



EQUIPES FRM 2022 CALL FOR PROPOSALS Review procedure

1. Go to <https://frm-ng.evision.ca/en>



Username
Password
 Remember me

[Password forgotten?](#)

2. Enter your username (email address) and password
3. Click on Self Assessment / Evaluation



4. Click on Committee ID "114"

Self Assessment / Evaluation		Meeting		
Self Assessment / Evaluation				
COMMITTEES				
Committee ID	Committee	Deadline	Status	Documents
<u>114</u>	Conseil Scientifique Demande EQU des... - 2022	2022-03-07 07:59	In progress	

- If you wish to fill an expertise form in French, please click on "FR" at the right top corner of the screen
- When you connect for the first time, you have to **read and accept the Confidentiality and disclosure agreement**

Self Assessment / Evaluation

WORKLIST - COMMITTEE: #46 - CONSEIL SCIENTIFIQUE DEMANDE EQU DU 22 MARS 2019 - 2018

Terms of use

CONFIDENTIALITY AND NON DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT


COMMITTEES - 46

- Acting as a scientific council or a committee member of the Fondation pour la Recherche Médicale. I certify that I will have to review scientific, technical or industrial confidential information during my expertise work on behalf of the Fondation pour la Recherche Médicale.
 - I will not disclose any confidential information communicated to me either orally or in writing or by any other means in the context of my expertise work and I undertake:
 - Not to disclose confidential information entrusted to me by the Fondation pour la Recherche Médicale.
 - Not to communicate with third parties the content of reviews, debates or the own opinion of other Council or Committee members, or FRM employees
 - Not to use the documents and information available through the expertise for any other purpose, especially ideas and data exposed within the proposals.
 - Not to keep, not to transmit or make available all files or documents after completion of evaluation.
 - To inform the Fondation pour la Recherche Médicale of any potential conflict of interest concerning a specific evaluation that would put me in a situation in which my impartiality might be questioned
- I also certify that I am aware of the ineligibility of my research team to the call(s) for proposals managed by the Council or the committee which I belong to during my term.
 - I accept the present commitment both for the review and selection of the proposals and the scientific follow-up of the selected projects.
 - I agree to take all steps to ensure compliance with my obligations
 - I have read the entire contents of this 'Confidentiality and Non Disclosure Agreement' and fully understand its contents. I hereby state that I have entered into this agreement of my own free will.
 - I understand that any violation of this Agreement can result in immediate termination of contract.
- Acting as an external referee for evaluation of research projects on behalf of the Fondation pour la Recherche Médicale. I agree to the following rules:
 - Not to disclose confidential information entrusted to me by the Fondation pour la Recherche Médicale.
 - Not to use the documents and information available through the expertise for any other purpose.
 - Not to use ideas or the data contained in the proposals.
 - To inform the Fondation pour la Recherche Médicale of any potential conflict of interest concerning a specific evaluation that would put me in a situation in which my impartiality might be questioned
 - Not to keep, not to transmit or make available all files or documents after completion of evaluation.
- I agree to take all steps to ensure compliance with my obligations
 - I have read the entire contents of this 'Confidentiality and Non Disclosure Agreement' and fully understand its contents. I hereby state that I have entered into this agreement of my own free will.
 - I understand that any violation of this Agreement can result in immediate termination of contract.

Accept

- The worklist (= a list of assigned applications) appears:

Self Assessment / Evaluation



TOP	Project No	Applicant Name	Program	Due	Review	Status	Reviewer score	Priority
1	ZZ95	VIGNUZZI, RCO	Team FRM	2019-03-12 09:00	Assigned	0.000		

Do not take into account the column "TOP" and "Your selection" notification.

To start the review, click on the **application number**. The worksheet of application appears including 3 tabs : Committee details, Application details and


Review

Review tab:

Declare if you have a **conflict of interest** or not with the applicant

If you click on "Conflict", an **alert message** appears. If you continue, you will no longer have access to this application.

Before to begin the review, you must first click on "No conflict" and "Save" to display the evaluation form (see arrows in screenshot below)



Application details tab: click on "Application Form and attachment (Full version)" to preview an application.



WORKSHEET - 12589 - AIT OUFELLA, HAFID - TEAM FRM	
Description	Conseil Scientifique Demande EQU du 19 mars 2021/ Scientific committee 19th march 2021
Reviewer Name	FRM, FRM
Reviewer Role	External Reviewer (External)

Application details	
Applicant	AIT OUFELLA, HAFID
Document	Application Form and attachment (Full version)

7.

3 evaluation criteria, total Score **50 points** including:

- **Applicant team** criterion (Score : **20** points) ;
- **Research Programme** criterion (Score : **20** points)
- **Funding** criterion (Score : **10** points)

Rating with a Score of 10:

0 = Proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.

1-2 = Poor. The criterion is inadequately addressed or there are serious inherent weaknesses.

3-4 = Fair. The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.

5-6 = Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.

7-8 = Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.

9-10 = Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

Rating with a Score of 20:

0 = Proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.

1-4 = Poor. The criterion is inadequately addressed or there are serious inherent weaknesses.

5-8 = Fair. The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.

9-12 = Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.

13-16 = Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.

16-20 = Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

My Review

If you believe that you have a conflict of interest with this application, please declare it below.

* **Conflict of Interest** No conflict Conflict

TOTAL SCORE

0

REVIEWER FORM

Base your detailed comments on the headings provided below. Please enter your comments in each text box after the description of the evaluation criterion.

OVERALL COMMENTS

*

Applicant team

- CV and quality of the applicant's publications
- Complementarity and contribution of team members

* **Score**

* **Comments**

Other required fields are: "overall comments" and "**Score**"

Save your review form

An alert message "You must SUBMIT your review and complete your selection (TOP) in the working list" appears. Please do not consider a mention "selection TOP", this option is not relevant for extern reviewers.

Submit your review form. *Attention: Once submitted, you will not be able to change scores and comments.*

Research programme

- Originality
- Description of the scientific background and objectives
- Methods and experimental approaches
- Medical and scientific interest
- Contribution of external collaborations.
- Feasibility

* Score

* Comments

Funding

- Importance and complementarity of other sources of funding
- Justification of the requested budget

* Score

* Comments

Committee notes (not available for the PI)