

Panel/Name of reviewer:
Name of applicant:
Title of proposed project:

Application number:

Please also write comments (not only numerical ratings) to each of the following sub-items.

The numerical evaluation of the sub-items and Item 1 (Quality of research plan), Item 2 (Competence of applicant(s), quality of research collaborations) and Item 3 (Overall assessment) is made with ratings ranging from 1 (poor) to 6 (outstanding).

1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, 4 = very good, 5 = excellent, 6 = outstanding

1 Quality of research plan	Rating (1–6):
-----------------------------------	----------------------

1.1 Project's relevance to the programme

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding question: How does the application contribute to achieving the objectives of the programme / call?

1.2 Scientific quality and innovativeness of research plan

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: Is the project scientifically significant? Does the project have potential for breakthroughs or exceptionally significant outcomes? To what extent are the objectives ambitious and beyond the state of the art (e.g. novel concepts and approaches or development across disciplines)?

1.3 Feasibility of research plan

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: Are the objectives and hypotheses appropriately presented and is the research plan feasible (bearing in mind the extent that the proposed research may include high risks)? Are the research methods and materials appropriate? Does the applicant acknowledge potential scientific or methodological problem areas, and how are alternative approaches being considered? Is the management of the proposed plan appropriate and well planned? Does the research environment support this project, including appropriate research infrastructures?

1.4 Ethical issues and open access to research results

Guiding question: Are there any ethical issues involved and, if so, how are they taken into account? Does the publication plan support open access? Does the data management plan responsibly support the reuse of research data after the project has been completed?

2 Competence of applicant(s), quality of research collaborations	Rating (1–6):
---	----------------------

2.1 Competence and expertise of applicant(s)

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: What are the merits and scientific expertise of the applicant(s)? Are they appropriate and sufficient for the proposed project? What are the competences of the applicant(s) in terms of supervising PhD candidates / postdoctoral researchers?

2.2 Research team, significance of research collaborations

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: Does the research team bring complementary expertise to the project (if applicable)? Is the project involved in national and/or international research collaborations that can significantly contribute to the success of the project? Does the research project support researcher training?

2.3. Researcher mobility

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: How does the mobility plan support the research plan? Does the receiving organisation stand out in the respective field of research? Is the length of the mobility period appropriate and is its timing right for the project?

Panel/Name of reviewer:
Name of applicant:
Title of proposed project:

Application number:

2.4 Research consortium (if applicable)

Guiding question: If a consortium is involved, what is the significance and added value of the consortium for the attainment of the research objectives?

3 Overall assessment	Final rating (1–6):
-----------------------------	----------------------------

3.1 Main strengths and weaknesses of project, additional comments and suggestions

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:

Please note that the final rating should not be a mathematical average of the sub-ratings.