

## Guidelines for reviewing Koret – Berkeley – Tel Aviv grant proposals

Thank you for agreeing to review the proposals. Your help is essential for this program.

We request that you provide both **scores** and brief **textual summary** of your evaluation. Your evaluations remain confidential, to be used by the review committee, and will not be delivered to the authors of the proposal.

Please **score** each of the following criteria:

- Scientific merit of the proposal
- Significance and promise of the problem addressed
- Strength of **computational biology** innovation
- The depth of collaboration between the groups
- Appropriateness of personnel and budget

**Evaluation criteria** include scientific excellence and promise, depth of integrated collaboration, appropriateness of personnel and budget. Innovative projects with associated risk are appropriate.

While experimental work may be supported to a significant degree, the evaluation should focus on computational biology and bioinformatics innovation and discovery. Applications that are primarily experimental with minimal or routine computational analysis are not eligible.

Projects require true collaborative efforts and most incorporate substantial mutual visits by the PIs and/or by other group members working directly on the proposed project.

Please follow the NIH scoring system below. Specifically, scores for each criterion are whole numbers (1=exceptional; 9 =poor). A score of 5 is a good, medium-impact application.

<b>Overall Impact or Criterion Strength</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<b>High</b>	1	<b>Exceptional</b>
	2	<b>Outstanding</b>
	3	<b>Excellent</b>
<b>Medium</b>	4	<b>Very Good</b>
	5	<b>Good</b>
	6	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<b>Low</b>	7	<b>Fair</b>
	8	<b>Marginal</b>
	9	<b>Poor</b>

Please provide also an **overall evaluation score**, assessing the project's likelihood to have a sustained, powerful influence on computational biology in the research field(s) involved, and to involve meaningful collaboration between the institutions. The overall evaluation score need not be the average of the criterion scores.

**Please summarize your evaluation in words**, to help us understand the reasons for your scores and to allow us to calibrate among different evaluations.

**KBT grant proposal review form**

**Proposal authors:**

**Reviewer:**

Scores in whole numbers (1=exceptional; 9 =poor). See guidelines.

Component	Score
Overall evaluation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Scientific merit of the proposal and approach</li></ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Significance and promise of the problem addressed</li></ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Strength of <b><u>computational biology</u></b> innovation</li></ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The depth of collaboration between the groups</li></ul>	
Appropriateness of personnel and budget.	
For full grants only: If this study cannot be supported as a full grant, does the proposal merit award of a seed grant (\$15k-\$25k for one year) instead?	

Textual evaluation: