|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***PROJECT REVIEW FOR GLYCONET GRANTS*** | *For internal use*  Project # |
| **REVIEWER NAME:** | |
| **PROJECT LEADER NAME:** | |

|  |
| --- |
| **NAME OF OTHER INVESTIGATORS (NI)s** |
|  |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **TITLE OF THE PROJECT** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Instructions** |
| 1. Please use the following scale to evaluate each criterion:  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Very weak** | **Weak** | **Average** | **Strong** | **Very strong** |   Note: Evaluate the proposal on each of the following criteria by placing a check (✓) or a plus (+) or (x) in the box that corresponds to your assessment. Choose from: *Very weak*, *Weak*, *Average*, *Strong*, or *Very Strong* for each item.   1. Record your comments in the space provided at the end of each section. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Overall Score (Refer to the last page)** |
| Please assign the overall score for the proposal on the last page of your review. Rate on a 1 **–** 5 scale, where:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Score** | **Definition** | | 1 | Very weak | | 2 | Weak | | 3 | Average | | 4 | Strong | | 5 | Very strong | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Scientific Excellence**   **This includes, but is not limited to:** | **Very weak** | **Weak** | **Average** | **Strong** | **Very Strong** |
| Overall scientific excellence and soundness of the project |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quality and logic of the rationale |  |  |  |  |  |
| Existence of strong preliminary data that support the hypothesis;  State of the technology. *(i.e. What is the level of validation of the technology as developed so far?)* |  |  |  |  |  |
| Soundness of the experimental plan |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity to generate applicable results at the end of the project |  |  |  |  |  |

**Please note that written statements for all sections, and particularly for the scientific assessment, are more important than the scoring tables, which serve to add metrics. The reviewers are asked to go beyond the subsections of each section if necessary. Written statements are considered by GlycoNet’s research management committee as the most important factor for all sections when assessing the scientific evaluation of a project in their decision to recommend funding projects.**

**COMMENTS (indicating scientific strengths and weaknesses of the project):**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Positioning of the Research Project**   **This includes, but is not limited to:** | **Very weak** | **Weak** | **Average** | **Strong** | **Very Strong** |
| Originality and novelty of the proposed research (i.e. *Do you see the proposed project as research or technology responding to a true unmet need for development?*) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Added value of product/computational tool/technology compared to existing/in development ones |  |  |  |  |  |
| Positioning of the project relative to the most current and powerful approaches or technologies that address the same end goal (i.e. *Is there any other technology you know about that is currently able to deliver what is proposed in this application?*) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Competitiveness of the project on an international scale based on what is available or what is in development stage by public or private entities. |  |  |  |  |  |

**COMMENTS:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Impact of the Research Project**   **This includes, but is not limited to:** | **Very weak** | **Weak** | **Average** | **Strong** | **Very Strong** |
| Potential impact of the project on the development of diagnostics/treatments/technology development |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity to address important non-resolved specific challenges in the translational process. Example include:   * Potential to open new therapeutic approaches and research avenues * Contribution of the project to the development of more effective cost-effective diagnostics * Overall impact on the reduction of R&D costs, time to market, and development risks |  |  |  |  |  |

**COMMENTS:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Feasibility**   **This includes, but is not limited to:** | **Very weak** | **Weak** | **Average** | **Strong** | **Very Strong** |
| Clear deliverables, milestones, and schedule |  |  |  |  |  |
| Feasibility of the project (clear deliverables, timetable, human and financial resources. (i.e. *Please identify any technical/feasibility risks you foresee with the proposed project.*) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall quality of the infrastructure, facilities and equipment available for the proposed project |  |  |  |  |  |
| Soundness of the project overall costs |  |  |  |  |  |

**COMMENTS:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Team**   **This includes, but is not limited to:** | **Very weak** | **Weak** | **Average** | **Strong** | **Very Strong** |
| If this application is led by an ECR, what is the research potential of this researcher |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall track record of the PI and co-applicants:   * Relevance of the expertise and productivity of the PI in the achievement of the proposed project * Capacity of the PI to lead and coordinate the research – if the researcher is an ECR then comment on the risk of an ECR undertaking this project * Relevance of the expertise and productivity of the co-applicants in the achievement of the proposed project (i.e. *Is the proposed team appropriate (in terms of expertise and size*) to conduct the planned activities?) |  |  |  |  |  |

**COMMENTS:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Long-Term Plan (~5 years) and Commercialization**   **This includes, but is not limited to:** | **Very weak** | **Weak** | **Average** | **Strong** | **Very Strong** |
| Is the long-term development plan sound and feasible? (i.e. *Who are the most likely and important clients for such research?*) |  |  |  |  |  |
| The technology will likely create commercial opportunities in the biopharma R&D sector or the clinic and elsewhere such as in one-health applications. (i.e. *To your knowledge, how long it takes for such technologies to be developed and adopted by the market*) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Is the technology easily transferable for use by partners or is the plan to access he technology well laid out (ex. service option)? |  |  |  |  |  |
| The project is well aligned with goals of the research partners. |  |  |  |  |  |

**COMMENTS:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Please assign the overall score for the proposal on a 1 – 5 scale:** |
| **Overall Score:** |

**SUMMARY**

**Provide an overall appreciation, including major strengths and weaknesses of the project, and a recommendation for funding or not):**