|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***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**  **1.0** | **Weak**  **2.0** | **Average**  **3.0** | **Strong**  **4.0** | **Very strong**  **5.0** |   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. Please record your summary and comments on the proposal in the spaces provided. The comments on the proposal should clearly explain the strengths and weaknesses of the application indicated in the scoring tables. 2. Based on the assessment tables and your comments, please provide a final numeric score from 1.0 (weak) - 5.0 (very strong) |

**Please provide a brief summary of the application that highlights the key goals and methods proposed (~ 200 words).**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Positioning of the Research Project**   **This includes, but is not limited to:** | **Very weak** | **Weak** | **Average** | **Strong** | **Very Strong** |
| Originality and novelty of proposed research in comparison to existing or related technology in development. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Competitiveness of the project internationally in comparison with what is available or that in at development stage by public or private entities. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Relevance of the project to the mandate of GlycoNet. |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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 of the project to generate results within the timeframe of the grant to lead to impact in commercializable 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 |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Feasibility**   **This includes, but is not limited to:** | **Very weak** | **Weak** | **Average** | **Strong** | **Very Strong** |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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?) |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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. |  |  |  |  |  |

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

**SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT**

*Please note that written statements 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.*

**Provide an overall summary assessment which clearly explains the strengths and weaknesses of the application indicated in the scoring tables above (1. Scientific Excellence, 2. Positioning of the Research Project, 3. Impact of the Research Project, 4. Feasibility, 5. Team, 6. Long-Term Plan (~5 years) and Commercialization).**