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Dear Dr. Jencová,

On behalf of the Executive Board of the Austrian Science Fund I would like to thank you for your willingness to prepare a review of this application by **22 February 2021.** The FWF will ensure that your identity is not revealed. Please accept the current review assignment only if you agree to the following terms of confidentiality and declare no conflicts of interest.

**Confidentiality:** All information about the application, data, ideas and results you receive for review must be kept confidential. Please do not inform anyone about the application, the review, or the review result.

**Conflicts of interest:** You should refrain from reviewing the application if a conflict of interest exists or could be perceived to exist. For the FWF, a conflict of interest can be perceived when:

1. You stand to profit professionally, financially or personally from the approval or rejection of the application;

2. You have published with, cooperated with or worked at the same research institution as the applicant(s) or any of the proposed team members in the past five years;

3. You have fundamental differences of scientific or scholarly opinion with the applicant(s);

4. You have close professional or personal connections to the applicant or any of the proposed team members beyond ordinary academic interaction (e.g., at conferences or workshops).

Should any of these points apply now or emerge at a later stage, please inform me immediately at the above email address.

Data protection: You are obliged to ensure the security of the data contained in the application in accordance with the [EU General Data Protection Regulation](https://gdpr-info.eu/). The data transmitted to you are intended for the sole purpose of evaluating the proposal and must be deleted after you submit your review.

To submit your review, please use the FWF evaluation form below. The evaluation form consists of three sections: Section 1 – the written review; Section 2 – recommendations for the applicant(s); Section 3 – confidential remarks addressed to the FWF. In Section 1, for each question as well as for the overall assessment, please provide written comments and select an assessment rating on the given scale. Sections 1 and 2 will be transmitted to the applicant in their entirety and in anonymous form. Section 3 will not be sent to the applicant.

In the evaluation form you will be asked to agree to comply with the terms of confidentiality and data protection mentioned above, and to declare that you have no conflicts of interest. Please submit the review form to the FWF, using my e-mail address above.

Thank you for participating in our evaluation process and helping us to uphold the highest international standards in our funding decisions.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Simone RECCHI

Strategy - Career Development

**Evaluation forms Lise Meitner Programme**

**Target group**

highly qualified researchers of any discipline from abroad who could contribute to the scientific development of an Austrian research institution by working at it.

**Goals**

* strengthening of the quality and the scientific know-how of the Austrian scientific community
* creation of international contacts
* career development

**Level of funding**

Personnel costs (24 months) and project specific costs up to 12,000 € per year

Further information on the FWF’s corporate policy and mission or the application guidelines:

http://www.fwf.ac.at/en/about-the-fwf/corporate-policy/

https://www.fwf.ac.at/en/research-funding/fwf-programmes/meitner-programme/

The FWF actively supports equal opportunities and fair treatment for all applicants. The FWF does not put applicants at a disadvantage for non-research-related reasons (such as age, gender, etc.) and therefore asks all reviewers to apply the same standards. For example, when assessing applicants’ qualifications, please disregard their actual age, but consider their academic age instead. Our commitment to equal opportunities also means taking into account breaks or delays in applicants’ research careers (e.g., due to parental leave; long-term or chronic illness; disability; caring responsibilities; etc.), which may have led to publication gaps, unorthodox career paths, or limited international research experience.

No more then the ten most important academic publications and the ten most important additional research achievements of the applicant are to be considered when evaluating the application. As a signatory to the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA), the FWF also emphasizes that, in assessing research performance, reviewers should refrain from using journal-based metrics such as the Journal Impact Factor.

Please review the present proposal[[1]](#footnote-1), using the following eight assessment criteria: 1) innovation and originality, 2) quality of the proposed research, 3) approach and feasibility, 4) researchers’ qualifications, 5) qualifications of the co-applicant and suitability as mentor, 6) career development / brain gain. 7) ethics and gender, and 8) overall evaluation. For each of these criteria except 7) we ask you for both written comments and a rating on a scale from “excellent” to “poor”. Please be aware, however, that the FWF’s funding decision will be based primarily on referees’ written assessments rather than the ratings assigned.

Section 1 and 2 will be forwarded to the applicant in its entirety:

Projekt Nummer: M 3151-N

AntragstellerIn: Dr. Elizabeth AGUDELO OSPINA

GutachterIn: Prof. Anna JENCOVÁ

**Section 1: Your review**

**Declaration** (mandatory):

I hereby confirm that I have read and understood the FWF terms of confidentiality, data protection, and conflicts of interest, and agree to comply with these terms.

**1. Innovation and originality**

Is the proposed research innovative? Does it make an original contribution to its field?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| excellent | very good | good | average | poor |

Please give reasons for your answers, taking as much space as you need.

Your assessment:

**2. Quality of the proposed research**

Are the research questions formulated clearly? Are they timely, challenging and likely to lead to relevant insights?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| excellent | very good | good | average | poor |

Please give reasons for your answers, taking as much space as you need.

Your assessment:

**3. Approach and feasibility**

Is the research design well conceived, clearly formulated, and suitable for answering the research question(s)? Is there a well-organized work plan? Have the methods been chosen well and does the proposal describe them in sufficient detail?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| excellent | very good | good | average | poor |

Please give reasons for your answers, taking as much space as you need.

Your assessment:

**4. Qualifications of the applicant**

How well is the applicant qualified to carry out the proposed research? How would you assess the academic qualifications of the applicant, their team and collaboration partners? In evaluating the qualification of the applicant, please consider their career stage, taking into account unusual career paths and circumstances that may have slowed down their progress (e.g., parental leave, long-term or chronic illness, disability, caring responsibilities).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| excellent | very good | good | average | poor |

Please give reasons for your answers, taking as much space as you need.

Your assessment:

**5. Academic qualifications of the co-applicant and suitability as mentor as well as the quality (international research reputation) of the research environment**

How would you assess the academic qualifications of the co-applicant and the quality (international research reputation) of the research environment? Is the co-applicant suitable for supporting the career of the principal investigator?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| excellent | very good | good | average | poor |

Please give reasons for your answers, taking as much space as you need.

Your assessment:

**6. Career development / Brain gain**

How important is the project for the career development of the applicant? Is an added value expected for the Austrian research institution through its cooperation with the applicant and co-applicant (brain gain)?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| excellent | very good | good | average | poor |

Please give reasons for your answers, taking as much space as you need.

Your assessment:

**7. Ethics and gender**

*Ethics*

Have ethical considerations been addressed satisfactorily?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| yes | no | not applicable |

Please give reasons for your answers, taking as much space as you need.

Your assessment:

*Gender*

Applicants are required to address any relevant sex-specific and/or gender-related elements inherent in their research questions and/or research design. Please assess whether their treatment of these components is adequate.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| yes | no | not applicable |

Please explain your assessment of how sex-specific and/or gender-related elements have been treated in the application.

Your assessment:

**8. Overall evaluation**

What is your overall impression of the proposal? Specifically, what would you consider its key strengths and weaknesses? Please give reasons for your answers, taking as much space as you need.

Your assessment:

Overall funding recommendation (see footnotes for definitions of the rating categories):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Excellent*[[2]](#footnote-2) | Funding is highly recommended. |
|  | *Very Good[[3]](#footnote-3)* | Funding is recommended. |
|  | *Good[[4]](#footnote-4)* | Resubmission is recommended after revisions. |
|  | *Average[[5]](#footnote-5)* | Before resubmission, major revisions are required. |
|  | *Poor.[[6]](#footnote-6)* | Rejection is recommended. |

**Section 2: Optional recommendations for the applicant(s)**

If you are in favour of the project being funded, you may want to add to the formal assessment in Section 1 by making further and perhaps more informal comments or suggestions here. However, please note that these remarks, too, may impact on the FWF’s funding decision, especially if they amount to substantive criticism of the project.

Your recommendations:

**Section 3: Confidential remarks to the FWF**

Please use this space to make any comments that you do not wish to be conveyed to the applicant(s). Feel free to also give us feedback about the evaluation process and your interactions with us.

Your remarks:

# Optional: Brief reviewer profile

The information requested below will help the FWF to maintain the high quality of its peer-review and to ensure diversity. The FWF will process these data electronically and use them for statistical purposes in anonymous and aggregate form only.

|  |
| --- |
| **Age group***:*  <40  40-50  50-60  >60  **Sex**:  female  male  diverse  **Academic degree**:  PhD  MD  **Current academic position**:  Full Professor  Associate Professor  Assistant Professor  Senior Researcher  Other, please specify: …  **Additional information**: |

1. The project proposal must meet the FWF’s formal requirements. Please bear these in mind when writing your review. (Key formal requirements: 20 pages max. for the project description including figures and tables; 5 pages max. for the list of references; 3 pages max. for each academic CV, including a description of previous research achievements and the ten most important publications. For further details see <https://www.fwf.ac.at/en/research-funding/application/meitner-programme>) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. ***Excellent* = funding is highly recommended**The proposed research project is among the best 5% in the field worldwide. It has the potential to break new ground and make a major contribution to knowledge. The applicant and the researchers involved possess exceptional qualifications by international standards. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. ***Very Good* = funding is recommended**The proposed research project is among the best 15% in the field worldwide. It is at the forefront internationally, but minor improvements could be made. The applicant and the researchers involved possess very good qualifications by international standards. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. ***Good* = resubmission is recommended after revisions**The proposed research project is internationally competitive but has some weaknesses, and/or the applicant and the researchers involved possess good qualifications by international standards. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. ***Average* = before resubmission major revisions are required**  
   The proposed research project will provide some new insights but has significant weaknesses and/or the applicant and the researchers involved possess sufficient qualifications by international standards. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. **Poor = rejection is recommended**The proposed research project is weak, and/or the applicant and the researchers involved are insufficiently qualified by international standards. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)