

FONDAZIONE



## Multi-round Telethon Call for Research projects 2021 – 2024

---

### FULL REVIEW EVALUATION GUIDELINES 2022 – COMMITTEE MEMBERS

The present call aims at funding basic and pre-clinical research projects focused on rare genetic diseases and conducted by researchers working in Italian public or private non-profit research institutions.

Research projects can be submitted into one of the following tracks:

- **Track BASIC RESEARCH**  
Focused on the identification of disease mechanism/s and/or disease target/s.
- **Track PRECLINICAL PROOF OF CONCEPT**  
Focused on the identification and validation of therapeutic candidate/s.

#### FULL REVIEW INSTRUCTIONS

Applications that will pass the triage phase will undergo full review and the whole application will be evaluated by three Telethon Scientific Committee members (hereon “Reviewers”).

**REVIEWERS’ ROLE** - The primary reviewer is responsible for the project’s presentation during the plenary review session. Primary and secondary reviewers have to provide written comments, whereas the tertiary reviewer is not requested to (but may provide written comments, if he/she wants to).

**EVALUATION** – The Reviewers are requested to fill in the “Full Application Evaluation Form” available in TETRA - Telethon Projects Managements system portal at <https://projects.telethon.it> accessible through personal login and password.

In support of their evaluation, Reviewers will be provided with written comments by External Reviewers, who are chosen ad hoc for each Application by Telethon Research Program Managers.

## Written Comments

Written comments are an essential part of the review and are critical in developing review reports for the Applicants.

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

Please note: External Reviewers' written comments will also be included as such in the review report.

### **Description** (max 2,000 characters including spaces)

The primary reviewer only is requested to fill in the description field by summarising the objectives of the study and the hypothesis to be tested. Also, the primary Reviewer will concisely describe the specific aims and procedures of the proposed research.

The Reviewers will be asked to evaluate and score each proposal based on the following criteria:

### **Project quality and feasibility**

- **Scientific rationale and unmet need** (max 3,500 characters including spaces) – Does the proposal offer a clearly-stated rationale for the study? Will the results of this research fill a gap in knowledge or meet an unmet need?
- **Background and preliminary data** (max 3,500 characters including spaces) - Is the link to rare genetic diseases properly addressed? Is the proposed research original and/or innovative? Are the preliminary results provided supporting the principles to be tested?
- **Design and methods** (max 3,500 characters including spaces) - Are the experimental approaches/methods appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Can the research be completed within the proposed time frame?
- **Project feasibility** (max 3,500 characters including spaces) – **For the preclinical project** does the reviewer see a practical pathway to translation? Is the project feasible? Does the Applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative plans?
- **PI and team competence** (max 3,500 characters including spaces) - Is the Team appropriately trained and well suited to carry out the work proposed? Is the work proposed proportionate to the level of experience of the principal investigator and key personnel (Partners/collaborators)? Does the Team play a significant role in the field of the submitted research project?
- **Budget adequateness** (max 3,500 characters including spaces) - Is the budget appropriate to the proposed research?

### **Project Impact**

- **Impact** (max 3,500 characters including spaces) - If the project is successful will it change the pathway to the development of a treatment?

## Scores

### - Project quality and feasibility

Relative weight: 80%

Score range: from **1.0 (poor)** to **5.0 (outstanding)** by 0.1-unit increments.

Full Review Scoring Scale		
Score	Value	Description
4.6 – 5.0	Outstanding	No concerns
4.0 - 4.5	Excellent	No substantial issues need discussion
3.0 - 3.9	Good	Only one or a few addressable concerns
2.0 - 2.9	Average	Several concerns in one or more Aims
1.0 - 1.9	Poor	Major concerns in one or more Aims

### - Project Impact

Relative weight: 20%

Scores and scoring criteria (based on the potential project impact):

**Score=5: High Impact**

**Score=4: Medium Impact**

**Score=3: Low Impact**

The overall score will be automatically calculated by combining the two scores according to their relative weight.