Guidelines for Scientific Reviewers

Reviewers are bound to respect the confidentiality of information provided in a CORBEL proposal. Reviewers must not disclose or otherwise exploit this confidential information for any purpose.

CORBEL seeks to harmonise access to European Research Infrastructures (RIs) joining their various expertise across the range of life science disciplines. This facilitated access is of particular relevance for advanced interdisciplinary research projects, which could highly benefit from the integration of several specialist services and technologies. Through defined pipelines, the services of more than 20 CORBEL partner institutes from ten participating RIs are made accessible to interested users. CORBEL partners launched an Open Call and thereby offered to all academic and industrial scientists in Europe the unique opportunity to access multiple RIs with just one application. For the selection of appropriate pilot projects, it is crucial to evaluate the project proposals particularly in the framework of CORBEL: **The projects should highly benefit from getting access to several services, they should help to establish sustainable pipelines of user-aligned services and they must involve access to at least two different RIs.**

- Reviews should be returned within two weeks.
- Each evaluation criterion must be scored.
- A too low score in any criterion (a red mark below) will suffice to reject the proposal
- A thorough evaluation of the scientific excellence of the proposed work is essential to prioritize proposals, as the capacity at some service providers is limited

Proposals should be scored according to the following criteria:

1. Scientific Excellence (6. Internationally Outstanding; 5. Excellent; 4. Good; 3. Average; 2. Satisfactory; 1. Not Competitive)

Proposals should be of high scientific quality, with a clearly defined background and innovative goal. The significance of the project in the context of international research and standards in the field as well as the relevance of the project to the scientist's overall scientific work should be considered.

2. Benefit of the access to several RIs (3. High benefit; 2. Average benefit; 1. No obvious benefit of accessing multiple RIs)

The aim of CORBEL is to support advanced research projects that could greatly benefit from getting access to several high-end technologies or services, which are offered by different RIs.

3. Expected impact (3. Great impact 2. Average impact 1. Little impact) CORBEL projects should have some impact on the field of science, economy, society, health or European collaboration.

Overall Threshold score for acceptance: 8 out of 12

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 654248.

Guidelines for Service Providers

Reviewers are bound to respect the confidentiality of information provided in a CORBEL proposal. Reviewers must not disclose or otherwise exploit this confidential information for any purpose.

Next to the scientific evaluation, the proposals will also be reviewed by staff at the requested facilities. The service providers will receive the scientific reviews of the proposals that have passed the scientific evaluation threshold. The technical feasibility review evaluates the following aspects:

- Feasibility of the project to be successfully conducted with the CORBEL service providing institute
- Availability of required technologies and expertise at the CORBEL service provider
- Availability of possible required supporting laboratory or animal facilities for the project
- Technical ability and motivation of the applicant: ability to conduct fully or partially the planned experiments, ability to provide the prerequisites to start the proposed work with the service provider or possibility to acquire the required skills in the time frame of the proposed project
- Maturity of the project: applicants should be ready to start the work within 3 months after project acceptance to ensure completion of service provision by the end of CORBEL
- Necessity to conduct the research with the requested CORBEL partner (or could the applicant conduct the work with another CORBEL partner that would be closer to his/her home laboratory, or that would be more qualified for the specified application)
- Justification for the combination of research infrastructures requested

The Moderator may refer back to the scientific reviewers and the service providers at any time for help and comment on the proposal outcome to the applicant. The applicant will receive the average review scores, the reviewer's comments as well as the Moderator's decision.
Help: Reviewers may contact the CORBEL Open Call project managers (Frauke.Leitner@embl.de and Marie.Vidal@mdc-berlin.de) for help with the online reviewing process.
Disclaimer: All proposals will be peer-reviewed by a scientific review panel and in addition need acceptance by the service providers selected in the proposal. This technical feasibility check is performed by staff at the requested facilities and it remains the right of the facilities to decline access on reasonable grounds (e.g. conflict of interest, capacity limitations, financial limitations).

Guidelines for Moderators

Moderators are bound to respect the confidentiality of information provided in a CORBEL proposal. Moderators must not disclose or otherwise exploit this confidential information for any purpose.

Moderators should assess proposals according to the following initial criteria:

- Eligibility: Proposals must originate from EU Member State or Associated Countries as defined by the Horizon 2020 programme
- Request of at least 2 research infrastructures: As the CORBEL mission is to establish pipelines between different RIs and to harmonize and facilitate access to different RIs, the application must combine services offered by more than one RI.

Moderators should choose a total of two reviewers for each proposal; matching their scientific and technical background to the project scope. Reviewers will be appointed and confirmed after each

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 654248.

deadline for application has passed. The aim is to provide a decision to the applicant within 6 - 8 weeks after each deadline.

When the scientific reviews and the technical evaluations have been returned, the Moderator should then action one of three outcomes:

Approval; Revision; Rejection.

The Moderator may comment on the proposal outcome including advice on next steps for the applicant. The applicant will receive all two reviewers' comments, their scores and the technical evaluation results.

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 654248.