Common Grant Writing Mistakes

- The proposal lacks significance or new and original ideas.
  Content from: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke

- The proposal raises ethical concerns.
  Content from: Harvard Grant Writers

- The research has a low impact on advancing scientific knowledge.
  Content from: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke

- The scientific rationale is not provided, or is not valid.
  Content from: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke

- The proposal is too ambitious with too much work proposed.
  *This is when you should seek advice or vet your proposal with senior faculty.*
  Content from: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, Harvard Grant Writers

- The proposal has unfocused aims and unclear goals.
  Content from: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke

- The aims rely too much on the success of prior aims.
  Content from: Harvard Grant Writers

- The studies are based on a shaky hypothesis or data, or alternative hypotheses are not considered.
  Content from: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke

- The proposal contains too much unnecessary experimental detail, or contains insufficient detail, especially for untested approaches.
  Content from: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, Harvard Grant Writers

- The experiments are technology-driven, rather than hypothesis-driven.
  Content from: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke

- The direction or sense of priority is not clearly defined.
  Content from: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke

- The proposal lacks alternative methodological approaches in case the primary research does not work out.
  Content from: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke
- The proposed model system is not appropriate to address the proposed questions.
  Content from: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke

- The proposal is innovative but lacks enough preliminary data.
  Content from: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke

- The preliminary data do not support the feasibility of the project or hypothesis.
  Content from: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke

- The proposal lacks appropriate controls.
  Content from: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke

- The proposal does not include discussion of potential pitfalls.
  Content from: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke

- The proposal does not include discussion of interpretation of data and alternative explanations.
  Content from: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke

- The investigator does not have enough experience with the proposed techniques or has not recruited a collaborator who does.
  Content from: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke

- The proposal does not clearly show which preliminary data were obtained by the investigator.
  Content from: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke

- The investigator has few recent papers.
  Content from: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke

- The investigator failed to recruit collaborators or did not include letters of support from collaborators.
  Content from: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke

- The proposal shows little institutional commitment.
  Content from: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke

- The investigator has suboptimal access to necessary equipment or technologies.
  Content from: National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke