

## PRC Instructions for project evaluations

*Given the sensitive character of this material, the distribution is made through a secure login, and none of the material is sent by e-mail. Please note that project applications and related information provided during the review process are confidential and must be treated as such by the reviewers. Information within the documents is provided solely to evaluate the application and is not to be released or reproduced in any form to anyone else. Following the evaluations, any paper copies must be either destroyed or returned to CBCS, and electronic documents must be deleted.*

Project proposals submitted to Chemical Biology Consortium Sweden (CBCS) are given priority rankings by the Project Review Committee (PRC) in bi-annual meetings. Before these meetings, the proposals are evaluated jointly by PRC members and CBCS personnel with knowledge and expertise within the field.

The following aspects of the proposal are addressed during the evaluation. Except for criterion 1, which concerns the scientific merits of the proposals and is the most critical aspect of the proposal, the aspects are not listed in priority order:

- |   |            |
|---|------------|
| 1. Overall biological rationale and potential scientific impact | PRC        |
| 2. The impact of CBCS's effort in the project                   | PRC / CBCS |
| 3. Availability of secondary assays and test models             | PRC / CBCS |
| 4. Plans for validation of chemical probe                       | PRC / CBCS |
| 5. Technical feasibility for CBCS and collaborator              | CBCS       |
| 6. Resources required   | CBCS       |
| 7. Publication strategy   | PRC        |

The above list also describes what aspects of the proposal are pre-evaluated by the PRC members, by the CBCS personnel and jointly by both parties. The applications are split between the PRC members such that each committee member is responsible for an in-depth review of their share of the applications. Each application is reviewed in this manner by two PRC delegates. The work is done independently, and PRC members cannot discuss the proposals between them at this point. The initial scoring is done before the meeting within the template, and the scores from the individual members can be summarized and discussed at the PRC meeting. Any discrepancies between the scores are resolved at the meeting. The below table serves as a guideline for how the various aspects are scored, and additional guidance is given in the electronic review template in Anubis.

Profile	Overall biological rational and potential scientific impact	Importance of CBCS's effort in the project	Availability of secondary assays and test models	Plans for validation of chemical probe	Technical feasibility for CBCS and collaborator	Resources required (CBCS time investment)	Publication or Innovation strategy
1	Poor	CBCS input is not required	No assays available for downstream characterization	No plans available	Assays/chemistry difficult or not amenable to small molecule modulation	Heavy CBCS support is necessary (>6 months)	A plan for publication/patent or commercial(izing) partner is missing.
2	Fair	Low CBCS input required for success	Ideas on assays available	Claims to have plans but not clearly outlined	Assays/chemistry difficult to judge	Substantial CBCS support needed (4-6 months)	Plans available but over-optimistic
3	Good	Intermediate CBCS input is required for success	Low throughput assay available	Plans available but inconsistent with publication/innovation strategy	Assays/chemistry likely doable, target/phenotype <u>may be</u> amenable to selective small molecule modulation	Intermediate CBCS support needed (2-4 months)	Publication/patent plan available but inconsistent with the plans for probe validation
4	Very good	High CBCS input is required for success	Multiple characterization assays are available	Structured plans consistent with publication/innovation strategy exists	Assays/chemistry doable, target/phenotype <u>may be</u> amenable to selective small molecule modulation	Limited CBCS support needed (1-2 months)	Structured publication/patent plan available or a realistic plan on how to progress in the innovation system
5	Excellent	CBCS input crucial for success	Both <i>in vitro</i> and <i>in vivo</i> assays are in place	Feasible plans consistent with publication/innovation strategy with clear responsibilities described	Assays/chemistry doable, target/phenotype <u>likely</u> amenable to selective small molecule modulation	Minimal CBCS support needed (Max 1 month)	A <u>feasible</u> draft manuscript/patent application available where CBCS contribution is clear