**Appendix I. Review process for UCB-Aduro Sponsored Research Proposals**

**UC Berkeley**

**Review Committee**

Two committees of UC Berkeley faculty will review proposals, including one for those submitted in Area of Interest A and D, and another for Areas of Interest B and C (to be reviewed jointly).

Committees will consist of three UC Berkeley faculty members, who may be of any rank. Members will be selected by the IVRI Leadership Committee (ILC) after submission of all proposals. Any ILC faculty members who has submitted a proposal(s) as a PI or funded collaborator will recuse him or herself from naming members of the review committee in the respective Area of Interest. Review Committee members may not serve on a committee to which he or she has submitted a proposal as a PI or funded collaborator.

Committees will receive all submitted proposals within the assigned Area of Interest, and following a period of individual review, meet to discuss and determine rankings. These rankings, along with the individual scores and comments of each reviewer will be provided to Aduro.

**Review Guidelines**

**Overall Rank**

Reviewers will rank all proposals submitted to the committee to reflect their assessment of the relative likelihood for the project vs. other projects reviewed to succeed and, if successful, to exert a sustained, powerful influence on the research field(s) involved and immunotherapy or vaccinology more broadly. Reviewers will also provide comments for the overall proposal.

The Committee will also collectively produce a finalized list of rankings of all proposals reviewed.

**Scored Review Criteria**

Reviewers will consider each of the criteria below, and give a separate score and comments for each major category listed below. The bulleted lists include the criteria that may be used to arrive at the score for that category. The overall evaluation will weigh the merits of the application as a whole as opposed to being a simple average of the category scores.

**Significance**

Reviewers will consider the significance of the project within the specific scientific field, and to immunotherapy and vaccinology more broadly. For example, reviewers may consider:

* Does the project address an important problem or address an important application in the Area of Interest?
* Does the rationale for the proposed project clearly explain how the outcome(s) will directly contribute to advancing the field of the selected Area of Interest and to immunotherapy/vaccinology more broadly?
* If the aims of the project are achieved, how will scientific knowledge, technical capability, and/or clinical practice be improved?
* How will successful completion of the aims change the concepts, methods, technologies, treatments, services, or preventative interventions that drive immunomodulation as a field?
* Does the proposed project represent a highly original or innovative approach to the field of the selected Area of Interest?
* For Area of Interest A and D, if the specific aims are achieved, could the results conceptually lead to transformative/high impact applications to prevent or treat cancer, infectious disease or immunopathologies?

**Team**

Reviewers will consider the quality of the team proposed to perform the project. For example, reviewers may consider:

* Is the PI and associated lab, as well as any collaborators well suited to the project?
* Does the team have sufficient expertise and an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s)? In the field of the proposed project?
* If the project is collaborative, do the investigators have complementary and integrated expertise? Is it likely that a cooperative governance and organizational structure appropriate for the project can be established?

**Approach**

Reviewers will consider the merit of the technical approach proposed. For example, reviewers may consider:

* Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project?
* Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented? Is the timeline proposed to meet specific aims and projected outcomes/results appropriate?

**Likelihood of Success**

Reviewers will consider the potential for the project to meet its aims, and/or provide a clear assessment of the value of the approach. For example, reviewers may consider:

* For exploratory projects, will the approach demonstrate proof-of-concept or feasibility, or provide sufficient evidence to rule out the proposed strategy? How will particularly risky aspects be managed?
* For established projects, is there sufficient preliminary evidence to demonstrate a good likelihood of success to achieve the specific aims?

**Additional Considerations**

As applicable for the project proposed, reviewers will consider each of the following items and provide comments, but will not give scores for these items. They may, however, be considered in providing an Overall Rank.

**Budget and Period of Support**

Reviewers will consider whether the budget and the requested period of support are justified and reasonable in relation to the proposed research.

**Aduro Biotech**

The results of the UC Berkeley review will be provided to Aduro. Aduro will take into account the scored review provided by the UC Berkeley committee, and make the final determination based on technical merit and alignment with Aduro’s strategic interests and goals.