

Policy for reviewing applications for IDBI seed grants

Goal: Ensure unbiased selection of the IDBI seed grant applications most likely to result in expansion of IDBI collaborations and acquisition of external funding.

Review committee: The review committee will be comprised of at least 3 members drawn from the IDBI leadership team and IDBI internal advisors, with other qualified SLU personnel serving as needed to provide adequate scientific expertise. IDBI support personnel may serve as *ex officio* members. The committee will select a Chair from its membership. Committee members will be recruited for each review cycle; service on consecutive committees is permitted.

Conflicts: Review committee members will be in conflict with an application if:

- They are a PI or co-investigator on the application.
- They have an active grant or a grant application under review with the seed grant PI.
- They have been co-authors on a paper with the PI published in the last 18 months.
- They have a personal association with the PI that may cause an appearance of conflict.
- They would receive funding through the grant (Discovery Services Core activities exempted).
- They consulted with the applicant at a level beyond answering programmatic or budget questions.

Potential conflicts will be declared to the IDBI leadership team, which will determine if a conflict exists. Reviewers can be in conflict with no more than 1 application per review cycle. Conflicted reviewers must not be involved in review of the application with which they are conflicted but will participate in review of the remaining applications.

Review criteria: Review criteria are similar to those of an NIH grant application. They are:

- Significance to external funding potential: Assuming the project is successful: Is the work proposed important to advancing a drug/biotherapeutic project for a planned external grant application? Would the seed grant project substantially increase chances of acquiring external funding? Applications that are strong in all aspects except funding potential will not be eligible to receive IDBI funding.
- Investigator: Is the investigator(s) qualified to do the work and/or has s/he identified a collaborator or vendor with the appropriate expertise? Does the investigative team represent a new collaboration involving SLU faculty? New collaborations are an asset but not required. Limited funding history will not be a weakness for junior investigators.
- Innovation
- Approach: Is the project scientifically robust and rigorous? Is it feasible within the approved budget and timeline?
- Overall impact on funding potential: Balance the 4 criterion scores to reflect the overall potential for the project to substantially improve competitiveness of one or more external grant applications.

Scoring: Applications will be scored using the NIH scoring system (1-9 in integers, with 1 being the best). Scores will be assigned for each criterion. Begin the review assuming the score will be 5 and move up and down as appropriate (i.e. review committee will

Feedback: Brief reviews of the applications will be written using the IDBI seed grant review form. Reviews are to clearly convey the strengths and weaknesses. Be constructive to assist the applicant in crafting a strong external grant application. The reviews will not be provided to the applicant to promote confidentiality in the review process. The review committee chair will write a brief summary for each application addressing the

committee chair will convey the review results and summary statement to the IDBI leadership team.

Funding selection: Applications will be selected for funding by the review committee primarily based on their impact on funding potential. Funding recommendations by the review committee will be reviewed by non-conflicted members of the IDBI leadership team leadership team identifies inconsistencies with prior funding decisions.

