

NIH should focus on devising the better funding review strategy

Yoshiyasu Takefuji

Jocelyn Kaiser et al. wrote an article entitled “Amid fears of idea theft, NIH targets foreign funding links” (1). A country that has economical leeway is generous to foreign people. For example, at the beginning of the 1980s in US universities, there was no scholarship difference between foreign students and US-citizen students. The strong term “idea theft” may mislead. The NIH’s mission is to uncover new knowledge that will lead to better health for **“everyone”**. Simply described, the goal of NIH research is to acquire new knowledge to help prevent, detect, diagnose, and treat disease and disability. The term **“everyone”** in the NIH’s mission should be changed into “people in US” . I agree that it is important for NIH to look to punish reviewers who violate confidentiality (1,2). However, NIH should focus on devising the better funding review strategy. Diversity plays a key role in real peer-reviewed evaluations. Grant application review is similar to paper peer review. Derek Lowe stated that great papers that have been rejected (3). Because, NIH’s review is lacking in diversity. The current NIH’s citation-based strategy does not work at all. John P.A. et al. mentioned that review articles receive more citations than articles with new empirical data (4). Editorial also states that reviews receive higher citations than original research papers (5). The review paper authors may not have contributed anything to the discoveries they summarized, yet they end up getting the credit for them (6). NIH should focus on devising the better funding review strategy

#### References:

1. Jocelyn Kaiser et al., Amid fears of idea theft, NIH targets foreign funding links, *Science* 361 (6405), 834
2. <http://science.sciencemag.org/content/360/6384/17>
3. Derek Lowe, Great Papers That Have Been Rejected, September 10, 2013  
[http://blogs.sciencemag.org/pipeline/archives/2013/09/10/great\\_papers\\_that\\_have\\_been\\_rejected](http://blogs.sciencemag.org/pipeline/archives/2013/09/10/great_papers_that_have_been_rejected)
4. John P.A. et al., Citation Metrics: A Primer on How (Not) to Normalize, *PLOS biology*, September 6, 2016
5. Citation data: the wrong impact, *Nature Neuroscience* 1, 641 - 642 (1998)
6. Blog of neuroskeptic, "Ethics of citations," March 12, 2017  
<http://blogs.discovermagazine.com/neuroskeptic/2017/03/12/the-ethics-of-citat>

ion/#.W4taHLh9hyQ