blue sky is that you're going to have a lot of people. That's not going to make it a blue sky grant. It really has to be something that hasn't been studied before.

01:33:41.000 --> 01:34:00.000

And as I said like the grant that we have which is looking at genetics and imaging and psychosocial data and then integrating all them and it uses the data from three different sites from Iowa Utah, and Yale University so that you know that can't happen

01:34:00.000 --> 01:34:16.000

without more funds. School Program is a little tricky because you can at least get it off the ground for, get it going with the smaller grant, and then apply for federal larger grant with those data.

01:34:16.000 --> 01:34:22.000

So, but, you know, give us a call. We're happy to talk with you about it.

01:34:22.000 --> 01:34:30.000

or we'll look at your alumni, but we can always help you figure out if it. If it fits or not.

01:34:30.000 --> 01:34:42.000

But I would say if we say no, this doesn't fit, pay attention to that we once had an applicant who they were told that it didn't fit the mechanism and then they replied with the same mechanism.

01:34:42.000 --> 01:34:49.000

When they did use the appropriate mechanism they were actually funded. So,

01:34:49.000 --> 01:35:09.000

question of how often are the grants that are funded supplemental, we're actually trying to increase this, because we see that as a great opportunity to study suicide or advanced suicide prevention research by joining forces on a larger grant, again it

01:35:09.000 --> 01:35:22.000

just has to be unique going so it can have its own IRB it's there's no overlap of funding per se, which you'll be asked to describe anyway.

01:35:22.000 --> 01:35:37.000

But we're a cartridge charging supplements, like the one Naomi was involved with because we learned so much from it and we wouldn't have had that at all, without having the structure already built in.

01:35:37.000 --> 01:35:53.000

Is it an SSI topic of interest or should we focus on suicide itself so non suicidal self injury is a topic of interest. As long as you can make the connection to to suicide.

01:35:53.000 --> 01:36:05.000

And, and we know there's a connection so that's not too hard to make others thoughts about that. We've definitely funded studies that involved in SSI.

01:36:05.000 --> 01:36:18.000

Just to say it's one of the number one risk factors for ultimate suicide death. So, I mean, as long as you. You have to build the case right that it matters to this area and then ultimately you could advance suicide prevention is Jill says I think is

01:36:18.000 --> 01:36:20.000

pretty should be pretty easy to do.

01:36:20.000 --> 01:36:24.000

Yeah, we've definitely funded grants looking at them.

01:36:24.000 --> 01:36:31.000

Looking at samples with Jessica and SSI. So, again, take a look at our abstracts.

01:36:31.000 --> 01:36:40.000

Can you say a bit more about researching primary prevention the focus was a risk and protective factors of suicide suicidal ideation.

01:36:40.000 --> 01:36:42.000

That is a good question.

01:36:42.000 --> 01:36:52.000

We do fund primary prevention activities. And again, you do need to make the case of what your proxy measure is.

01:36:52.000 --> 01:36:58.000

But you can't just say we're studying depression because a lot of people who died by suicide have depression.

01:36:58.000 --> 01:37:04.000

Somehow you have to link it in some way.

01:37:04.000 --> 01:37:06.000

It's a fair way to.

01:37:06.000 --> 01:37:18.000

And then, another question we're really excited to say that starting this year, we will be funding indirect costs at 8%. This is a big change for us.

01:37:18.000 --> 01:37:30.000

But we're excited that will be doing that, except for the postdoc because obviously that's the training. grant. But, yeah, we will be.

01:37:30.000 --> 01:37:44.000

We will be allowing indirect costs so we hope that brings more people on board who haven't been able to apply because they because until this point we have it.

01:37:44.000 --> 01:38:01.000

Thanks, is a FSB interested in funding parent interventions of children who have attempted suicide yes we've funded many, and they're really helpful and important whether it's helping parents to intervene, or parent counseling or anything, I mean you

01:38:01.000 --> 01:38:10.000

could. I'm forgetting this out there, nobody's done it but, you know, talking about to parents about if they've lost somebody to suicide What did they say beforehand.

01:38:10.000 --> 01:38:25.000

I mean, yes, that's the bottom line is, we're interested in anything, we really want to be preventing suicide. And Chris has been great at telling us what time it is.

01:38:25.000 --> 01:38:33.000

And we just have a couple of minutes left, so I think it would be good.

01:38:33.000 --> 01:38:44.000

Somebody asked about the indirect costs will be on top of the amount that's budget. So if it's \$100,000 grant, you can get \$108,000.

01:38:44.000 --> 01:38:46.000

Just to clarify that question.

01:38:46.000 --> 01:38:55.000

So I'd like to go around and just ask each of you to say pearl of wisdom or something.

01:38:55.000 --> 01:39:11.000

And I try a different I'm going to go in reverse order. So, not that it's reverse or whatever but more. Why don't you start. Oh, I guess you know what just what I would say for the really, especially the junior investigators I'll just underscore the comment

01:39:11.000 --> 01:39:23.000

not to put the kitchen sink in Jill's advice to have two or three names is really good. I will point out that it doesn't mean that you only have two or three ideas you probably have lots and lots of different ideas, write a really tight grant around a

01:39:23.000 --> 01:39:32.000

couple of very achievable outcomes, get funded, do what you say in the grant, and you can always do more things, you know with the data that you've compiled later we do that all the time.

01:39:32.000 --> 01:39:44.000

And of course, FSU will be very happy with, with more studies than than what you promised initially. So, but just keep it as tight as you can and good luck to everybody.

01:39:44.000 --> 01:39:46.000

ever you want to go.

01:39:46.000 --> 01:39:47.000

Yeah.

01:39:47.000 --> 01:40:07.000

So yeah, I'll echo what Mark said and also speaking as a fairly new kind of early career person I would say that really hone your idea, take advantage of the circle around you but also reach out to other people look at look at it as an opportunity to

01:40:07.000 --> 01:40:14.000

put your ideas together, even if it doesn't get funded on the first try to get lots of great feedback.

01:40:14.000 --> 01:40:27.000

And I feel like, speaking for myself I I didn't quite had a lot of confidence when I was applying to face to face be funding I was very surprised that it got funded so you just never know.

01:40:27.000 --> 01:40:42.000

And I would say don't be afraid to go for it and have have people look at it and really kind of open yourself up to feedback and critique, because it really really help you improve your writing your idea generation and kind of go for that happy medium

01:40:42.000 --> 01:40:53.000

of innovation, but not too ambitious, to show feasibility I think they're just like all these kind of secret sauces that people who are more experienced will tell you about so definitely get feedback and go for it.

01:40:53.000 --> 01:40:55.000

Don't be. Don't be afraid.

01:40:55.000 --> 01:41:11.000

Right, thank you. Naomi. Yeah, I think these are all really outstanding points. Another thing I would say is you know respect your own experience about where the gaps in knowledge are so you know if you start there and you're passionate about an area

01:41:11.000 --> 01:41:27.000

where we just don't have enough information or tools or understanding, you know, make sure you go to the literature and get good advisors if this is a new area to you but that is a very important place to start.

01:41:27.000 --> 01:41:43.000

You know where, what can you do that would make a difference because you know that there's a gap in our understanding tools knowledge approaches in that area thats related to suicide suicide prevention survivors of suicide loss any of those areas and

01:41:43.000 --> 01:41:49.000

and you know that will be considered strongly by the committee as well.



01:41:49.000 --> 01:41:56.000

So I just want to say thank you all for attending. You know, we're passionate group of people.

01:41:56.000 --> 01:42:17.000

Because, you know, suicide is a sign of pain, and it's not really a wish for death and so many people are affected by it and while we still can prevent all suicides, we can really learn more and do a better job in suicide prevention, and I hope you all

01:42:17.000 --> 01:42:26.000

join this field or keep pursuing it if you're already in it, and speak to people as everyone said come to the summit.

01:42:26.000 --> 01:42:37.000

Join our webinars, and we look forward to seeing your grants and please ask us ask if you have a question, don't hesitate we've heard it all.

01:42:37.000 --> 01:42:53.000

And when you finish your research we will be sharing it with the general population which is such a rewarding experience, not that I don't mind, presenting in front of my peers, but when a person who's had lived experience or lost someone to suicide asks

01:42:53.000 --> 01:42:55.000

you a question.

01:42:55.000 --> 01:43:09.000

It's so powerful and meaningful and it's really, I think growth and juicing so thank you all for coming. I hope we got to most if not all of your questions but go to the website [afsp.org](http://afsp.org) slash restart.

01:43:09.000 --> 01:43:25.000

and we look forward to seeing your applications.