

**SINTESI VALUTAZIONE ISTITUTI 2014**  
**Dipartimento Scienze Biomediche (DSB)**

Struttura	Voto Panel 2014	Giudizio	Rank 2014	Rank 2009
Neuroscienze	119,8	(/130)	1	1
Genetica Molecolare	111	(/130)	2	10
Biochimica delle Proteine	109	(/130)	3	12
Ricerca Genetica e Biomedica	106	(/130)	4	8
Genetica e Biofisica	101,75	(/130)	5	3
Biologia e Patologia Molecolari	96	(/130)	6	8
Biostrutture e Biomagnini	86,25	(/130)	7	4
Endocrinologia e Oncologia	85,25	(/130)	8	2
Biomagnini e Fisiologia Molecolare	83,75	(/130)	9	15
Tecnologie Biomediche	83,2	(/130)	10	7
Fisiologia Clinica	82,38	(/130)	11	14
Biomembrane e Bioenergetica	79,4	(/130)	12	13
Scienze Neurologiche	69,38	(/130)	13	4
Biologia Cellulare e Neurobiologia	66,25	(/130)	14	4
Biomedicina e di Immunologia Molecolare	64,25	(/130)	15	11
Farmacologia Tradizionale	59,67	(/130)	16	16
<b>MEDIA PANEL</b>	<b>87,71</b>			

\* Per IBCN il riferimento è INMM; per IFT il riferimento è ITOI

**Istituto:** Neuroscienze - (IN)

<b>Voto Panel</b>	119,8
<b>Giudizio</b>	(/130)

**Panel Recommendations**

This is a great institute that could serve as a blueprint for improving the quality of other CNR institutes as well. CNR will be well-served by, if anything, increasing the funding to this institute. This is a well-managed Institute with a very clear research strategy that achieves a good level of external funding. I think that correction 7 implementation of some of the limits reported in the SWOT analysis would be desirable to improve even further the research output of this already excellent Institute.

**Istituto:** Genetica Molecolare - (IGM)

Voto Panel	111
Giudizio	(/130)

**Panel Recommendations**

In summary, this is one of the better institutes of CNR, and further funding is recommended without hesitation.

**Istituto:** Biochimica delle Proteine - (IBP)

Voto Panel	109
Giudizio	(/130)

**Panel Recommendations**

Istituto: Ricerca Genetica e Biomedica - (IRGB)

Voto Panel	106
Giudizio	(/130)

**Panel Recommendations**

The institute deserves to continue being funded. If anything, it is worth increasing the support to this excellent institution.

Istituto: Genetica e Biofisica - (IGB)

Voto Panel	101,75
Giudizio	(/130)

**Panel Recommendations**

While it is impossible to deliver recommendations on the basis of thievery telegraphic indications provided by the institute, my superficial impression is that the institute might profit from reducing the number of research units and focusing the few topics where it possesses real strengths. This is a well-managed Institute with a very clear research strategy that achieves a good level of external funding. I think that implementation of the opportunities (e.g. animal house, bioinformatics core etc.) reported in the SWOT analysis would be desirable to improve even further the research output of this already excellent Institute.

**Istituto:** Biologia e Patologia Molecolari - (IBPM)

Voto Panel	96
Giudizio	(/130)

**Panel Recommendations**

The institute should be advised to try and compete for grants of the European Research Council as well. I believe that Irene Bozzoni would have a good chance to win such a grant.

**Istituto:** Biostrutture e Bioimmagini - (IBB)

Voto Panel	86,25
Giudizio	(/130)

**Panel Recommendations**

In view of the lack lustre performance of the bioimaging part, one might consider closing that down and concentrating all energies into the chemical synthesis part of the operation. The Institute needs to take more profit from a rather unique expertise profile, which is already recognized but may find ways to be better exploited.

Istituto: Endocrinologia e Oncologia - (IEOS)

Voto Panel	85,25
Giudizio	(/130)

**Panel Recommendations**

For a referee it is frustrating to be unable to gain insight into the specific productivity of the individual laboratories. This critique applies to the entire exercise of reviewing CNR institutes.

Istituto: Bioimmagini e Fisiologia Molecolare - (IBFM)

Voto Panel	83,75
Giudizio	(/130)

**Panel Recommendations**

**Istituto:** **Tecnologie Biomediche - (ITB)**

<b>Voto Panel</b>	83,2
<b>Giudizio</b>	(/130)

#### **Panel Recommendations**

This is a complex institute, which could benefit from a reduction of fragmentation by a clearer definition of the research priorities. The translational potential could also be improved by an increase in external collaborations.

**Istituto:** **Fisiologia Clinica - (IFC)**

<b>Voto Panel</b>	82,38
<b>Giudizio</b>	(/130)

#### **Panel Recommendations**

The IFC is unique amongst the CNR Institutes because has the potential to conduct a full cycle of translational research activities from bench to bedside. Over the last 3-4 decades the Institute has conducted outstanding research activities, particularly in the field of ischemic heart disease. It would be in the interest of CNR and of the Nation to retain some of the original characteristics of this Institute although there is a need to revisit some aspects of its organization. It would be useful to reduce the research activities and focus on fewer synergistic topics. The unique expertise in cardiovascular research should be promoted and remain the main focus of research. This should be more integrated with other areas(e.g. metabolism) that have been traditionally strong. As mentioned in the SWOT analysis, it would be important to implement legislation that would allow the Institute's researchers to carry out clinical activities; this is a particularly relevant problem. In parallel, it would be important to maintain and potentate the infrastructures for non invasive imaging (in particular radiochemistry, PET and MRI) that are instrumental for maintaining a high-level of competitive external funding and generate high level research.

Istituto: Biomembrane e Bioenergetica - (IBBE)

Voto Panel	79,4
Giudizio	(/130)

#### Panel Recommendations

Istituto: Scienze Neurologiche - (ISN)

Voto Panel	69,38
Giudizio	(/130)

#### Panel Recommendations

Focus on areas of strength and closedown areas of weakness. The Institute seems to be in difficult situation in terms of resources and organization. It is in need of serious reconsideration of the potential areas of activity and of the realistic possibilities of development. A major weakness of this institute is the low impact of the publications. The impression is that of a decline throughout the years. The question is whether it is really worth trying to rescue this institution, considering in particular the current economic crisis of the country. In case of rescue, the introduction of young P.I.s could certainly be of help.

**Istituto:** Biologia Cellulare e Neurobiologia - (IBCN)

Voto Panel	66,25
Giudizio	(/130)

#### **Panel Recommendations**

The institute seems to be vastly oversized when compared to its output. It is recommended that laboratories be dismantled when their respective principle investigators go into retirement. Alternatively, a change in leadership may be required to enable the necessary changes in the scientific culture of the institute. Considering the size of the Institute, the scientific output does not seem adequate. Less widespread, research interests and a more focalized program, may help in increasing the quality of the output. In addition, a rather strong disagreement between the CIT and the director seems to exist, which may not help the growth of the institute. It would be advisable to re-organize the institute, which seems to be in need of a strong leadership.

**Istituto:** Biomedicina e di Immunologia Molecolare - (IBIM)

Voto Panel	64,25
Giudizio	(/130)

#### **Panel Recommendations**

If an institution of fundamental research does not achieve excellency in any area, one has to seriously entertain the question whether it is justified to maintain the existence of this institute. It would be useful to reduce the number of modules and focus the research efforts on fewer synergistic topics to increase competitiveness. Given the size and type of Institute, a higher level of competitive external funding could be expected. The extra funding could be used to strengthen the infrastructures of the Institute and in turn increase its ability to produce a higher level scientific output.



Istituto: Farmacologia Traslazionale - (IFT)

Voto Panel	59,67
Giudizio	(/130)

**Panel Recommendations**

It may help to reduce the number of areas of activity in research, which is currently disparate, and focus on one thing and try to it well.