FONDAZIONE TELETHON SPRING SEED GRANT 2025

Review process and Guidelines

The evaluation process entails three consecutive phases:

1. Fondazione Telethon ETS first verifies all submitted applications for administrative purposes and relevance and selects an ad hoc panel of expert reviewers (Panel Members).
   - The Panel Members are asked to remotely evaluate the scientific merit of the accepted applications and provide written comments and a score.
2. The evaluation process culminates in a final discussion during a plenary scientific review meeting.

The evaluation form is available in the *Fondazione Telethon Grant Management* system portal at this **link** accessible through personal login and password.

Reviewer Account

Registered Users in TETRA (the former Grant Management system)

Reviewers already registered in TETRA – the former Fondazione Telethon Grant Management system – are **kindly asked NOT to create a new account**.

Please click on *Forgot Password?* and follow the given instructions for setting a New Password, hen enter the portal.

New Reviewer to Fondazione Telethon Calls

To register and review the Applications, Reviewers should click on the *Register Here* button and enter their email address: to complete the registration process follow the online instructions.

Peer Review Process

The Panel Members are asked to review the assigned Applications and provide a score through the *Fondazione Telethon Grant Management* system portal at this **link**. By clicking on

Ver. April 2025

Pending Panel Review, the Panel Reviewers can see their assigned Applications and can access the evaluation form by clicking on the specific project.

The whole Application is visible by clicking on the **View/Print** button next to the **Application Preview** section.

Once the revision is completed, Panel Members can submit it by clicking on the **Submit** button.

All the submitted reviews are available from the Homepage, under the **My Reviews** tab.

Written Comments

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

Panel Members are asked to provide a summary statement highlighting the key reasons for their recommendation according to the criteria specified below.

The individual written comments will be anonymously incorporated into a complete review report that will be sent 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 an assessment of a Candidate CV based on journal-based metrics, such as Journal Impact Factor. Fondazione Telethon signed and endorses the San FranciscoDeclaration 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 are asked to give a score, which should reflect the written comments, according to the following scale:

Score range	Judgment	Description
4.6 – 5.0	**Outstanding**	Exceptionally strong, no concerns
4.0 – 4.5	**Excellent**	Very strong with only minor* weaknesses
3.6 – 3.9	**Good**	Strong with moderate* weaknesses
2.0 – 3.5	**Average**	Few strengths and one or more major* weaknesses
1.0 – 1.9	**Poor**	Numerous major* weaknesses

Ver. April 2025

(*) Note:

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

Rome, April 1st, 2025