



# TELETHON FALL SEED GRANT 2024

---

## Review process and Guidelines

The evaluation process entails three consecutive phases:

1. All submitted applications have been first verified by Fondazione Telethon ETS for administrative purposes and relevance. Fondazione Telethon has selected an ad hoc panel of expert reviewers.
2. The panel is asked to evaluate the scientific merit of the accepted applications and to provide written comments and a score.
3. 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 <http://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 the review report for the Applicant.

We ask you to provide a statement that 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 and weaknesses on the basis of the following parameters:

### **Significance**

Does this study address an important problem? What will the effect of these studies be on the concepts or methods that drive this field?

### **Originality of science**

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 or technologies?

### **Appropriateness of design and methods**

Are the conceptual framework, design, methods, and analyses adequately developed, well-integrated, and appropriate to the aims of the project?

### **Preliminary results - if ANY**

Please note: preliminary data are not mandatory, so their absence will not be considered a minus per se. The absence of preliminary data should not be considered detrimental to the significance and originality of the proposal; their presence instead has not to be considered an added value.

Are preliminary results adequately supporting the hypothesis to be tested?

### **Feasibility**

Does the Applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative plans? Is the project feasible in the 12-month timeframe?

### **Safety**

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.

### **The potential of the proposed project**

**Added value**: If the project is successful, how will the results advance current scientific knowledge in the field?

**Unmet need**: How will the project contribute to fulfilling current unmet need/s of rare patients?

### **Applicant**

Is the applicant appropriately trained and well-suited to carry out this work? Is the proposed work proportionate to the applicant's 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 San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA, <http://www.ascb.org/dora/>).

### Budget

Is the budget appropriate for the proposed research?

**Of Note:** A maximum of € 50,000 for 12 months project is allowed.

### Overall Recommendation

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

Score range	Judgment	Description
4.6 – 5.0	<b>Outstanding</b>	Exceptionally strong, no concerns
4.0 – 4.5	<b>Excellent</b>	Very strong with only minor* weaknesses
3.6 – 3.9	<b>Good</b>	Strong with moderate* weaknesses
2.0 – 3.5	<b>Average</b>	Few strengths and one or more major* weaknesses
1.0 – 1.9	<b>Poor</b>	Numerous major* weaknesses
<p><b>(*) Note:</b></p> <p><b>Minor:</b> easily addressable weakness that does not substantially lessen the value of the project</p> <p><b>Moderate:</b> weakness that lessens the value of the project</p> <p><b>Major:</b> weakness that severely limits the value of the project</p>		