CARIPLO – TELETHON ALLIANCE
Joint call for Applications

REVIEWERS GUIDELINES

Fondazione Cariplo (FC) and Fondazione Telethon (FT) made an alliance to foster basic research to support projects focused on unknown aspects of rare diseases. Basic research, especially in the field of rare diseases, is still an orphan area of investment, but it is also pioneering for the development of applied research in more frequent diseases.

Indeed, the analysis of scientific literature has highlighted the tendency of researchers and funding agencies to focus on a limited portion of the human genome. The most studied genes are not necessarily the most significant: sometimes studying one gene instead of another is simply linked to the timing of its discovery. There are therefore numerous DNA regions and gene sets - with their relative mRNA and proteins - whose function is still unknown but could potentially play an important role within molecular pathways, physiological and pathological mechanisms.

FT has implemented and maintains a quality management system compliant with the UNI EN ISO 9001:2015 for the peer review process: initial and final evaluation, selection and scientific and administrative monitoring of funded research projects, management of research funds assigned to external Institutions (universities, hospitals and other research institutes).

Peer Review Process

The Reviewers are requested to fill in the "Evaluation Form" available in *TETRA - Telethon Projects Managements system portal* at https://projects.telethon.it accessible through personal login and password.

Full Review

Eligible applications will undergo **Full review** and will be evaluated by three Scientific Committee reviewers. In support of their evaluation, Scientific Committee Reviewers will be provided with written comments by one External Reviewer, who will be chosen *ad hoc* for each application by FC-FT Scientific Officers.

Description

Primary reviewers only are requested to fill in this field. The description should be a summary of the hypothesis to be tested, the specific aims, and the procedures of the proposed research.

All reviewers will be asked to separately evaluate each proposal based on the following criteria:

Project quality and feasibility

Scientific Evaluation (max 3,000 characters including spaces)

What are the proposal's major strengths and major weaknesses?

Appropriateness of Design and Methods (max 3,000 characters including spaces)

Are the experimental approaches/methods appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the proposal? Can the research be completed within the proposed time frame?

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

Preliminary results – if ANY: Please note preliminary results are not mandatory and as such their absence should not be considered detrimental to the significance and originality of the Proposal. If present, please verify whether the provided results are adequately supporting the principles to be tested.

Team Competence (max 3,000 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 (Partner/collaborators)? Does the Team play a significant role in the field of the submitted proposal?

Is the plan to engage/train young researchers appropriate?

Budget (max 3,000 characters including spaces)

Is the budget appropriate for the proposed research?

For Multicentre research proposals, is the shared budget appropriately justified?

Project impact

Potential of the proposed research (max 3,000 characters including spaces)

- What will be the potential impact of the proposed research if successful (does it address an important gap, what difference will it make to the scientific community)?

Potential impact on patients (max 3,000 characters including spaces)

What will be the potential impact on patients in the long term?

Scores

- **Project quality and feasibility**

Relative weight: 80%

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

Full Evaluation 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.

September 20th, 2022