

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 (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

Academy Project funding provides researchers with an opportunity to carry out scientifically ambitious research. The project funding is primarily intended towards the salaries of researchers who work full-time on the project and for other project costs. The salary costs of the PI can be incorporated into the project costs to be funded, but these costs must not be significant in relation to the project's total costs. As a rule, the funding is granted for four years.

1 Research plan

Rating (1–6):

1.1 Scientific quality and innovativeness of research plan

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: Is the project scientifically significant and innovative? Is the project ambitious and does it have potential for breakthroughs? Does it have potential for exceptionally significant outcomes? If the project is multi/inter/transdisciplinary, what is the added value of this?

1.2 Feasibility of research plan

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: Are the objectives and hypotheses appropriately presented and is the research plan realistic? 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?

1.3 Ethical issues

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

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?

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?

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 project, additional comments and suggestions

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:

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