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 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 PRC members´ evaluations focus on the biological rationale and scientific impact. In contrast, CBCS evaluations focus on technical feasibility and the prevalence of small molecules already described in relation to the proposal. This highlights whether a screen or the use of chemistry efforts is motivated or whether the applicant should instead be directed to already available tools when addressing the biological question. 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, the aspects are not listed in priority order. For each aspect, relevant comments are made, and a score is given, which runs from 1 to 5, where 1 = poor and 5 = excellent.

Evaluation responsibilities by the PRC committee

1. Biological rationale and potential scientific impact
    a. Research/technological quality with comments.
    b. Novelty and originality with comments.
    c. Relevance with comments.
    d. Overall score with comments.
2. Importance of CBCS efforts with comments
3. Availability of described assays, resources, and funding, including follow-up and validation studies with comments
4. Scoring of publication plans with comments.

Evaluation responsibilities by CBCS technical personnel

1. Is the requested work from CBCS feasible?
2. How many estimated full-time months of work from CBCS?
3. Are there already small molecules available?
4. List secondary assays suggested.
5. Monitor national spread and gender perspective.

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	Research methodology and technological quality	Novelty & Originality - innovative nature of the project	Relevance of the project in relation to chemical biology and CBCS profile	Overall score of biological rationale and potential scientific impact	Importance of CBCS's effort in the project -and reasonable timelines	Availability of secondary assays, follow-up and validation studies, and comments on resources/funding.	Publication or Innovation strategy
1	Assay/chemistry difficult or not amenable to small molecule modulation	Poor	Poor	Poor	CBCS input is not required	No assays available for downstream characterization, low on resources and funding.	A plan for publication/patent or commercializing partner is missing.
2	Assay/chemistry difficult to judge	Fair	Fair	Fair	Low CBCS input required for success	Ideas on assays available	Plans available but over-optimistic
3	Assay/chemistry is likely doable. Target/phenotype may be amenable to selective small molecule modulation.	Good	Good	Good	Intermediate CBCS input is required for success	Some assays are available. Funding and resources are available for parts of the project.	Publication/patent plan available but inconsistent with the plans for probe validation
4	Assay/chemistry doable, target/phenotype may be amenable to selective small molecule modulation.	Very good	Very good	Very good	High CBCS input is required for success	Multiple characterization assays are available	Structured publication/patent plan available or a realistic plan on how to progress in the innovation system
5	Assay/chemistry doable, target/phenotype likely amenable to selective small molecule modulation	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	CBCS input crucial for success	Both *in vitro* and *in vivo*/advanced model assays are in place. Resources and funding are fully covered.	A feasible draft manuscript/patent application available where CBCS contribution is clear