

Expert Selection Committee Phase

Brief Guide for Evaluators



1 Introduction

Expert Selection Committees' assessments are of **paramount importance** to help "la Caixa" Foundation to **select the best projects to fund**. We rely on your experience and dedication to receive high-quality reviews. In addition, **providing your substantial and constructive comments to applicants** may help to **improve** the next generation of **applications**.

We send the **15 pre-selected proposals of each thematic area** to all the members of the Selection Committee. We ask a **first remote assessment** to be done before the **first week of June**. So you can revise and **modify your assessments** and comments **during the interviews in Barcelona** in June 6 and 7th.

2 Health Research 2019 Call Essential information

"la Caixa" Foundation launches the second edition of the Call for **biomedical and health research** projects of **scientific excellence**, with a **high social impact**, whether in **basic, clinical or translational** research. Grants may be awarded up to a **maximum of €15,000,000**.

Thematic areas

Proposals must be submitted in the following thematic areas:



NEUROSCIENCE



ONCOLOGY



CARDIOVASCULAR
AND ASSOCIATED
METABOLIC DISEASES



INFECTIOUS
DISEASES



ENABLING
TECHNOLOGIES
(focused on the previous
thematic areas)



Up to
€500,000

Individual projects:
submitted by a single
research institution
(Host institution)



Up to
€1,000,000

Research consortium
projects: submitted by
at least two research
institutions and coordinated
by the Host institution

Grants

Two types of projects:



3 Assessment criteria, scoring scale & comments structure

BOX1. DURING YOUR EVALUATION, PLEASE:

- 1 Be **objective, independent** and **professional**.
 - Ensure to maintain the **confidentiality** of peer review information
 - Be aware of **unconscious bias** and consider the proposal objectively. Think about it outside of the context of your own field of research.
 - Document and manage potential **conflicts of interest**.
 - Make **substantial comments**: provide **constructive, clear and concise comments**, as well as **objective criticisms**.
 - Provide justification for your comments and the score, using **only scientific arguments**.
 - It helps the applicants if the comments are backed by **references** to the literature.
 - Clearly **indicate** what the applicants should **address or change**.
- 2 Be **clear but respectful**. Before submitting, please read the review from the **recipient's perspective**. Even negative criticism can be phrased constructively.

Criterion 1. Scientific excellence and impact (75%)

Subcriterion 1.1. Project Quality (30%)

- Novelty of the concept and the research.
- Clarity and coherence of the objectives.
- Relevance and transformative approach of the concept towards the challenges of its own field of action.
- The extent to which the proposal goes beyond the state of the art and demonstrates groundbreaking potential, novelty and high relevance.

Subcriterion 1.2. Scientific approach and work plan (20%)

- Feasibility and rigor of the methodology and the work plan in accordance with the objectives and expected results.
- Proper justification of the timescales, resources and budget necessary to carry out the proposal.
- Limitations of the study and contingency plan.

Subcriterion 1.3. Impact (25%)

- Scientific impact and social relevance: the extent to which the results of the Project can make a positive, relevant and innovative difference.
- Ethical considerations: detailed analysis of the ethical, legal, social and environmental implications of the execution of the Project and/or the potential implantation of its results in the society.
- Dissemination and transfer: suitable description of the mechanisms, actions and activities of dissemination, communication, social implication, valorization and transfer of the results of the Project.

Criterion 2. Project Leader and Team (25%)

Project Leader and Research Team of the Host Institution (25% in Individual projects or 12.5% in Research Consortium projects)

- Professional trajectory and research potential of the PL.
- Adequacy of the role and capacity of the research team members to support the Project execution.
- Suitability and contributions of the other Cooperating Organizations of the Project.

Research Consortium, if applicable (12.5%)

- Professional trajectory and research potential of the PIs of each Research Performing Institution of the Research Consortium.
- Adequacy of the role and capacity of the Team Members of the Research Performing Institutions of the Research Consortium.

Score each evaluation sub-criterion using a two-decimal number **from 1 to 5** (being 1 the lower and 5 the higher scores).

★★★★★★ 5,00 (higher)

★★★★★☆ 4,00

★★★★☆☆ 3,00

★★★☆☆☆ 2,00

★★☆☆☆☆ 1,00 (lower)

Provide numerical scores and their corresponding written comments (taking into consideration the recommendations included in BOX 1) and following this simple structure:

- Concise summary
- Strengths
- Weaknesses

BOX 2. GLOSSARY OF RELEVANT TERMS FOR THE OBJECTIVES OF THE HEALTH RESEARCH CALL

In order to facilitate a better understanding and **promote the alignment of the evaluation process with** the objectives of the **Health Research 2018 Call**, some guidelines on the concepts referenced in the “Rules for Participation” are described below:

- **Consideration of the gender dimension** refers to the acknowledgment and integration of the relevant characteristics of gender in the subject of research, with the intention of increasing the scientific and societal relevance of the research. It implies as well the balance between men and women in the research teams.
- **Ethics and Responsible Research and Innovation** are considered by “la Caixa” Foundation an integral part of research, and ethical compliance as key for research excellence. Responsible research and innovation is a guidance for research to be more diverse and inclusive, open and transparent and more responsive and adaptive to the needs and values of society. (www.rri-tools.eu)
- **Groundbreaking potential** is understood as the potentiality of a project to result in a major breakthrough within its thematic area. It entails a high risk/high gain nature.
- **Professional trajectory** is a relevant indicator of scientific capacity, but, especially for early-stage investigators, please consider their **research potential** and adequacy of their role in the project execution. When evaluating publications, we understand that the scientific content of a paper is much more significant than publication metrics or the identity of the journal in which it was published.
- **Relevance** is understood as the degree to which the content of the project is connected to its goal in a way that makes it useful in its own thematic area.
- **Social engagement** implies the inclusion of Cooperating Organizations (COs), and specific activities in a deliberate effort to increase the social impact of the research conducted. COs are described as non-research performing civil society organizations or companies that carry out activities of the Project.
- **Social impact** is understood as the social, cultural, environmental and economic returns of the research beyond the academic impact. It can range from third-stream and public dissemination activities to the inclusion of non-academic audiences. The evaluation of social engagement criteria should be conducted in coherence with the type of research of the project, whether basic, translational or clinical.

> [More information in “Rules for Participation” in our website](#)

> [More information in “Evaluation process guide” in our website](#)