



## Grant Application Evaluation Grid

Grant Program for Collaborative Structuring Projects — 2026-2027 Call

<b>Project Title:</b> _____	<b>File No.:</b> _____
<b>Principal Applicant:</b> _____	<b>Reviewer:</b> _____
<b>Date of the evaluation:</b> _____	

### Instructions for the reviewer

The procedure of evaluation can be found in the Appendix 1 at the end of this document.

Please note that all criteria should be filled out by the reviewer unless otherwise stated. Certain criteria will be pre-filled by the RARE.Qc Coordination team for ease of evaluation.

Respond to the admissibility criterion questions on section 1 and assign a score from 1 to 5 for each criterion in sections 2-5 by checking the corresponding box. An average score for each section should be calculated. Comments are expected for each section, particularly for scores  $\leq 2$  or  $\geq 4$ . The evaluation must be conducted independently, in accordance with [RARE.Qc's conflict of interest policy](#). All information contained in the application is confidential.

*In the event of a potential conflict of interest with any of the applicants, please notify the RARE.Qc coordination office immediately before proceeding with the evaluation.*

## 1. RARE.Qc Grant Eligibility

### Does the project application include at least 2 RARE.Qc regular members?

*(Section reviewed by the RARE.Qc Coordination team)*

**Yes, Proceed with the evaluation**

**No, Stop evaluation (Application is ineligible)**

### Does the project offer a promising and tangible opportunity to improve the health of people living with rare diseases?

*(Section evaluated by the reviewer)*

**Yes, Proceed with the evaluation**

**No, Stop evaluation (Application is ineligible)**

**Comments - Criterion 1**

<b>2. Strategic priorities</b>	<b>Weight: 35%</b>
--------------------------------	--------------------

Criterion	Elements to Consider	0	1
<b>2.1 Inter-institutional collaboration</b> <i>(Section reviewed by the RARE.Qc Coordination team)</i>	<i>New collaboration between members from different RARE.Qc institutions.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2.2 Capacity Building</b> <i>(Section reviewed by the RARE.Qc Coordination team)</i>	<i>Involvement of early-career researchers (within 8 years of obtaining their first independent academic position and can begin a maximum of 6 years after obtaining their most recent university degree (PhD, MD, DDS., etc).</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2.3 Novelty of the Collaboration</b> <i>(Section reviewed by the RARE.Qc Coordination team)</i>	<i>The co-applicants have no prior collaboration (no documented history of joint projects or co-authored publications).</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2.4 Interdisciplinarity and Intersectorality</b> <i>(Section evaluated by the reviewer)</i>	<i>Integration of expertise from distinct fields or disciplines (e.g., basic research + clinical, AI + biology, researcher + patient partner, etc.)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Comments - Criterion 2</b>	Average score: ____ / 1		

### Scoring Scale

<b>1</b>	Severe gaps. Proposal not acceptable.	<b>2</b>	Significant gaps. Proposal not acceptable.	<b>3</b>	Good proposal with some gaps
<b>4</b>	Excellent proposal with minor gaps	<b>5</b>	Outstanding proposal meeting all criteria		

<b>3. Scientific Quality, Innovation and Feasibility</b>	<b>Weight: 30%</b>
--	--------------------

Criterion	Elements to Consider	Score ( /5)
<b>3.1 Scientific Merit</b>	<i>Clarity of rationale, rigour of the research question, grounding in existing literature.</i>	
<b>3.2 Innovation</b>	<i>Novelty of the approach, methods, or technologies; potential for breakthrough or significant advancement</i>	
<b>3.3 Feasibility</b>	<i>- <u>Methodology</u>: Methodological approaches are clear, consistent with objectives and realistic.</i>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Resources and Infrastructure</u>: Access to necessary equipment, platforms, databases or biobanks</li> <li>- <u>Realistic Budget</u>: Expenditures are justified and comply with <a href="#">FRQ guidelines</a>.</li> <li>- <u>Timeline</u>: Realistic and achievable work plan within 12 months.</li> </ul>	
<b>3.4 Open Science</b>	Commitment to making data and results accessible (FAIR data, open-access publications).	
<b>3.5 Integration of EDI into Project Design</b>	An EDI (Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion) statement is included in the application; it is substantive (beyond a generic commitment).	
<b>Comments - Criterion 3</b>		Average score: ____ / 5

<b>4. Scalability, Future Funding and Team Capacity</b>	<b>Weight: 20%</b>
---	--------------------

Criterion	Elements to Consider	Score ( /5)
<b>4.1 Generation of Preliminary Data</b>	<i>Project's capacity to generate data or proof-of-concept results to leverage external funding applications (FRQS, CIHR, etc.) Types of projects: Pilot/feasibility study, clinical or translational project, data reuse, biobanking/omics, PROs / patient engagement.</i>	
<b>4.2 Scalability</b>	<i>The project can reasonably lead to a larger-scale initiative; identification of target funding agencies.</i>	
<b>4.3 Functional complementarity</b>	<i>The integration of expertise from different fields enhances the project's scientific scope and translational potential.</i>	
<b>4.4 Clarity of Roles</b>	<i>Each co-applicant's contributions are clearly defined; convincing description of the collaboration.</i>	
<b>4.5 Team capability</b>	<i>Evidence of prior experience in collaborative work.</i>	
<b>Comments - Criterion 4</b>		Average score: ____ / 5

<b>5. Training and Next-Generation Development</b>	<b>Weight: 20%</b>
--	--------------------

Criterion	Elements to Consider	Score ( /5)
<b>5.1 Trainee Involvement</b>	<i>At least one undergraduate, graduate, or doctoral student or postdoctoral fellow is involved in the project.</i>	
<b>5.2 Quality of Training Provided</b>	<i>The roles and responsibilities of trainees are described; the experience clearly contributes to their scientific development.</i>	
<b>Comments - Criterion 5</b>		Average score: ____ / 5

### Score Summary

Criterion	Score <i>(from above)</i>	Weight	Weighted Score
2. Strategic priorities	/ 1	<b>35 %</b>	/ 35
3. Scientific Quality, Innovation and Feasibility	/ 5	<b>30 %</b>	/ 30
4. Scalability, Future Funding and Team Capacity	/ 5	<b>20 %</b>	/ 20
5. Training and Next-Generation Development	/ 5	<b>15 %</b>	/ 15
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>		<b>100 %</b>	<b>/ 100</b>

### Final Recommendation

Each reviewer must adjust their scores according to the distribution below. These standardized scores will be used to establish the final ranking of all applications.

#### Final ranking table

Recommendation	Score	Percentage of the number of applications per score
<b>Recommended for funding</b>	100	2%
	90-99	5%
	80-89	10%
<b>Could be recommended for funding</b>	70-79	16%
	60-69	17%
	50-59	26%
	40-49	10%



<b>Not recommended for funding</b>	30-39	7%
	20-29	5%
	10-19	2%

*This form is confidential. Please return it to the RARE.Qc coordination team by the deadline indicated in the reviewer instructions at [info@rare.quebec](mailto:info@rare.quebec).*