

Reviewer Scoring Guide

2026 ODIN Grant Type 2A Application

REVIEW PROCESS

- Each application is appraised individually by eligible Project Review Committee (PRC) reviewers.
- Review questions are based on the Guidelines and the Selection Criteria.
- Scientific Scope is assessed separately as an eligibility check, and contributes 0, 3, or 6 points to the total score per reviewer.
- Scored review questions are rated on a 1–6-point scale, based on the scoring guide below.
- Question 8 is an overall assessment and carries 2x weight.

SELECTION PROCESS

- Based on the total PRC scoring, a ranked overview will be provided to the Steering Group.
- If two or more applications are related to the same previously funded ODIN grant, only the highest-scoring application among them will be eligible for nomination.
- The Steering Group makes the final funding decision and may also consider the overall budget and project portfolio.

Score	Label	General meaning
1	Inadequate	Major weaknesses, serious gaps, or very low confidence.
2	Weak	Some relevant elements, but significant weaknesses or uncertainties.
3	Good-minus	Partly meets the criterion, but important weaknesses or lack of clarity remain.
4	Good	Meets the criterion to a reasonable level, but with room for strengthening.
5	Strong	Meets the criterion convincingly, with clear strengths and only minor weaknesses.
6	Outstanding	Fully meets or exceeds the criterion; clearly stands out.

For Reviewers: Please read through the full application before providing your ratings.

Version 1: 10.07.2026

1. SCIENTIFIC SCOPE

Mainly Related to Application Section(s): 2, 4, 6

Assess whether the project is clearly and substantively relevant to one or more of the eligible 2026 ODIN Grant Type 2A scientific scope areas within drug discovery or diagnostics development.

Eligible GT2A scope areas: cardiometabolic diseases, cardiovascular diseases, infectious diseases, regenerative medicine, and disease-agnostic platform technologies or research tools/methods linked to one or more of the other eligible GT2A scope areas.

NOTE: CNS is not a directly eligible GT2A scope area in 2026. If more than half of reviewers select "No - outside scope" the proposal may be administratively rejected.

SELECT ONE:

- 0 = No - outside scope:** the project is clearly NOT relevant to any 2026 GT2A scientific scope area or not relevant to eventual drug discovery or diagnostics development.
- 3 = Unclear/borderline:** the project may have some relevance to an eligible scope area and to drug discovery/diagnostics, but the connection is weak, insufficiently explained, or difficult to assess.
- 6 = Yes - in scope:** the project is clearly relevant to at least one 2026 GT2A scientific scope area and is likely to support future drug discovery or diagnostics development.

2. SCIENTIFIC EXCELLENCE & FEASIBILITY

Mainly Related to Application Section(s): 4, 6, 8A–8C

How strong is the project's scientific rationale and methodological approach, and how convincingly does the plan demonstrate feasibility within the GT2A timeframe?

Consider:

- Is the scientific rationale clear, convincing, and appropriately ambitious?
- Are the proposed methods suitable for achieving the project aim?
- Do the implementation plan and risk mitigation give confidence that the project can be delivered within the maximum 1-year GT2A timeframe?

SCORING EXAMPLES – SCIENTIFIC EXCELLENCE & FEASIBILITY

- 1 = Inadequate.** The scientific rationale or approach is unclear or weak, and/or there are major feasibility or risk-related concerns.
- 3 = Good-minus.** The project has a plausible scientific rationale and approach, but important aspects of the methods, feasibility, timeline, deliverables, or risk mitigation are only partly clear or convincing.
- 6 = Outstanding.** The project presents a strong scientific rationale and suitable methods, supported by a realistic implementation plan and well-considered risk mitigation.

3. ADDED VALUE TO PREVIOUSLY FUNDED ODIN PROJECT

Mainly Related to Application Section(s): 5, 6

How convincingly does the application explain that the proposed GT2A project meaningfully extends, strengthens, or increases the value of the previously funded ODIN project?

Consider:

- Does the project clearly build on and diverge from the original ODIN project?
- Does the proposed work add value beyond what can be achieved within the original project or other secured resources?
- Will it increase the significance, usability, openness, or innovation potential of the original project outputs?

SCORING EXAMPLES - ADDED VALUE TO THE PREVIOUSLY FUNDED ODIN PROJECT

1 = Inadequate. The project appears largely repetitive, weakly connected to the original ODIN project, or does not clearly justify the need for GT2A funding.

3 = Good-minus. The project has a plausible connection to the original ODIN project, but the added value, distinct contribution, or need for separate GT2A funding is only partly convincing.

6 = Outstanding. The project clearly builds on and extends the original ODIN project in a meaningful way, with strong potential to increase the value, usability, openness, and downstream innovation potential of the original project outputs.

4. OPENNESS

Mainly Related to Application Section(s): 6, 8B-8C

Does the project align with ODIN's open science model, with outputs that can realistically be shared openly and reused by others?

Consider:

- Are the expected outputs suitable for open sharing?
- Is the dissemination plan realistic and appropriate?
- Are potential restrictions or dependencies sufficiently addressed?

SCORING EXAMPLES - OPENNESS

1 = Inadequate. There are major concerns about whether the project outputs can be openly shared or reused.

3 = Good-minus. The project appears broadly compatible with ODIN's open science model, but the expected outputs, sharing plan, reuse potential, or handling of possible restrictions or dependencies are only partly clear.

6 = Outstanding. The project is clearly compatible with ODIN's open science model, with well-described outputs and no major unresolved barriers to open reuse.

5. VALUE CREATION & INNOVATION PATHWAYS

Mainly Related to Application Section(s): 7

*How convincingly does the application explain the value of the expected GT2A outputs for **project partners and others beyond the project team**, and how may those outputs support further research, development, collaboration, and downstream innovation?*

Consider:

- Are there plausible pathways for the outputs to be used by the participating partners for further research, development, or innovation?
- Are the outputs likely to be useful beyond the project team, including for broader research or industry use?
- Does the project demonstrate potential to enable downstream innovation (e.g., contribute to commercially relevant drug discovery, diagnostics, or enabling technologies)?

SCORING EXAMPLES – VALUE CREATION & INNOVATION PATHWAYS

1 = Inadequate. The expected outputs have little or no clearly articulated value for project partners, the wider research and innovation ecosystem, or downstream drug discovery/diagnostics.

3 = Good-minus. The application identifies some plausible value, but this appears underdeveloped, narrowly framed, mainly academic, limited to a narrow group of users, or only weakly connected to downstream innovation.

6 = Outstanding. The project outputs have clear and compelling potential value for participating partners as well as the wider research and innovation ecosystem, with credible short- and longer-term routes to further R&D and especially downstream innovation.

6. TEAM, INTERDISCIPLINARITY & COMPANY ENGAGEMENT

Mainly Related to Application Section(s): 3A-C, 9, and 8C

Does the project bring together a well-composed team with the relevant expertise interdisciplinary fit, and meaningful company engagement needed to carry out the GT2A project?

Consider:

- Does the project bring together sufficient and relevant expertise across disciplines, sectors, and institutions to create a well-rounded team that can complete the project without major unresolved competency gaps?
- Does the project show credible and relevant industry engagement, based on the company partner(s)' expected role(s), planned contribution(s), and in-kind support?

SCORING EXAMPLES - TEAM, INTERDISCIPLINARITY & COMPANY ENGAGEMENT

1 = Inadequate. The team appears poorly suited to the project due to major unaddressed competency gaps, unclear roles, or company engagement that appears minimal or largely symbolic.

3 = Good-minus. The team includes a plausible core of relevant expertise and engagement, but roles, contributions, competency coverage, or in-kind support are only partly convincing or appear insufficiently integrated into the project.

6 = Outstanding. The project has a highly relevant and well-integrated team, with clearly defined roles, complementary expertise, and substantial, well-embedded company engagement that strongly supports the project aims.

7. BUDGET

Mainly Related to Application Section(s): 10

Is the proposed budget realistic and proportionate to the project's aims, activities, and expected added value?

Consider:

- Is the budget aligned with the planned activities and timeline?
- Are the main cost drivers reasonable and sufficiently justified?
- Is the requested funding proportionate to the expected GT2A value?

SCORING EXAMPLES - BUDGET

1 = Inadequate. The proposed budget appears unrealistic, disproportionate, poorly justified, or misaligned with the project.

3 = Good-minus. The budget seems plausible, but uncertainty remains because key cost drivers, special costs, institutional allocations, or the link to planned activities and expected GT2A value are only partly clear or convincing.

6 = Outstanding. The proposed budget is realistic, proportionate, well justified, and clearly aligned with the project.

8. OVERALL ASSESSMENT (2x weight)

Based on the application as a whole, how strong is this project as a candidate for GT2A funding?

SCORING GUIDE:

- 1 = Inadequate / Not fundable.** Major concerns or very low overall confidence.
- 2 = Weak.** Some potential, but significant weaknesses or uncertainties.
- 3 = Good-minus.** Moderate potential, but important weaknesses or imbalances remain.
- 4 = Good.** Reasonably strong candidate, with some weaknesses but enough promise to consider funding.
- 5 = Strong.** Strong candidate with clear strengths across key criteria and only limited concerns.
- 6 = Outstanding.** Exceptional candidate with a highly convincing case for GT2A funding.