

## **RFI “Maximizing Research Funds by Limiting Allowable Publishing Costs”**

### **Disclosures:**

All personally identifiable information in this submission can be put into public use for future solicitations on “**Maximizing Research Funds by Limiting Allowable Publishing Cost**”.

### **Contributions by:**

Professor Emmanuel Oluyinka IDOWU

MBBS. MSc. MPH. MRCEM. MD. FACEP. FAAEM

Professor of Emergency Medicine

**My Contributions to the request for information on “Maximizing Research Funds by Limiting Allowable Publishing Costs” with special interest in the bullet one (1) of the proposed NIH policy options while in addition providing other (alternative) options not considered in the request for information that best achieves the goal of balancing flexibility in providing results with maximizing the use of taxpayer funds to support research:**

1. Use of taxpayer funds is a welcome development but for sense of co-ownership with government as well as joint accountability to the public that was taxed, a strict, transparent and responsible oversight committee or organ would be required that both monitors and evaluate use of the funds at local levels while efficiently coordinating the disbursement and administration of the fund pool centrally. With strict and well-defined inclusion and exclusion criteria, as well as allowable thresholds set in place, public trust and government accountability will be on a safe pedestal.
2. NIH-governed grant project-tailored publishing platforms could be put in place for authors to publish grant project manuscripts either for free or at a highly subsidized rate to principal investigator(s) (or recipient institutions) so as to relieve the financial burden to authors (or recipient institutions ) and as such maximize grant funds. Reviewers in these platforms can be encouraged through a reward system that favors high-quality, scientifically rigorous, ethically sound, purely-human powered reviews. AI-assisted review platforms should not be rewarded.
3. Other suggested alternative option : Proposed **Best ratio Tripartite Recycling Model**

Right from the point of development and submission of research protocol for NIH approval, a tripartite recycling model of shared burden of accruable cost from publishing grant projects could have been established in the grant procedures. This potentially looks more sustainable through the signing of memorandum of understanding by the relevant stakeholders: donor agency (NIH), recipient university (or equivalent institution), and the Principal investigator in the relevant institution, especially with respect to publication costs and other allied costs. The best ratio may

be selected after piloting 20: 40: 20; 40: 20: 20; 20:20: 40 sharing formulae etc.  
adaptable to local variabilities in the context of other related factors to be considered.  
This can augment the taxpayer fund pool especially in situations that warrant  
emergency donor agency grant policy switches putting strain on the conduct and  
publishing of basic and/or clinical grant projects.