

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, 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

*The aim of the funding for research posts as **Postdoctoral Researcher** is to advance the professional competence of the most promising researchers who have recently earned their doctorate (PhD completion 0–4 years ago, or max. 8 years ago, provided that the doctoral degree has been obtained simultaneously with medical specialist training). The funding period is 36 months.*

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, quality of research collaborations

Rating (1–6):

2.1 Competence and expertise of applicant

Sub-rating (1–6):

Guiding questions: What are the personal merits and scientific expertise of the applicant? Are they appropriate and sufficient for the proposed project? Does the research plan advance the applicant's professional competence and independence?

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?

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:

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.