



Multi-round Telethon Call for Research projects 2021 – 2024

REVIEW EVALUATION guidelines 2023

PEER REVIEWERS – III ROUND

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.

EXTERNAL REVIEWER'S ROLE

External reviewers will support the Telethon Scientific Committee members in the evaluation process by providing written comments and an overall recommendation.

FULL REVIEW INSTRUCTIONS

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

Written Comments

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

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

External Reviewers are asked to provide written comments based on the following criteria:

Project quality and feasibility

- **Significance** (max 3,500 characters including spaces) – Is the link to rare genetic diseases properly addressed? Is the proposed research original and/or innovative? Does the proposal offer a clearly stated rationale? Will the results of this research fill a gap in knowledge or an unmet need? If the project is successful, will it improve therapeutic development?
- **Approach** (max 3,500 characters including spaces) – Do the preliminary results support the principles to be tested? Are the experimental approaches/methods appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Is the project feasible and can be completed within the proposed timeframe? Is the budget appropriate? Does the applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and provide alternative plans? For preclinical project is there a practical pathway to translation? Please highlight overall strengths and weaknesses.
- **PI and team competence** (max 3,500 characters including spaces) - Is the PI and 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?

Overall Recommendation

Based on the specific points raised in the written critique, the External Reviewers are asked to choose their recommendation as follows:

- A** - Outstanding; Exceptionally strong with only minor weaknesses.
- B** - Excellent; Very strong with no major weaknesses.
- C** - Good; Strong but with moderate weaknesses.
- D** - Average; Few strengths and one or more major weaknesses.
- E** - Poor; Numerous major weaknesses.

Definitions:

Minor: easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen the value of the project

Moderate: weakness that lessens the value of the project

Major: weakness that severely limits the value of the project

Milan, October 10th, 2023