FONDAZIONE



# 2022 Fall seed grant

# PEER REVIEW PROCESS and GUIDELINES

The evaluation process entails two consecutive phases:

- 1. All submitted applications have been first verified by Fondazione Telethon for administrative purposes and relevance. Fondazione Telethon has selected an ad hoc panel of expert reviewers.
- 2. The panel are asked to evaluate the scientific merit of the accepted applications and to provide a written comment. The evaluation process will culminate in a final discussion during a plenary scientific review meeting.

## **EVALUATION INSTRUCTIONS**

Panel Members are asked to fill in the "Project Evaluation form" available in the Telethon Projects Management system, TETRA at <a href="http://projects.telethon.it">http://projects.telethon.it</a> accessible through personal login and password.

#### **Written Comments**

Written comments are an essential part of the review and are critical in developing the review report for the Applicant.

We ask to provide a statement which should be a summary of the key reasons for your recommendation according to the criteria specified below.

The individual written comments will be anonymously incorporated into a complete review report that will be fed back to the Applicant. It is therefore important that the written evaluation is accurate, clearly written, and does not include derogatory language.

# **Evaluation criteria**

## Scientific Merit

Evaluate the overall scientific merit of the proposal by providing an analysis of the strengths andweaknesses on the basis of the following parameters:

<u>Significance</u>: Does this study address an important problem? What will the effect of these studies be onthe concepts or methods that drive this field?

#### 2

# 2022 Fall Seed Grant Peer Review process



<u>Originality of science:</u> Does the project employ novel concepts, approaches or methods? Are the aims original and innovative? Does the project challenge existing paradigms or develop new methodologies ortechnologies?

<u>Appropriateness of design and methods</u>: Are the conceptual framework, design, methods, and analyses adequately developed, well-integrated, and appropriate to the aims of the project?

<u>Preliminary results</u>- if ANY: Please note: preliminary results are not mandatory and as such their absence should not be considered detrimental for the significance and originality of the Proposal. Their presence instead has not to be considered added value; verify whether the provided results are adequately supporting the principles to be tested.

Feasibility: Does the Applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative plans?

<u>Safety</u>: Please evaluate the adequacy of the proposed protection for the humans, the animals or the environment (if any), to the extent they may be adversely affected by the project proposed in the Application.

# Potential of the proposed project

Added value: If the Aims of the Application will be achieved, how current scientific knowledge will advance?

Unmet need: How will the project contribute to fulfill current unmet need/s in the disease underinvestigation?

# **Applicant**

Is the Applicant appropriately trained and well-suited to carry out this work? Is the work proposed proportionate to his/her level of experience?

Please note that Fondazione Telethon does not apply assessment of Candidate's CV based on journal-based metrics, such as Journal Impact Factor. Fondazione Telethon signed and endorses the SanFrancisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA, <a href="http://www.ascb.org/dora/">http://www.ascb.org/dora/</a>).

# Budget

A maximum of 50,000 € for a one-year project is allowed. Although no budget related details have been provided by the applicant, panel members will be asked to evaluate overall budget request in relation to the proposed experimental plan.

## Overall Recommendation

Panel Members will be asked to give a score, which should reflect the written comments, according to the following scale:

- 5 Excellent; no substantial issues need discussion.
- 4 Good; Only one or a few addressable concerns.
- 3 Average; Several concerns in one or more Aims.
- 2 Poor; Major concerns in one or more Aims.