



Registration number:

REVIEWER'S REPORT
OF A JUNIOR GRANT PROJECT PROPOSAL

Confidential

Please provide in this box the information requested:

Name, titles	
Institution	
Address	
.....	ZIP/Postal Code
Tel.	Fax
E-mail	
Your area of expertise:	
.....	

This is to certify the following: That I have applied only scientific criteria and that no conflict of interest has been involved in this review. That these materials connected with this review were used solely for the review and were not made accessible to unauthorised persons, were not photocopied and upon completion of the review were returned to the Grant Agency or destroyed. I am fully aware of and respect the confidential nature of the review and of the submitted materials.

I have not, directly or indirectly, contacted the applicant on any matter relating to this project. I agree that the pages 2 - 5 of the review (parts I to III) may be given to the applicant.

.....
date and place

.....
signature

I. Project evaluation report

Insert the single letter corresponding to your assessment into each box below.
Please note that rating within individual categories does not follow a linear pattern.

<p><input type="checkbox"/> 1 Scientific value of the project</p> <p>A scientific value is highly significant within the research field and/or even reaching beyond the field</p> <p>B scientific value is significant within the research field, opening new research directions</p> <p>C the project is complementing or refining present knowledge within the research field</p> <p>D the project objectives (proposed research results, methods, materials) are either of minor significance or already known</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 2 Proposed concept and method of the project solution</p> <p>A the concept is ground-breaking, innovative, and realistic at the same time, could be an asset in itself; the method is well-selected and established</p> <p>B the concept is clear; the method is appropriate to the problem, reliable and established</p> <p>C the concept and the method are generally correct, but unclear in details; which require more clarification</p> <p>D the concept and the method are incorrect, the proposed objectives cannot be achieved</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> 3 Originality of the project</p> <p>A both the aim and the approach proposed in the project are original (i.e., defining a new phenomenon or a new principle, etc.)</p> <p>B the project significantly extends the scope of currently known approaches to the problem(s)</p> <p>C the project is just another variation of already established approaches and concepts</p> <p>D the project, in using already established approaches, does not bring any new ideas</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 4 Qualification of the applicant *</p> <p>A qualification of the applicant is outstanding, in spite of his/her youth the applicant has been very successful and has also (co-)authored high-quality publications</p> <p>B qualification of the applicant is very good, the applicant has (co-)authored high-quality publications</p> <p>C qualification of the applicant is standard; the applicant has a good chance to perform the goals of the proposed research</p> <p>D qualification of the applicant is weak; the capability of the applicant to perform the proposed research is doubtful</p>

* Please note that this proposal is evaluated in a special category open only to young researchers. It is likely that many applicants will not have a sufficient record of accomplishment. Therefore, in the category “Qualification of the Applicant“, please use the “D“ assessment only if there is positive information that the applicant may have difficulty finishing the project successfully.

<p><input type="checkbox"/> 5 Quality of the research team</p> <p>A scientific expertise of the research team is optimal, team members have already accomplished high-quality research results</p> <p>B scientific expertise of the research team is adequate for the project goals</p> <p>C scientific expertise of the research team is only average</p> <p>D scientific expertise of the research team is deficient</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 6 The project costs</p> <p>A the project costs are reasonable, appropriate to the needs of the project</p> <p>B the project costs are overestimated, smaller budget would be sufficient</p> <p>C the budget calculation is unrealistic and unreasonable</p> <p>E the project costs cannot be assessed from the project proposal</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> 7 Professional and instrumental support of the research team</p> <p>A support is of high quality; it can advance the professional growth of the young researcher</p> <p>B support is of average quality, but still sufficient</p> <p>C support is insufficient, does not enable the successful attainment of the research goals</p> <p>E support cannot be assessed from the project proposal</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 8 Time schedule and the duration of the project</p> <p>A both the time schedule and the duration of the project are reasonable and adequate for the project goals</p> <p>B the proposed duration of the project is rather short but the project goals are still attainable</p> <p>C the proposed duration of the project is overestimated; the schedule should be fit into a shorter period of time</p> <p>D time schedule and the duration of the project are inappropriate</p>

II. Overall rating of the project

Please select one of the statements listed below to express your overall assessment of the project quality and write the appropriate letter from A to F in the box below. **Please give your specific reasons when you apply categories A or F.**

If you feel that a more balanced judgment on some categories would be necessary, **choose the one that best approximates your assessment** and explain your point of view verbally.



A Outstanding

The originality, significance of the key concept and the quality of the proposed approach of this project all **markedly surpass the level of current projects** in my field. The prospects of the research team to obtain original and good-quality results are good. The results may contribute to extend human knowledge.

B Very good

The project is based on an original idea, the approach is well argued, the research team has a good chance to obtain original and good-quality results.

C Good

The project is based on a good idea, the proposed approach is adequate and feasible, the applicant and his team do have reasonable chances of a successful solution. The expected results may be a valuable contribution to knowledge already available.

D Sufficient

The project is based on sound arguments and can be useful. The approach is generally correct, nevertheless one of the following objections applies:

- the project is just another variation of already established approaches;
- the proposed methods do not guarantee realizing results of the significance assumed;
- the time schedule is not quite fitting but the proposed results may still be obtained after re-scheduling.

E Sufficient only after project adjustments

The project is based on sound arguments and can be useful. The approach is generally correct but its realization requires revision. A revised proposal should be submitted again. One of the following objections applies:

- the proposed methods are incomplete and without its revision the proposed goals cannot be accomplished;
- the research team must include another specialist (or other specialists);
- the schedule is inadequate to the research goal;
- the projected costs are inadequate.

F Insufficient - unacceptable

One of the following objections applies:

- the project is not based on sound arguments;
- the concept is based on non-scientific or unsubstantiated theory;
- the sequence of methods is not documented or is not adequate for the attainment of the project goals;
- the applicant or his/her team lack sufficient qualification.

III. Written evaluation of the project

Comments and recommendations for the applicant