

## PEER REVIEWING POLICY

### 1. INTRODUCTION:

Peer reviewing allows the Sanfilippo Children's Foundation (SCF) to seek independent, expert advice in order to make decisions about which research to fund.

Peer reviewing is expert advice provided by appropriately qualified, independent professionals and experts. A 'peer' is an individual that the applicant would consider to be of at least equal standing in the field, or have equal knowledge, and whose opinions are most likely to be respected. Lay experts can be used to provide advice on other aspects of research, such as the potential benefits to patients or how well it fits with the research strategy of the organisation.

Funding decisions are ultimately made by the Charity's Board of Directors based on the recommendations made by the Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) and any external peer reviewers.

### 2. AIMS:

The essential aims of the peer reviewing process are to ensure that the proposed research is:

- Relevant to the charity's objectives and research strategy;
- Within the capabilities of the applicant(s);
- Novel and not a duplication of other studies;
- Using appropriate methodologies;
- Conducted by competent researchers, in a suitable research environment and that the level of financial support requested is appropriate for the work to be undertaken.

### 3. REVIEWERS:

Internal reviewers are considered as those serving on the SAB. SAB members will not be employed by SCF.

External reviewers are considered as those not serving on the SAB, and are sought for their specific expertise. The SAB can use external experts to seek additional informed opinions, in writing or in person, about the applications under review.

Members of the SAB will have relevant experience and expertise in the field that SCF's research strategy is focused on, and the majority will be active in research and/or clinical care.

### 4. PRINCIPLES OF PEER REVIEW:

SCF requires its internal and external reviewers to adhere to the [NHMRC peer review guidelines](#) that outline best practice for the conduct of peer review:

As such, it is expected that SCF peer reviewers:

- are fair, accurate and honest in their review;
- give constructive feedback
- act in confidence and do not disclose the content or outcome of any process in which they are involved;
- declare all conflicts of interest and do not permit personal prejudice to influence the peer review;
- do not agree to participate in peer review outside their area of expertise;

In particular the NHMRC guidelines go into considerable detail about conflict of interest which should be considered before accepting an invitation to peer review a grant. SAB members should also consider these guidelines in relation to grants being considered, declare any conflict of interest and abstain from voting/scoring of grants.

**SAB members and external reviewers must not discuss applications with applicants and, similarly, applicants should not approach SAB members either before or after the SAB meeting. All correspondence should be made via SCF.**

## Grant Round: Peer Review Report 2021

### HOW THIS FORM WILL BE USED:

The Sanfilippo Children's Foundation's Scientific Advisory Board will use your comments and ratings to assist in the selection of applications to be funded in 2021.

The questions below are designed to address the following assessment criteria:

1. Scientific Quality – 50% weighting
2. Significance and/or Innovation – does the project have the potential to change the course of Sanfilippo Syndrome - 25% weighting
3. Team Quality and Capability – do the researchers have the required skills and experience to carry out the project? - 25% weighting

This Peer Review Report, with the assessor de-identified, will be passed on to the applicant for rebuttal prior to funding decisions being made.

### RATING GUIDE:

Please follow directions contained within the individual rating cell. Further guidance on this scoring system can be found on the [NHMRC website](#)

1 = Poor	2= Unsatisfactory	3= Marginal
4= Good	5= Very good	6= Excellent
7= Outstanding		

### COMPLETING THIS FORM:

1. Please add comments within each section of each evaluation category (the section will expand as required, please write as much as you feel necessary). Your feedback is invaluable to our researchers.
2. Add a rating.
3. Please feel free to add comments in the confidential section. These comments will only be available to the Scientific Advisory Board.

APPLICATION TITLE:

PRINCIPAL APPLICANT:

Section	Evaluation categories. This section will expand as required.	Rating
1a	<i>Is the proposed project well-defined, coherent and well developed? Please add comments in this cell.</i>	Rating 1-7
1b	<i>Is the study well designed and in your opinion are the aims achievable in the time frame? Please add comments in this cell.</i>	Rating 1-7
1c	<i>Is the project feasible and are the facilities, tools and techniques available? If applicable, do you foresee any problems obtaining ethics approvals? Please add comments in this cell</i>	Rating 1-7
2a	<i>Does the project have the potential to change the course of Sanfilippo syndrome? If so how quickly? Please add comments in this cell.</i>	Rating 1-7
2b	<i>Is this project innovative and will it contribute significantly to the field of Sanfilippo research? Is it duplicating work done elsewhere? Please add comments in this cell.</i>	Rating 1-7
3	<i>Does the research team have the experience, expertise and track record to carry out the proposed research and where relevant realise it's translational potential? Please add comments in this cell.</i>	Rating 1-7
4.	<i>Is the budget adequate? Please add comments in this cell.</i>	Rating not required
5.	<i>Please summarise the overall strengths of the application. Please add comments in this cell.</i>	Rating not required
6.	<i>Please summarise the overall weaknesses of the application. Please add comments in this cell.</i>	Rating not required
7.	<b>OVERALL RATING of the application.</b> We will calculate the overall weighted score.	Leave blank
8.	CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS TO SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY BOARD. These comments will <u>not</u> be passed back to the applicant.	