

Example social media posts for scientists to edit and share:

Facebook:

A quick request from your friendly neighborhood scientist -

A proposed federal rule could significantly change how medical research is funded and managed in the U.S.

Scientists support strong oversight of taxpayer dollars. That's already built into the grant process. The concern is that these proposed changes could make research slower, more burdensome, and less driven by scientific merit.

If you've ever benefited from medication, cancer treatment, surgery, or medical test, you've benefited from federally funded research.

The proposal is open for public comment, and anyone can participate. If you have five minutes, I'd really appreciate your support.

Resources:

<https://www.navbo.org/omb-rule/>

<https://elizabethginexi.substack.com/p/this-new-omb-rule-is-bigger-than>

LinkedIn:

As scientists, we spend years building research programs designed to answer important questions that improve human health. We also spend considerable time writing grants, reporting progress, and ensuring responsible stewardship of taxpayer funding. Accountability is essential.

The Office of Management and Budget's recently proposed rule would introduce significant changes to how federally funded research is reviewed and managed. Many researchers are concerned that the proposal could increase administrative burden, create uncertainty for long-term research, and make funding decisions less driven by scientific merit and more susceptible to changing political priorities.

The proposal is currently open for public comment, and this is an opportunity for researchers, patients, and members of the public to share their perspectives.

Whether your work focuses on cardiovascular disease, cancer, diabetes, neuroscience, rare diseases, or basic biology, the policies that govern research funding shape tomorrow's discoveries.

If this issue is important to you, I encourage you to learn more and consider submitting a thoughtful public comment before the deadline on July 13, 2026. You can find example comments and instructions below.

Resources:

<https://www.navbo.org/omb-rule/>

<https://elizabethginexi.substack.com/p/this-new-omb-rule-is-bigger-than>

Email Draft for non-scientists:

Subject: Your Friendly Neighborhood Scientists Need Your Help Protecting Research Integrity

Body:

Dear friends and family,

I'm reaching out to ask for a favor that could have a real impact on the future of medical research in the United States... and on my job.

Right now, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), which is part of the Executive Office of the President, is considering major changes to the rules that govern how almost all federally funded medical research is awarded and managed.

The proposal is long and technical – I've linked it [here](#) if you want to look at it, and I'll give you a quick summary of the changes and why my colleagues across the country and I are concerned.

This proposed rule would give the federal **government broader authority** over how research grants are reviewed and managed. It would add **new administrative requirements**, expand the government's ability to **terminate grants** after they've been awarded, create **additional restrictions** on research collaborations, and introduce new layers of review that many researchers worry could make funding decisions lean toward ever-changing **political priorities** rather than based on impact and merit.

Scientists already spend a significant amount of time writing grants, reporting results, and meeting administrative requirements. It's a rigorous and highly regulated process designed to ensure scientific integrity, accountability, and responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars. Those safeguards are essential, and no one is arguing against them. The concern is that these proposed changes could add even more administrative burden while making funding decisions less driven by scientific merit and more susceptible to non-scientific considerations.

We want to ensure the system continues to support rigorous, evidence-based science and allows researchers to focus on discovering solutions to the world's toughest health challenges. Whether it is heart disease, diabetes, cancer, dementia, or rare diseases, **today's treatments began with research**. The rules being considered could influence how quickly tomorrow's discoveries reach patients.

The good news is that the proposal is currently [open to public comment](#), and **you don't have to be a scientist** to share your thoughts and opinions. If you have five minutes, I'd be incredibly grateful if you would [submit a comment](#). I've included a few example comments below from different perspectives (friend or family member of a scientist, taxpayer, and patient), but the most effective comments are the ones that reflect your own thoughts and experiences.

I appreciate your time and support!

Example Comments

Friend/Family of a scientist perspective:

I am writing as a friend/family member of someone who has dedicated their career to scientific research.

Over the years, I've seen firsthand how much work goes into conducting research responsibly. Scientists spend countless hours writing grant applications, reporting results, managing budgets, complying with regulations, and ensuring taxpayer dollars are used appropriately. Accountability is already a major part of the process.

I am concerned that the proposed changes would add even more administrative burden while making it harder for scientists to focus on the research that leads to new discoveries and better treatments. I am also concerned that these changes could make research funding decisions less driven by scientific merit and more vulnerable to non-scientific considerations.

I respectfully urge OMB to withdraw or substantially revise this proposed rule. Any changes to federal grant regulations should strengthen accountability while preserving an independent, merit-based research system that allows scientists to pursue discoveries that improve people's lives.

Taxpayer perspective:

I am writing as a taxpayer who believes federally funded scientific research is one of our nation's best investments. I expect taxpayer dollars to be managed responsibly, and I support strong oversight of federal grants. At the same time, I want research funding decisions to be based on scientific excellence, transparency, and the potential to benefit the public.

Medical research supported by federal funding has produced lifesaving treatments, strengthened our economy, and helped maintain America's leadership in science and innovation. I am concerned that parts of this proposed rule could make research less efficient, discourage collaboration, and slow the pace of discovery.

I urge OMB to withdraw or significantly revise this proposal to ensure that oversight is balanced with the need for a strong, independent, and globally competitive research enterprise that serves the American people.

Patient perspective:

I am writing as someone whose life has been affected by disease.

Every treatment available today exists because researchers were able to ask important questions, conduct careful studies, and share their discoveries with the scientific community. Patients and families depend on continued investment in medical research to develop better treatments and, ultimately, cures.

I am concerned that the proposed changes could make it more difficult for scientists to conduct research, collaborate with one another, and move discoveries from bench to bedside. Delays in research can mean delays in hope for patients like me and millions of others.

I respectfully ask OMB to withdraw this proposed rule. Please ensure that federal research policies continue to support rigorous, evidence-based science that prioritizes patients, scientific merit, and the public good.