

PNS GRANTS SCORING GUIDELINES

The purpose of this document is to provide a brief guidance to harmonize the criteria used to score the different items of the evaluation form of the PNS training grants across reviewers. In general, reviewers are expected to proceed with an evaluation using the standards of other competitive research calls from public or private institutions. Before starting with scoring the proposal we encourage reviewers to take a look to the purpose and criteria of these grants on this link <https://pnsociety.com/training-grants/>

The scoring process consists of two stages:

- Peer review scoring according to the criteria detailed below.
- Face-to face Interview by grant committee
 - o With the purpose of clarifying doubts about the aims of the project, methodologies, resources or feasibility of the proposed tasks.

PEER-REVIEW SCORING

- Three reviewers will review each proposal
 - o One member of the grant committee
 - o One member of the PNS expert in the research field of the proposal
 - o One member of the PNS from outside the research field of the proposal
- Each item of the review is scored with 0=Weak 1=Fair 2=Good 3= excellent. A sumscore of all points will be calculated. The maximum score possible is 27 points per reviewer (81 points in total). Proposals scoring below 18 average (total sumscore divided by 3 reviewers) points will not be considered eligible for funding.

PROPOSAL SCORING

Originality (0-3 points)

Please, score the overall novelty of the proposal in comparison with state of the art research in the field. Consider elements like the use of novel experimental approaches, novel techniques or novel models (in vitro or animal) that may be interesting not only for the project itself but also for the field at large.

Feasibility (0-3 points)

Please, score the feasibility of the project taking in account mentor and grantee expertise, resources supplied by the mentor for the development of the project and amount and difficulty of the tasks for the proposed timeline.

Impact of the project for the PNS field

Please, score the potential of the project to generate knowledge that can open new research avenues in the field, by its ability to generate preliminary knowledge to build bigger follow-up projects, to understand peripheral nerve disease or fundamental nerve biology or by its potential impact on clinical practice.

Methods

Please, score the experimental or clinical design, the methodological robustness, the potential risks of the proposed methods and mitigation strategies to achieve the aims of the project.

MENTOR SCORING

Mentor's CV

Please, score the CV of the mentor in accordance to the topic of the proposal: previous work related to the project, peer-reviewed publications related to the field of the proposal and previous successful projects in relationship with the topic of the proposal.

Ability to mentor

Please, score the ability to conduct research as senior or corresponding author, previous mentoring activities within academic or clinical contexts and activities as PhD or resident supervisor.

CANDIDATE SCORING

Candidate's CV

Please, score education trajectory of the candidate, expertise in research fields, techniques or models related to the proposal (even if they are outside the peripheral nerve domain), prior mobility across Institutions and participation in other research projects before.

Publications

Please, score peer-reviewed publications taking in account their relationship to the proposal, academic or clinical impact, quality of the journals and position of authorship. Please, take special consideration of first, last and corresponding author publications.

Career perspectives

Please, score motivations and overall plan to incorporate to the PNS community taking the letter of intent, prospects of future projects in the field, professional trajectory in research and the overall potential of the candidate to become a consolidated researcher in the PNS field.