

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

Application number:

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

Numerical evaluation of the sub-items and Item 1 (Research plan) and Item 2 (Competence of applicant and quality of research environment) and Item 3 (Overall assessment) is made with ratings ranging from 1 (weak) to 6 (outstanding).

1 = weak, 2 = unsatisfactory, 3 = good, 4 = very good, 5 = excellent, 6 = outstanding

1 Research plan

Rating (1–6):

1.1 Scientific quality and innovativeness of the research plan

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: Is the project scientifically significant? Is the project ambitious? Is the project breakthrough research containing risks and does it have potential for exceptionally significant outcomes? Is the project innovative? Can the project generate new knowledge, new methods, new technology or new practices to end-users? If the project is multi/inter/transdisciplinary, how?

1.2 Feasibility of the research plan

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: Are the research plan, objectives and hypotheses clearly presented and realistic? Does the applicant acknowledge potential scientific or methodological problem areas and how are alternative approaches being considered? Are the research methods and materials appropriate for the project? Are the project management, resources and the division of labour and the proposed schedule appropriate and well-planned?

1.3 Ethical questions (to be answered if relevant)

Guiding question: Are ethical issues involved and if so, how are they taken into account?

2 Competence of applicant and quality of research environment

Rating (1–6):

2.1 Competence and expertise of the applicant(s)

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: Are the merits and scientific expertise of the applicant(s) appropriate and sufficient for the proposed project? What are the merits of the applicant(s) to supervise doctoral/postdoctoral students (if relevant)?

2.2 Research team and environment

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: Does the research environment support this project, including appropriate research infrastructures, and offer a wide base for researcher training? Does the research team bring complementary expertise to the project (if applicable)? How is the project integrated into the research environment?

2.3 Significance of research collaborations and researcher mobility

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: Is the project engaged in national and/or international research collaborations that can significantly contribute to the success of the project? What is the significance of the mobility plan?

2.4 Research consortium (if relevant)

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

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

Application number:

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

3.1 Main strengths and weaknesses of the project. Additional comments and suggestions.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:

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