

**ERA-NET on Translational Cancer Research (TRANSCAN)
First Joint Transnational Call for Proposals (JTC 2011) on:
"Validation of biomarkers for personalised cancer
medicine"**

Pre-proposal Evaluation Form

(template for electronic submission system)

Referee name:

Project reference number:

Coordinator:

Project title:

Acronym:

CONFLICT OF INTEREST:

You should refrain from reviewing the application if a conflict of interest exists or may exist. There is or may be a conflict of interest if you and/or colleagues affiliated with the same institution during the last three years, and/or your family members and partner relatives (1st degree) may benefit professionally, financially or personally from approval or rejection of the application. You should also refrain from reviewing the application if you are currently cooperating with and/or professionally dependant on the applicant(s) or the applicant's institutions, and/or have published together with the applicant(s) or their co-workers within the last three years. In the case of conflict of interest, please inform the Joint Call Secretariat immediately so that a substitute can be found.

Joint Call Secretariat contact data:

Dr. Falko Drews : Email: falko.drews@dlr.de – Phone number: +49 228 3821 1742

Conflict of interest: No Yes

If yes, please specify:

GENERAL INFORMATION:

The purpose of the first step of the evaluation process is to decline projects that present obvious problems of feasibility and to identify projects which deserve the evaluation of a full proposal.

To facilitate the evaluation process, please classify this pre-proposal into category A, B, or C according to the following indications:

- A: The pre-proposal successfully addresses all or most aspects of the criteria and therefore the applicant may be invited to send a full proposal.**
- B: The pre-proposal generally addresses the criteria, but there are significant weaknesses. Further discussion will be needed during the SEC meeting.**
- C: The pre-proposal clearly does not meet the standards of a highly competitive final evaluation step. It therefore should be rejected.**

EVALUATION OF RELEVANT CRITERIA

During the pre-proposal evaluation, all criteria should be considered. Each criterion should receive a point score between 0 and 5:

- 0: Failure. The proposal fails to address the criterion in question, or cannot be judged because of missing or incomplete information.**
- 1: Poor. The proposal shows serious weaknesses in relation to the criterion in question.**
- 2: Fair. The proposal generally addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses that need corrections.**
- 3: Good. The proposal addresses the criterion in question well but certain improvements are necessary.**
- 4: Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but small improvements are possible.**
- 5: Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all aspects of the criterion in question.**

Please note that scoring one or more evaluation criteria under the defined threshold means that, in your opinion, the project should not be selected for the 2nd phase (full proposal submission) and thus falls into category C.

Criterion 1: Scientific excellence of the pre-proposal

- *Relevance to the topic addressed by the call.*
- *Soundness of concept and quality of objectives.*
- *Proposal originality.*
- *Progress beyond the state-of-the-art.*

Score (0-5): _____

Threshold 4/5

Criterion 2: Quality of the transnational research consortium and efficiency of the implementation and the management of the project

- *Quality and effectiveness of the methodology and associated workplan.*
- *Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants (for young teams, appropriateness of their current work and training of their members should be considered).*
- *Quality of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity, added value of the multinational collaboration).*
- *Appropriateness and justification of the resources to be committed (personnel, equipment, etc) and of the estimated budget.*

Score (0-5): _____

Threshold 3.5/5

Criterion 3: Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results.

- *Potential impact of the expected results for future clinical practices and/or pharmaceutical/industrial applications in the area of personalised cancer medicine.*
- *Appropriateness of measures for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results including socio-economic aspects and anticipation of intellectual property issues (patenting, industrial exploitation, marketing, etc).*

Score (0-5): _____

Threshold 3.5/5

General comments, strengths and weaknesses

Please summarise your general comments underlining the main strengths and weaknesses of the proposed project.

Please note that the entry into this free text field should closely match the category filled below (A, B or C) and that the text could also be used to send a final anonymised report to the applicant.

Please use as much space as you need / A minimum of 150 words is required

TOTAL SCORE (maximum 15):

_____ *Threshold 11/15*

CATEGORY (A, B or C):
