

**Health
Research Call**

Eligibility and evaluation guidelines



*A world
to discover*

Actin filaments in mouse cortical neurons grown in vitro. H. Vindin.

Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Eligibility phase	3
3. Remote pre-selection	4
4. Selection committee evaluation.....	9
5. Feedback to project leaders	11
6. Awarding of the grant.....	11
7. Appendix.....	12

1. Introduction

This guide sets out the procedure for evaluating and selecting proposals in the Health Research Call (hereinafter, proposals and individually proposal) and contains the guidelines and evaluation criteria to be followed in scoring a grant proposal.

The "la Caixa" Foundation has established that the following principles should govern all assessment processes for the Health Research Call:

- » **TRANSPARENCY.** Information about the basic principles that govern the process of evaluating and selecting proposals, and procedures followed for that purpose, is available to Applicants, evaluators and the general public on the Call for Proposals website. In addition, Project Leaders receive timely information on the status of their proposal at each stage of the process and, when appropriate, feedback regarding the evaluation of that proposal.
- » **EQUITY.** Proposals are evaluated based solely on the merits they demonstrate in relation to the evaluation criteria explicitly defined for each stage of the process, with no other factors being taken into consideration. All proposals are treated equally and according to the same evaluation criteria. All proposals undergo an assessment process conducted by expert, independent evaluators.
- » **EFFICIENCY.** The "la Caixa" Foundation's grants are characterised by the thoroughness with which the proposal assessment process is conducted and the rigour applied in complying with the stipulated procedures. Punctuality in meeting established deadlines, all of which are known to Project Leaders, is of the utmost importance. The system has been designed to allow evaluators sufficient time to perform their scoring with high standards.
- » **QUALITY.** The "la Caixa" Foundation's grants are awarded solely on the criteria of scientific excellence and quality of the Project, the potential value of the proposal, its social relevance and impact, and the suitability and research potential of the Project Leader and Team. For this reason, and to ensure that the evaluators perform their duties adequately, they are appointed in accordance with their area of expertise.

The selection of a proposal comprises a maximum of three phases:

ELIGIBILITY PHASE: The eligibility procedure will consist of the following steps:

- » **Format eligibility:** All Applications received will be reviewed to ensure they fulfil the Application criteria published in the Rules for Participation of this Call.
- » **Content eligibility:** Those Applications that fulfil the format eligibility will be checked to ensure they are ready to undergo the evaluation procedure.

REMOTE PRE-SELECTION: Each eligible proposal is sent to three or four experts in the research field(s) of the proposal. After the remote phase, the proposals that receive the highest scores in each Thematic Area will move on to the next evaluation phase.

SELECTION COMMITTEE EVALUATION: Project Leaders whose proposals have passed the pre-selection evaluation phase will be invited to a face-to-face interview in front of a Selection Committee composed of eight to twelve experts in the Thematic Area of their proposal.

2. Eligibility phase

During the eligibility phase, the format and content of the proposal will be validated to facilitate the evaluation process.

Therefore, the evaluators must consider all proposals submitted to them as formally eligible for examination and scoring, since they have not been dismissed during the previous eligibility phase.

2.1. Format eligibility

The Grant Project Office checks the suitability of the proposals submitted by the established deadline and their compliance with the formal requirements of the Call, based on the Application criteria described in section 5 of the Rules for Participation.

2.2. Content eligibility

The **content eligibility process** aims to identify, in advance, those Applications that are **highly unlikely to reach a funding position** when assessed against the overall applicant pool. The assessment of content eligibility is based on an **Artificial Intelligence (AI) tool** subject to human oversight and periodic auditing, as explained below:

AI tool:

This phase uses a generative **AI tool** that analyses the content of the Applications by applying the assessment criteria defined for the programme (see section 7 of the Rules of participation). The AI tool assesses the information included in the text fields of the Application and generates a ranking of Applications according to the extent to which they meet the programme's assessment criteria (please note that personal data are not considered in the assessment). As described below, this phase is under human oversight and periodic auditing.

Based on this assessment, the AI system classifies proposals according to the completeness of the evaluation criteria. Proposals receiving the **lowest classification may be declared content-ineligible** (for more details see the Eligibility and Evaluation Guidelines) and, therefore, may not proceed to the full evaluation process. This reflects the assessment that such Applications are highly unlikely to reach a funding position when compared against the overall applicant pool. For each AI assessment, the tool provides a justification and a confidence level. These outputs are used to support the human based selection of the sample of Applications that will be reviewed by human experts.

Being identified as content-ineligible does not imply any formal deficiency in the Application, but rather reflects its relative position within a highly competitive selection process.

The Project Leader will be informed if their proposal has been identified as content-ineligible through the content eligibility process. At this point, the Applicant shall have 48 hours to explicitly withdraw the proposal in the online system (should they wish to do so). Applications that are not withdrawn may be subject to an additional review by human experts, who may either validate or overturn the AI-generated recommendation. Upon completion of this process, Project Leaders will be notified of the final outcome of their proposals, including whether they

will advance to the remote evaluation stage or be excluded during the content eligibility assessment.

Human oversight and auditing:

As indicated, the content eligibility process is subject to human oversight and periodic auditing to ensure its correct functioning, consistency and alignment with the programme's assessment criteria. The AI tool supports the content eligibility process but does not make funding decisions.

The performance of the process will be regularly monitored and reviewed by the Foundation. Human experts will guarantee proper human oversight by analyse the Applications and outcomes generated by the AI tool in order to verify that the process operates as intended and remains aligned with the objectives and standards of the Call. Where appropriate, adjustments may be introduced to improve the robustness, consistency and reliability of the process.

As indicated above, personal data are not considered in the assessment. Furthermore, if personal data are included by Applicants within the text fields, they may be processed incidentally as a residual consequence of the analysis, but never as part of the main processing activity or for AI training purposes. In any event, personal data included within text fields will have no impact, neither intentionally processed on the content eligibility process.

2.3. Eligibility communication

If a proposal is dismissed by the eligibility process (either in the format or content eligibility phase), the "la Caixa" Foundation will send an email notification to the Applicant. **No redress or appeal procedure will be admitted.**

For proposals dismissed during the content eligibility process, a report including the corresponding feedback will be provided. This feedback will be based on the AI ranking justification and, where applicable, the outcome of the human validation process.

The PL and PIs of the proposals dismissed by the eligibility process will not be able to participate as PL in the next edition of the Call.

The PL and PIs of the proposals dismissed by the eligibility process will not be able to participate as PL in the next edition of the Call.

3. Remote pre-selection

Proposals sent for pre-selection evaluation are reviewed by three or four peer reviewers from the same research field(s) as the proposal or from a closely related field. This phase of the evaluation is carried out through the online platform.

The evaluation process for the proposals in this phase is as follows:

- » Proposals that fulfil the eligibility criteria will be sent to three peer reviewers for remote assessment.
- » Each peer reviewer will assign a score to the proposal according to the established evaluation criteria. All scores will be normalised (see Box - Normalisation system, in Section 7).

- » The final score for a proposal is calculated as the average of the normalised scores provided by the three peer reviewers.
- » If there is a significant discrepancy regarding a proposal that may reach the threshold to move on to the next evaluation phase, that proposal will be sent to a fourth peer reviewer. The final score will then be calculated using the four normalised scores.
- » Proposals will be scored and a ranking for each Thematic Area obtained.

3.1. Assignment of evaluators for the pre-selection of proposals

The pre-selection evaluation phase is carried out by independent peer reviewers who are recognised experts and researchers from each of the five thematic research areas of this Call. The selection of peer reviewers is conducted at the beginning of the Call by the Grant Project Office. Every year a data-scraping process is performed to update the scientific profiles of the peer reviewers. With the information gathered in the scraping process and the information provided by the PL (i.e. type of research and keywords) a matching process is performed with the objective of finding the most suitable group of three peer-reviewers to evaluate the proposals in the remote evaluation phase. These peer reviewers will have expressed both their willingness to be part of this phase of the evaluation and their suitability for the research field(s) of this Call for Proposals.

Each proposal will be assigned to and evaluated by three of these peer reviewers, taking into account the keywords listed in the proposal.

In general, each peer reviewer will evaluate no more than 20 proposals. However, this threshold may be adjusted based on the number and type of proposals submitted.

3.2. General considerations and recommendations for evaluators

Peer reviewers involved in the pre-selection phase will accept an agreement with the "la Caixa" Foundation through the online system, whereby they undertake to maintain the confidentiality of proposals examined, declare any conflicts of interest, accept the code of conduct and commit to follow the guidelines and recommendations provided by the "la Caixa" Foundation.

Before beginning their evaluation, evaluators are expected to familiarise themselves with the Evaluation Criteria (detailed in Section 7 of the **Rules for Participation**). They should also review this **Evaluation Process Guide** and the **Code of Conduct for Evaluators**. It is recommended that they become familiar with the Call by reading a number of proposals before starting to evaluate them.

To score proposals during the pre-selection evaluation phase, peer reviewers will use a scoring scale with the criteria and sub-criteria for evaluation, each of which has a specific weight (detailed in Section 7 of the **Rules for Participation**).

Each peer reviewer must provide a rationale (i.e. a qualitative evaluation) for the different criteria for each proposal, along with a concise written brief that includes the reasoning behind their evaluation of each proposal, as well as its strong and weak points. The main objective of the rationale is to ensure objective and well-justified evaluations and to support the resubmission of the proposal in subsequent editions.

The use of AI tools by evaluators in writing their comments is not allowed, except for translation or grammar correction purposes, provided that such tools do not compromise the confidentiality of the information. In all cases, the content of the report must be original and authored by the expert.

An AI-based tool will be integrated into the online system to identify potential errors or inconsistencies in the evaluation report at the time of submission. Any flagged information will be shown to the reviewer, who may decide whether or not to take it into account before submitting the report.

These comments will be made accessible to candidates and members of the Selection Committee, along with the overall score of the proposal. Therefore, evaluators should be extremely careful with their wording and respectful towards the proposals presented. Comments should have a strictly professional tone and a constructive spirit. Under no circumstances should comments:

- » reveal information about the identity of the evaluator;
- » contain offensive, discriminatory or improper statements; or
- » be inconsistent with the numerical score.

In order to allow evaluators to score the proposals free from pressure and act with maximum independence, the composition of the peer review remote phase will not be made public while the evaluation phases are open. However, once the grants have been awarded, the complete list of evaluators (including full name and institution) who have intervened in the evaluation phases will be published on the "la Caixa" Foundation website.

3.3. Evaluation of a proposal in the remote pre-selection

» Scoring scale.

For each proposal, **peer reviewers will score each evaluation sub-criterion using a two-decimal number from 1 to 8** based on following scale of values.

This scale represents not only the quality of the proposal but also the competitiveness within the framework of this call.

RATING	Exceptional	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Poor	Very poor
SCORE	7.50 to 8.00	7.00 to 7.49	6.50 to 6.99	6.00 to 6.49	4.00 to 5.99	1.00 to 3.99

These scores will be weighted accordingly and added together to obtain a final score for each proposal, rounded to two decimal places.

Please note that the PL and PIs of proposals with a final peer-review score < 6.0 will not be eligible to apply to the next Call as a PL. Based on previous edition results, only those proposals with a score > 7.0 are likely to be funded.

» Aspects evaluated.

Peer reviewers will carry out the pre-selection evaluation of all proposals in line with the evaluation criteria described below. To score proposals, peer reviewers will use a qualification

grid with the evaluation criteria to be assessed, each of which will have a specific weight, as will each sub-criterion.

Each peer reviewer will also provide a rationale, along with a brief written explanation, of the reasons for the score of each proposal evaluated, as well as its strengths and weaknesses.

The same evaluation criteria and sub-criteria will be applied to all proposals, and the established weights that apply to each criterion and sub-criterion, described in the **Rules for Participation document, Section 7**, are also detailed here:

a) Scientific excellence and impact (Weight: 75%):

a.1. Project Quality (30%)

- Potential of the proposal to go beyond the state of the art and generate groundbreaking, novel and highly relevant results.
- Soundness of the hypothesis, support of the preliminary results and coherence of the objectives.

a.2. Scientific approach and work plan (20%)

- Feasibility and rigour of the methodology and the work plan in accordance with the objectives.
- Adequate justification of the timescales, resources and budget necessary to carry out the proposal.
- Definition of the limitations of the study and contingency plan.

a.3. Impact (25%)

- Scientific impact and social relevance: the extent to which the results of the proposal can make a positive, relevant and innovative contribution to the scientific field and/or society.
- Responsible research: detailed analysis of the ethical, legal, social and environmental implications of execution of the proposal and/or the potential implementation of its results in society and/or the scientific field.
- Dissemination and transfer: suitable description of the mechanisms, actions and activities of dissemination, communication, public engagement, valorisation and transfer of the proposal results.

b) Project Leader and Team (Weight: 25%):

Individual proposals: 25% PL, Team and CSO, if applicable

Research Consortium proposals: 12.5% PL, Team and CSO, if applicable / 12.5% PIs and Teams.

The following criteria will be assessed in both Individual and Research Consortium Projects:

- Professional trajectory and research potential of the PL.
- Adequacy of the role and capacity of the research team members to support the Project execution.
- Suitability and contributions of the Civil Society Organisations in the proposal.

In addition, regarding Research Consortium Projects, the following criteria will be assessed:

- Professional trajectory and research potential of the PIs of each Research Performing Organisation in the Research Consortium.

- Adequacy of the role and capacity of the Team Members of the Research Performing Organisations in the Research Consortium.

» **Pre-selection of proposals in the remote phase.**

Once the total score for each proposal is established by each of the three peer reviewers, results are received by the Grant Project Office and an average score calculated. The system monitors the consistency of evaluations among reviewers who examine and score the same proposals, also considering the average score of each reviewer across all their proposals. Scores are weighted according to the matching value associated with the peer reviewer and the Project.

If there are any significant discrepancies between the scores assigned to a proposal that could determine whether it passes the threshold for the next evaluation phase, the "la Caixa" Foundation will send that proposal to a fourth peer reviewer for evaluation. The average score will then be calculated taking into account the four peer-review evaluation scores.

Proposals will be ranked according to their average score. The best 18 Projects in each Thematic Area will move on to the next evaluation phase.

Once this evaluation phase is complete, Project Leaders will be notified as to whether or not they have been selected.

4. Selection Committees evaluation

Proposals that have been selected for this evaluation phase (i.e. the face-to-face interviews), are reviewed by evaluators from the Selection Committee of the specific Thematic Area of the proposal. The evaluators of the Selection Committees have not participated in the remote phase of evaluation of the same Call.

4.1. Assignment of evaluators for the Selection Committees

The Selection Committees are formed by international experts from different disciplinary areas within a Thematic Area. The Committee is characterised by the integration of the knowledge and scientific approaches of its members. These experts will have expressed both their willingness to be part of this phase of the evaluation process, as well as their expertise in the specific Thematic Area of this Call for Proposals.

Experts involved in the selection phase will accept through the online system an agreement with the "la Caixa" Foundation whereby they undertake to maintain the confidentiality of proposals examined, declare any conflicts of interest, accept the code of conduct and commit to follow the guidelines and recommendations provided by the "la Caixa" Foundation.

There are five Selection Committees, one for each Thematic Area. Each Selection Committee will consist of eight to twelve internationally recognised experts.

4.2. General considerations and recommendations for evaluators in the Selection Committees

Each Selection Committee will receive information about the proposal and the corresponding Project Leader sufficiently in advance to enable them to prepare adequately for the interviews. The Selection Committees will also have access to the scores and evaluations given to each proposal by the peer reviewers who were involved in the pre-selection evaluation phase. To the extent that they deem appropriate, evaluators may consider such information when evaluating and scoring the proposals.

Prior to the Selection Committee meetings, the best practice is for evaluators to familiarise themselves with the Evaluation Criteria (see Section 7 of the Call for Proposals) and the process in general by also reviewing the Selection Committees Evaluation Process Guide and the Code of Conduct for Evaluators. Likewise, it is recommended that they become familiar with the procedure by reading the Online System Manual. Information regarding the pre-selected proposals of each Thematic Area will be available to all members of the Selection Committee on the online system at least three to four weeks before the interviews. The online system will be open to allow comments or annotations that may be helpful during the interviews. Evaluators' final comments and scores will be entered into the same online system during the interviews. Once the grants have been awarded, the complete list of evaluators (by full name and institution) who have taken part in the Selection Committee process will be published on the "la Caixa" Foundation website.

4.3. Evaluation of a proposal by the Selection Committees

» Scoring scale

The Selection Committee members will score the various aspects of the proposal after the face-to-face interview in accordance with the evaluation criteria. Each expert on the Selection Committee will score each evaluation block (scientific excellence and impact, and Project Leader and team) using a two-decimal number from 1 to 5 (where 1 is the lowest).

These scores will be weighted correspondingly and added together to obtain a final score for each proposal, rounded to two decimal places. This score will determine the final ranking of the proposals in each Thematic Area, and therefore which proposals will be funded by the Call.

» Aspects evaluated

The Selection Committee will carry out an evaluation of all proposals, including the proposal documents provided on the online platform and the face-to-face interview with the Project Leader, according to the evaluation criteria. To score proposals, evaluators will use a qualification grid with two evaluation criteria, each of which has a specific weight and contains specific aspects to consider in the evaluation.

Evaluation criteria are the same for both the remote evaluation and the Selection Committees. Nevertheless, peer reviewers will score each section (four scores from 1 to 8) while panel reviewers will score by block (two scores from 1 to 5): Scientific excellence and impact (Weight: 75%) and Project Leader and Team (Weight: 25%).

Each expert will also provide a rationale, in a brief written explanation, of the reasons for the score of each proposal evaluated as well as its strengths and weaknesses.

» Interview content

Face-to-face interviews enable the Selection Committee to assess the quality and consistency of the proposal being evaluated, based on more detailed and nuanced considerations. The interview allows evaluators to resolve any questions that arise from reviewing the proposal and to gauge the ability of the Project Leader to defend their Project according to the evaluation criteria.

During the interview, the Project Leader's theoretical knowledge may be tested, although this is not the main objective. First and foremost, interviews are used to judge the merit of the proposal, based on the evaluation criteria.

The face-to-face interview seeks to:

- expand on the information provided in the proposal, focusing on the scientific excellence and impact of the Project;
- evaluate the Project Leader's and Project Team members' scientific and professional potential in relation to their capacity to implement the Project; and
- resolve doubts or seek clarification on matters not included in the proposal.

» Formal aspects to consider in the interview by evaluators

- Interviews will be conducted by the Project Leader and will be entirely in English.
- Each interview will last 25 minutes. Project Leaders will briefly summarise their proposal in 10 minutes. The Selection Committee will then ask any questions they deem relevant in

order to assess the proposal properly (Q&A). If necessary, the PL may be accompanied by up to two Team Members or PIs, who can assist in the Q&A phase.

- After the interview, experts will have 10 to 15 minutes to discuss the proposal, if necessary, and to enter scores and comments into the system.
- A representative of the "la Caixa" Foundation will chair the interview, ensuring adherence to established schedules and moderating the discussion, if necessary.
- » There are no established protocols with regard to the form of address. Nevertheless, the interviews must be characterised by their formality and the relevance of the questions.
- Evaluators comprising the Selection Committee will not introduce themselves to the Project Leader. During the face-to-face interviews, a place card will identify the name and Institution of each expert.
- Notes taken on other Project Leaders or documents with their scores should also be kept out of sight of the Project Leader being interviewed.
- In order to ensure confidentiality of internal discussions, the "la Caixa" Foundation will ensure that the Project Leader leaves the vicinity of the room after their interview.
- The Selection Committee should avoid discussing previous interviews when a new Project Leader is entering the room.

5. Feedback to Project Leaders

The Project Leaders will be informed as to whether they have been selected for funding by the Health Research Call.

Once the evaluation process is completed, feedback reports will be sent to all Project Leaders. These reports aim to provide Project Leaders with a general understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of their Projects as identified by the experts during the evaluation process.

Specifically, they will contain a quantitative evaluation of the proposal's performance in comparison with other proposals within the same Thematic Area, and a qualitative comment on the value of the Project. The comments received by Applicants are reviewed, and, in the case of the selection committees, compiled with the support of an AI tool.

The reports are intended as an informative tool for the researchers, and no redress procedure will be available at this point.

6. Awarding of the grant

The number of Projects to be awarded will depend on the total budget of the proposals selected. The intention is to distribute the total funding (see *Rules of Participation*) approximately equitably amongst the Thematic Areas, but the final distribution will always depend on the quality and specific characteristics of the proposals submitted to this Call.

After the final discussion, the members of each Selection Committee should express their agreement with the outcome of the process, including the final ranking of the proposals evaluated.

If a Selection Committee considers the level of the proposals falls below the minimum standard required to be awarded a grant, any unallocated budget will be reassigned by the "la Caixa" Foundation to the proposals of the other Thematic Areas, following the ranking established by the corresponding Selection Committee.

7. Appendix

» Remote evaluation final score

Once the remote evaluation process is complete, the system will collect the three scores assigned to the proposal. The procedure to obtain the final score that will be used for the ranking is as follows:

- Each peer reviewer will assess each proposal and assign a score ranging from 1 (min.) to 8 (max.) to each sub-criterion. **The scores for each sub-criterion will be given to two decimal places.**
- By means of the weighting associated with each sub-criterion, the system will calculate a weighted score for the proposal that ranges from 1 to 8. **This number represents the score by that reviewer for a specific proposal and will be rounded to three decimal places.**
- The Grant Project Office will receive three scores associated with each proposal, which will then undergo a process of normalisation (see Remote Evaluation Normalisation Formula). **The final score for a proposal will be obtained by calculating the average of the three normalised scores and rescaling it to the 1-8 range.**
- If there is a significant discrepancy between the highest and lowest normalised scores assigned by the peer reviewers assessing the same proposal, that proposal will be sent to a fourth peer reviewer. The new final score will be calculated as the average of the four scores.

The step-by-step procedure to obtain the final score that will be used for the ranking is detailed below:

BOX - Normalisation system Prior to computing the average, the scores are normalised. Scores are normalised via a two-step process:	
1. "TENDENCY": Scores are normalised according to (i) the standard deviation of the peer reviewer's scores across all editions and (ii) the standard deviation of the scores in the current edition. The intent is to minimise the effect of harshness or leniency bias among reviewers.	2. "WEIGHTED-MATCHING": Scores are weighted according to the discipline-matching value associated with the peer reviewer and the proposal. The aim of this step is to reflect the peer reviewer's familiarity with the discipline of the proposal.
The specific calculations for this procedure can be found in the Remote Evaluation Normalisation Formula (steps 2 and 3).	

Remote Evaluation Normalisation Formula

A = proposal

p = peer reviewer

w_s = weight associated with each sub-criterion

s = sub-criterion (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2)

i = editions in which the peer reviewer has participated

$1 < \text{mark}_{A,p} < 8$

E_A = average score

$w_{A,p}$ = weight of the peer reviewer with respect to proposal A

$\frac{w_{A,p}}{\sum_A w_{A,p}}$ = normalised matching-weight

$\frac{w_{A,p}}{\sum_A w_{A,p}} \text{correctmark}_{A,p}$ = Final score

Step 1: Calculation of the score for each proposal according to the weighted sub-criteria:

$$\text{mark}_{A,p} = \sum_{s=1.1, \dots}^2 \text{mark}_{A,p,s} w_s$$

Step 2: Normalisation of the score according to the peer reviewer's mean and standard deviation:

$$\text{normmark1}_{A,p} = \frac{\text{mark}_{A,p} - \text{mean}_p}{\text{Stddev}_p}$$

Goal of this step: to normalise by accounting for the effect of the mean and standard deviation of a reviewer's scores across all editions of the Call in which the reviewer has participated (historical record).

Step 3: Normalisation of the score according to the Call mean and standard deviation:

$$\text{normmark2}_{A,p} = \frac{\text{normmark1}_{A,p} - \text{mean}_{\text{normmark1}}}{\text{Stddev}_{\text{normmark1}}}$$

Goal of this step: to normalise by considering the oscillation in scoring in the current Call across all reviewers compared to each other.

Step 4: Rescaling considering the original Call score and the evaluator's historical record:

$$reescmark1_{A,p} = (normmark2_{A,p} * Stddev_p) + (mean_p + \frac{mean_{convhist\ p} - mean_p}{k})$$

Where: $mean_{convhist\ p} = \frac{\sum_i n_{A_i} * mean_i}{n_A}$

and k is a correction factor used to adjust the impact on the score of the distance between the historical mean of a given evaluator and the weighted mean of all editions in which that evaluator has participated.

Goal of this step: to rescale taking into account the original score of the proposal as well as the historical record of the evaluator and its differences from the weighted mean of all editions in which the evaluator has reviewed.

Step 5: Rescaling to the previous range 1 to 8:

$$reescmark2_{A,p} = \frac{reescmark1_{A,p} - \min(reescmark1)}{\max(reescmark1) - \min(reescmark1)} * (\max(originalmark_A) - \min(originalmark_A)) + \min(originalmark_A)$$

Step 6: Corrector factor for peer reviewers with a small number of evaluated proposals:

$$Variation = reescmark2_{A,p} - originalmark_{A,p}$$

$$Corrector\ Factor_{A,p} = \frac{number\ projects_p}{threshold(number\ projects)}$$

; $threshold(number\ projects) = 20$

$$If\ number\ projects_p > threshold(number\ projects) \rightarrow Corrector\ Factor_{A,p} = 1$$

$$correctmark_{A,p} = originalmark_{A,p} + variation * Corrector\ Factor_{A,p}$$

Step 7: Calculation of discrepancies:

$$n = \max(correctmark_{A,p}) - \min(correctmark_{A,p})$$

Step 8: Calculation of the final score for each proposal considering the weighted-matching:

$$\underline{E_A} = \sum_{p=1}^3 \frac{w_{A,p}}{\sum_A w_{A,p}} correctmark_{A,p}$$

When there are discrepancies among the peer reviewers, the calculation for the final score would be:

$$\underline{E}_A = \sum_{p=1}^4 \frac{w_{A,p}}{\sum_A w_{A,p}} correctmark_{A,p}$$

After calculating the discrepancy and sending proposals with the potential to be pre-selected to a fourth reviewer, the normalisation is recalculated considering the four scores in those cases.

All final normalised scores are then weighted according to the discipline-matching value associated with the peer reviewer for the proposal.

» Selection committee final score

The final score for a given proposal is derived from the average of the scores entered into the system by each of the experts for that proposal (see Selection Committee Normalisation Formula).

A final score with two decimal places will be used.

Selection Committee Formula

A = proposal
 p = expert
 w_c = weight associated with each criterion
 s = sub-criterion (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2)
 $1 < mark_{A,p} < 5$
 $\underline{E}_A$ = average score
 n = total number of experts in the Selection Committee

Step 1: Calculation of the score for each proposal according to the weighted sub-criteria

$$mark_{A,p} = \sum_{s=1, \dots}^3 mark_{A,p,c} w_c$$

Step 2: Calculation of the average score for each proposal. The resulting number is the final score for that proposal:

$$\underline{E}_A = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{p=1}^n mark_{A,p}$$