

## **ANEXA 4 – Fișă de evaluare (Evaluation sheet)**

**Please deliver your comments for each sub-criterion as a bullet point list of strengths (+) and weaknesses (-).**

### **1. Principal Investigator and Mentor - 40% of the total score;**

#### **Principal Investigator**

##### **1.1 Quality of the PI's research output - 60% of the total score of Criterion 1**

*(see sections B1.1, B1.2 and B4.1)*

*Evaluate to what extent the PI's research has led to progress in their field of expertise. Comment on the importance of the PI's scientific discoveries, as reflected in their track record (focus on the PI's papers as a main author). Citations may be considered only as strengths. Please take into account that this is only a postdoctoral grant and thus the PI's citation number and H-index are not relevant.*

#### **Mentor**

##### **1.2 Impact of the Mentor's research output and leadership - 20% of the total score of Criterion 1**

*(see sections B2 and B4.2)*

*Evaluate to what extent the Mentor's scientific output is internationally recognized. Comment on the international visibility of the Mentor's scientific output as reflected, for example, in the citation number, H-index and/or ranking (Q1-Q4) of their published work. Evaluate to what extent the Mentor's capacity to autonomously manage scientific activities as a researcher and/or research group leader is demonstrated (as indicated by their track record as corresponding author and their ability to attract research funding).*

*(in the case of the Humanities, please take into account the relevance and impact of the journals and publishers for the professional sub-field of the Mentor, as well as the presence of specific publications in the online catalogues of major international libraries).*

*(in the field of Mathematics, while the use of numerical indicators in evaluating the Mentor is permitted, it is not particularly encouraged. The evaluation of this criterion should not be based exclusively on such indicators, and should vastly include the evaluator's objective assessment of the intrinsic value of the Mentor's scientific contributions and its actual impact on advancing the state-of-the-art in the specific mathematical field).*

*(for 1.2. please see statistical charts of H-index, citations and Q1/Q2 articles of all competing Mentors, for use if relevant)*

##### **1.3 Match between the Mentor's previous research output and proposed topic - 20% of the total score of Criterion 1**

*(see section B3)*

*Evaluate to what extent the Mentor's research output is relevant for the present project. Comment on how the previously published work of the Mentor relates to the proposed research.*

### **2. Research Project - 60% of the total score;**

#### **2.1 State-of-the-art and originality/innovation - 30% of the total score of Criterion 2**

*(see section C1)*

*Evaluate whether the problem addressed by the project is clearly identified in relation to the state-of-the-art in the field. Comment on the originality and novelty of the proposed solution.*

## 2.2 Research objectives, methodology and work plan - 30% of the total score of Criterion 2

(see section C2)

Evaluate the clarity and coherence of the scientific objectives. To what extent is the proposed methodological approach suitable for reaching these objectives? How effective is the work plan in terms of achieving the proposed objectives? Comment on the coherence of the approach in terms of tasks, activities and time scales.

## 2.3 Feasibility resources - 20% of the total score of Criterion 2

(see section C3)

To what extent the available infrastructural support will ensure successful implementation of the project? Why is the host institution relevant for the proposed project?

## 2.4 Risks and contingency plans - 10% of the total score of Criterion 2

(see section C4)

To what extent the risk analysis correctly identifies potential pitfalls? Also comment on the effectiveness of the alternative solutions proposed.

## 2.5 Expected impact and dissemination plan - 10% of the total score of Criterion 2

(see section C5)

To what extent is the expected scientific output of the proposed work realistically described and how likely is it to lead to significant progress in the field? What is the expected impact of the project on the PI's career development? How will the proposed research impact (the visibility of) the host institution? Also, comment on the quality of the proposed measures to disseminate the scientific output of the proposal. Social, economic, or cultural impact should be considered only if relevant for the proposed research.

## 3. Budget; this section will not be scored

(see section C6)

Please provide an overall assessment of the research budget requested and evaluate to what extent it is justified by the proposed research activities. There will be no score associated with this criterion, but the assessment will be useful to the funding agency in negotiating the final financial award.

**Please deliver your comments for each sub-criterion as a bullet point list of strengths (+) and weaknesses (-).**

### Recommendations for Rapporteurs:

1. Propose a score **only after** consensus has been reached on the comments; make sure that the comments are **concrete, complete** (i.e. address all questions) and **consistent** with the semantics of each score, namely:

0	<b>ABSENT</b>	The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to <i>missing or incomplete information</i> .
1	<b>UNSATISFACTORY</b>	The criterion is addressed in an <i>inadequate manner</i> , or there are <i>serious inherent weaknesses</i> .
2	<b>SATISFACTORY</b>	While the proposal <i>broadly addresses</i> the criterion, there are <i>significant weaknesses</i> .
3	<b>GOOD</b>	The proposal addresses the criterion <i>well</i> , although <i>improvements would be necessary</i> . A number of weaknesses/shortcomings are present.
4	<b>VERY GOOD</b>	The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although <i>certain improvements are still possible</i> . A small number of weaknesses/shortcomings are present.
5	<b>EXCELLENT</b>	The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

2. When scoring each subcriterion use the full scale, from 0 to 5 - in 0,5 increments.
3. The scores must reflect the strengths and weaknesses and they must be in line with the comments. Scores below 5 (including 4.5) **must be in accordance with the identified weaknesses, which should be clearly indicated** in the Consensus Report!
4. Each strength and weakness must be reflected only once in the report and the scores (**no double penalty, no double reward**).

**Note:** The final score will be calculated as a weighted sum of the scores for each subcriteria multiplied by 20 (final score between 0 and 100);

**Final grade = 20\*[(s1.1\*60/100 + s1.2\*20/100 + s1.3\*20/100)\*40/100 + (s2.1\*30/100 + s2.2\*30/100 + s2.3\*20/100 + s2.4\*10/100 + s2.5\*10/100)\*60/100], where si,j is the score for criterion i,j**