

Additional Scoring Guide for Research Applications

The IGI scoring system was designed to encourage reliable scoring of applications. Reviewers who assign high ratings to all applications diminish their ability to communicate a correct scientific evaluation of an individual application. Therefore, reviewers are encouraged to carefully consider the rating guide below. This can improve the reliability of their scores as well as their ability to communicate the scientific evaluation of the applications reviewed.

Evaluation: The evaluation will consist of two parts.

The first part is the most relevant criteria for the purposes of the IGI grant call. This will include the 5 evaluation criteria including: **1) originality, 2) capacity building, 3) quality of the work plan/proposal, 4) feasibility of the proposal, 5) experience of research team.** This part will be rated on a 10-point scale.

Narrative feedback: The IGI request that reviewers should also provide investigators a narrative feedback regarding the weakness and strength of the proposal. The reviewers should provide this narrative feedback in the evaluation form by using a concise numbering format.

EVALUATION SCALE

POINTS	Description of evaluation
LOW (1-4)	Applications may be addressing a problem of <u>low</u> or <u>no</u> importance in the field, with many weaknesses in the selected criteria.
MEDIUM (5-7)	Applications may be addressing a problem of <u>moderate</u> importance in the field, with some or no weaknesses in selected criteria.
HIGH (8-10)	Applications are addressing a problem of <u>high</u> importance/interest in the field. May have some or no weaknesses in the selected criteria.

Criteria definition: All reviewers should consider the following definition while evaluating each proposal:

1) Originality: Refers to addressing a scientific problem using a novel strategy that integrates state of the art biotechnology and bioscience tools.

2) Capacity building: Refers to creating new biotechnological and/or human resources capacities in the Institute. The establishment of new useful methodologies and/or human resources to develop various areas of interest within local and global research areas. This should focus on tools that will help solve problems of national and

international interest. This does not refer to construction, renovation or infrastructure and/or major equipment acquisition.

3) Quality of the work plan/proposal: Refers to the study/research design to approach the scientific problem.

4) Feasibility of the proposal: Takes into consideration the possibility that the research can be conducted/completed under the current local, and to a lesser extent global scientific condition.

5) Experience of research team: Refers to the expertise of the scientific team based on their publication record related to the research proposal topic. The principal investigator should demonstrate related experience on the subject area of the proposal.

The second part will include 4 additional criteria that reviewers should also consider while rating the proposal: **1) significance of the question being study, 2) applicant information, 3) quality and adequacy of available resource and budget, and 4) impact.** These criteria will be rated on a 5-point scale.

POINTS	1	2	3	4	5
RELEVANCE	Not relevant	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent

The evaluation form must be filled out using Adobe Reader. Evaluations must be submitted to: internalgrant@indicasat.org.pa