Grant application pre-proposal form 2025

NWO Talent Programme – Veni scheme

Applied and Engineering Sciences
Science
Social Sciences and Humanities

Version: June 2025

Information about rules and guidelines (the 'explanatory notes') are embedded in this form. Please expand the explanatory notes for information about terms, conditions and requirements.

Note: The explanatory notes are automatically visible in Google Docs. To view them on Apple devices, select 'Outline' under the 'View' tab in Word.

Please **make sure the Explanatory notes are not visible in the PDF version of your pre-proposal**. To achieve this, delete the explanatory note text boxes before submitting your pre-proposal.

← Expand for general explanatory notes

General explanatory notes

- Use **Calibri**, **black, 9.5-point** font with single line spacing. If using LaTeX, please choose a font style and size that most closely approximate the preferred font, with margins of 2.5 centimetres.

- Complete the application entirely in English.

- Word counts include **all text** (including, but not limited to, references, footnotes, text in tables and figures). Exceptions are explicitly noted.

- When asked for personal details, please only provide initials and surnames and do not state first names in order to avoid gender effects.

- When writing the pre-proposal, bear in mind that it will be read by a broadly composed assessment committee within the chosen domain.

Before completing the grant application pre-proposal form, please study the information in the Call for proposals of the NWO Talent Programme – Veni 2025 and the guidelines provided in the explanatory notes in this form. You can download these documents from the NWO Veni website. The original Dutch-language text of the call is the authoritative version. Where the English-language text is open to a different interpretation, no additional rights may be derived therefrom. If you have any further questions, please consult the FAQ (Frequently Asked Questions).

If you have any questions about the pre-proposal form or application process, please do not hesitate to contact the programme coordinator for your domain. Contact details are listed in the call and on the NWO website: https://www.nwo.nl/en/researchprogrammes/nwo-talent-programme.

Please note that all documents must be submitted in PDF format without security locks. You are free to use programs other than Word to complete the pre-proposal form, as long as you preserve the form's overall structure and lay-out.

Submitting your pre-proposal in our system on time
The deadline for submitting your pre-proposal is **2 September 2025, 14:00:00 hrs** (CEST). All fields must be completed and the pre-proposal form and optional annex must be uploaded and submitted by clicking the 'submit' button **before** 14:00:00 hrs (CEST). Start the submission process in ISAAC/MijnZonMw at least one day in advance. If you encounter any problems, contact the relevant helpdesk. **Applications received after the deadline are automatically disqualified.**

You will receive a confirmation of the eligibility of your submission (i.e., whether it complies with all formal requirements) within approximately two weeks after the submission deadline. If it does not meet the requirements, you will be asked to amend your pre-proposal. Bear in mind that, if you are asked to amend your pre-proposal, you must be available to do so shortly after the deadline.

1. NWO domain and field of research

← Expand for explanatory notes on section 1

Explanatory notes 1a. NWO domain

Select the NWO domain where you submit your research proposal.

For the domain **Science** (ENW) you have to choose the panel in which your pre-proposal will be evaluated.
See call for proposals section 3.3.3 for more information.

Within the domain SSH, the assessment of pre-proposals and full proposals takes place in six panels. Indicate your choice for a panel in the dropdown menu, and submit your pre-proposal form in the corresponding submission window in ISAAC. When preparing your pre-proposal, please consider which panel to choose. An overview of the various disciplines associated with each panel can be found here. Keep in mind that, even when your field is one of the social sciences, your relevant discipline might be in a different panel from the 'Social Sciences' panel. For example, Political Science is part of the panel 'Law and governance', and Social and Organisational Psychology is part of the panel 'Behaviour and education'. See call for proposals 3.3.3. for more information'.

Explanatory notes: 1b. Main field of research

Enter one or more research fields corresponding to the subject of your research proposal.

Choose only from the research fields listed in the NWO research field list, using the exact names and codes: www.nwo.nl/researchfields. You can also find the research fields and codes in the dropdown menu.

Before submitting your pre-proposal, make sure that the information in the ISAAC system under the 'General information' (*Algemeen*) tab in the 'Research fields' (*Disciplines*) section is

exactly the same as in your pre-proposal.

Note that only the research fields need to be entered in the ISAAC system manually, not the associated codes. For example, if your main research field is business administration, enter:

- In the pre-proposal: 39.90.00, Business Administration
- In ISAAC: Business Administration

Note: ISAAC lists research fields in the language of correspondence as previously selected by you (English or Dutch). You have to search for your research field(s) in your selected language (e.g., Business Administration or *Bedrijfskunde*).

1a. NWO domain

SSH (SGW) - Philosophy, historical sciences and religion

1b. Main field of research

Indicate the main field of research and (if applicable) other fields of research, in order of relevance, by selecting names and codes from the dropdown menu. For more information, see the explanatory notes.

	Code/Field of research:
Main field of research:	26.70.00 Methods and techniques (Archaeology)
Other field(s) of research (if applicable):	27.50.00 Social and economic history
	26.90.00 Archeology, other
	Choose fourth field of research (if applicable)

2. Evidence-based curriculum vitae

Explanatory notes: 2. Evidence-based curriculum vitae

Why do we ask for an evidence-based curriculum vitae?

NWO asks for an evidence-based CV to assess the full range of individual researchers' scientific results and qualifications. This is important as each researcher is unique, has particular academic qualities and excels in their own way. NWO aims to recognise and reward researchers for their specific qualities and merits within carefully formulated criteria.

The evidence-based CV was developed according to the principles of the National Recognition & Rewards programme, and the DORA initiative. This has resulted in a more **qualitative assessment** of applicants, a reduction of the uncritical use of bibliometric indicators, and ongoing efforts to eliminate bias in the assessment of research and researchers.

Applicants are therefore required to **describe** and **substantiate** among other things: their academic abilities and achievements, how these excel beyond the average, and why they are relevant to the research idea. In other words, the *why* is just as important as the *what*. In addition, there is a limit of 10 key outputs and applicants have to demonstrate the relevance and quality of both the academic profile and the key outputs. This ensures that applicants are assessed on their individual qualities and merits instead of on indirect measures of quality.

NWO is aware that it can be challenging to write and evaluate an evidence-based CV and therefore provides instructions for both applicants and committee members. These instructions are designed to support everyone working with the evidence-based CV format in order to facilitate qualitative assessment of each applicant.

Committee assessment
The evidence-based CV is assessed by a **broad** scientific committee from the corresponding NWO domain. The academic profile and key output sections must therefore be clear and comprehensible for all assessment committee members.

How will the committee assess the evidence-based CV?
The committee uses the following guidelines to assess the evidence-based CV, in line with DORA and the National Recognition & Reward principles:
- How does the applicant substantiate claims they make? The applicant's qualities and how these qualities are substantiated are at the core of the evidence-based CV. Applicants have to explain **why** the stated milestones are important for their career. It is not sufficient for applicants to solely mention what they have achieved. The committee is instructed not to include any unsubstantiated claims in their assessment.
- The committee is instructed to evaluate the content of the pre-proposal, not the writing skills.
- The contributions of each committee member carry equal weight, regardless of individual expertise.
- The committee will assess each pre-proposal in the same way, following the guidelines for inclusive assessment: https://www.nwo.nl/sites/nwo/files/media-files/NWO-

What does the committee assess?
The evidence-based CV (sections 2a and 2b) is used to assess the 'Quality of the researcher' criterion. This consists of the following elements:

- Whether the researcher fits in the target group*: is the researcher at the stage of transitioning to
independence, and to what extent will the Veni contribute to the researcher's development in this area?
- The extent to which the researcher's qualities clearly exceed what is customary within the international peer group, as shown in the cv, by the quality and impact of the key output, and by other academic achievements.**
- The extent to which the researcher's work is positioned with respect to scientific and (where possible) societal themes or questions.
- The quality of the (inter)national network, collaborative abilities and visibility of the researcher.
- The extent to which the researcher demonstrates the capability of generating innovative ideas;
- Whether the researcher's key output and academic profile clearly align with the research idea, or whether the researcher presents a convincing vision of how this alignment will be achieved.

*You can find more information on the Veni target group in the call for proposals in section 2.1.
**Examples of 'other academic achievements' are contributions to the development of scientific theories and methods, indications of independence, contributions to Open Science and 'academic citizenship'.

Admissibility check of the evidence-based CV
To maintain a level playing field for applicants, the call for proposals sets out conditions for determining the admissibility of evidence-based CVs. These conditions are partly based on the DORA guidelines. In the list below we have indicated what information **CAN** and **CANNOT** be mentioned in an evidence-based CV. Committees are instructed to disregard any output that does not meet the criteria and NWO may request proof of the status of the output, when needed.

	Allowed	**Not allowed**
Including lists	The core is quality over quantity. Therefore, listing results obtained is allowed, in case it is explained why this is relevant for the academic profile.	Listing results without context is not allowed.
Mentioning totals	Totals with respect to supervisory activities are allowed (e.g. total number of PhDs/MScs/Post-docs supervised).	Totals of publications, acquired funds, grants and prizes are not allowed.
Activities and (non-) academic output	Describing academic activities and non-academic output in section 2a is allowed. Mention of academic outputs included in section 2b is also allowed, provided that reference is made to the specific output item as	Mentioning any other academic output that are not included in the key output is not allowed.

	listed in 2b.	
Quality indicators	Quality indicators are allowed, as long as they relate to a single output item. Applicants may choose up to three quality indicators for each key output in section 2b. They are encouraged to explain every indicator, though this is not obligatory.	With respect to journals, conferences, publishers and research institutes, use of terms indicating rank/reputation are not allowed, for example: • Terms such as 'top' journal/publisher, 'top-tier' journal, 'prestigious' journal/publisher, 'leading' journal/publisher are not allowed. • h-index, G-index, i10-index, total number of citations of an author (measured over multiple publications), journal impact factor (JIF), Source Normalised Impact per Paper (SNIP), SJR, SCImago Journal Rank, Q1, Scientific Journal Rankings (SJR) and university rankings are not allowed.
Accepted publicatio ns	Publications must be published, in-print, or unconditionally accepted. In addition, preprints and working papers are allowed in section 2b, provided they are findable (published in an open repository: Directory of Open Access Preprint Repositories) and the journal/submission venue is not named. Pre-prints and working papers are academic manuscripts that have not been peer-reviewed or published in a traditional venue (yet). Because only output with at least the status unconditionally accepted can be mentioned, NWO can ask for proof of the status of the unconditional acceptance of your output. The publication must be unconditionally accepted before the deadline of the pre-proposal.	Manuscripts which an applicant is still working on (e.g. submitted, under review or forthcoming papers) and/or are not openly accessible are not eligible as key output items in section 2b. It is permissible to mention them in section 2a as ongoing projects, as long as there is no reference to publication plans/platforms/publishers.
Book contracts	Mention of book contracts IS allowed in section 2a, without mention of the publisher.	Note that book contracts are not considered unconditionally accepted publications and therefore may not be mentioned as key outputs in section 2b, unless the definitive version of the book manuscript has been unconditionally approved by the publisher.
Hyperlinks	In section 2b, one hyperlink (max) is	The use of hyperlinks and URLs is not

	allowed per output item, on the condition that it links directly to that output item. Inclusion of an additional link to the same key output in open access is also allowed. The hyperlink should preferably be in the form of a persistent identifier (e.g. a DOI).	allowed in the pre-proposal, with the exception of in the key output section (2b).

Explanatory notes: 2a. Academic profile

Applicants are free to shape their narrative in any way that suits their profile. For example, applicants can choose to simply describe their academic profile in running text, highlight sections using bold or italic, add structure using subheadings, or list achievements point by point, followed by explanations, etc. (while sticking to abovementioned font and line space). As stated above, the focus of section 2a is on substantiating any quality claims the applicant wishes to make, and not on output or output indicators. Output should be addressed in section 2b.

In the general academic profile, applicants should describe their unique profile, including research line(s)/agenda/vision, relevant qualities, skills and activities; see the criterion in the call for proposals. They should present an evidence-based narrative highlighting the academic achievements that are most relevant to their field, other scientific fields, society and/or the research idea. They should elaborate and provide evidence of how these achievements demonstrate **qualities** that clearly exceed the norm in their international peer group. Applicants should also describe how the grant will contribute to their academic development. Which achievements are relevant to mention depends on the particular field, the application concerned and the personal situation. Applicants may also include context about situations that have hampered their ability to demonstrate their qualities.

Explanatory notes: 2b. Key output

Information about the culture and standards of the scientific field

The committee is asked to assess each applicant's outputs in light of the culture and standards of the scientific field and the applicant's net academic research time. Applicants are encouraged to include relevant information on the culture and standards of their scientific field, though without mentioning any of the quality indicators that are not allowed by NWO. Applicants may explain this information in the general box at the top of the paragraph. You can use a maximum of 50 words. This does not count towards the word limit of the 10 output items.

Key output items

Applicants can list a maximum of 10 output items here that best demonstrate their qualities and are relevant to the application, their own and/or other scientific fields, the research idea and/or society. While the maximum number of output items is 10, applicants can list fewer

items. The evidence-based CV format is designed to accommodate all scientific disciplines, and NWO recognises that typical numbers and types of output vary from one discipline to another.

Practical instructions for key outputs:

- Provide reference information about the output item in the 'Reference' text field. For journal publications, book publications and all other outputs (insofar as possible), provide the following details: author(s) in the order published, date, title of the publication, journal or series in which the publication appeared, volume, page numbers and (if applicable) publisher and place. Do not use 'et al.', so committee members can see the applicant's position in the author list.
- In the 'URL' text field, provide a URL that links directly to the output item, preferably in the form of a persistent identifier (e.g. a DOI). If the output is of a type for which no URL is available, applicants can leave this field empty. An additional link to the same key output can be included if it is published open access.
- If 'Other, please describe' is selected for the output or quality indicator type, the output type/quality indicator can be added under the dropdown menu.
- Applicants must select at least one quality indicator from the drop-down menus in the "Quality indicators" field. **Please note: applicants may provide numbers with their choice of quality indicator. Do not add any additional text next to the indicators fields.**
- In the 'Motivation' text field, applicants should provide their motivation for the given output item and explain the significance of the chosen quality indicator(s) in this context. Applicants should explain their own contribution, particularly if the output is multi-author. Motivations for multiple key output items can be combined.
- If output is 'open', e.g. open access publications, open access databases or open source software, applicants should mark it as such. Output marked open access must be freely accessible worldwide at least as from the time of the application deadline.
- If an applicant lists fewer than 10 key outputs, all empty output fields should be deleted.
- Applicants can include any more relevant information for a specific key output item about the culture and standards of their scientific field in the 'Motivation' field.

2a. Academic profile

For more information, expand the explanatory notes
(Min. 400 – max. 700 words)

Academic Profile:

My main research focus has been about the ways we can draw information about past activities through the analysis of human teeth from an archaeological context. My training was initially based in the anthropological 'four-field' approach with a specialisation in archaeology. Alongside the core training, I also explored multiple scientific disciplines, including chemistry and biology, which led me to an interest in analytical approaches supported by theory, and vice versa. These interests came together during my doctoral research, where I applied methods from oral microbiology to explore fundamental processes in the development of dental calculus (3,7,8), how these processes relate to dietary markers that become entrapped in dental calculus and preserved over time, and our subsequent interpretations and theories about human diet (9). During this time, I developed collaborations with the Middenbeemster Historical Society and researchers from the Department of Forensic Medicine at Aarhus University; connections that will be integral to the proposed project, in addition to a collaboration with researchers at the Department of Archaeology and Heritage Studies, also at Aarhus University.

In addition to my interest in specific topics and methods related to the human past, I am also interested in improving the way we do science in academia. To me, this means doing science more openly, transparently, and responsibly. I take the time to ensure that my analyses are not only open, but also reproducible (2); that all my data are published and adhere to the FAIR principles (4), and to experiment with open, non-traditional ways to communicate my results (6). Science is for the benefit of society and not for the profit of large companies. To back this up, I no longer publish my manuscripts in journals with excessive article processing charges, and preferentially publish in more equitable Diamond Open Access journals (1,3).

For me it is important to contribute to community-led resources and platforms. This has primarily been in the form of contributing to AncientMetagenomeDir (5), a resource containing standardised metadata for ancient metagenomes curated by the SPAAM (Standards, Precautions, and Advances in Ancient Metagenomics) community. I also volunteer for Peer Community In, where I help formatting articles for the Peer Community Journal and checking the reproducibility of preprints submitted to Peer Community In Ecology and Peer Community In Evolutionary Biology. Both activities have given me additional perspective on how other people use and reuse data and code, and have been valuable learning experiences to improve my own practices.

Working as a Data Steward has allowed me to advocate for Open Science at an institutional level and influence policy, as well as gain experience from the support side of research in the form of providing trainings on open source tools, alternative and open forms of outputs, and research data management. While not in itself relevant to the field of research, and may even have hampered my ability to produce research products in the time since my defense, these are all processes that have contributed to my academic development and improved skills needed to conduct good quality, responsible research.

The grant will allow me to get back into research as the lead of a project, and continue to pursue topics and questions that arose during my doctoral research. On a more personal note, I have a Danish background and am based in the Netherlands, which had a large influence on the proposed topic and will allow me to approach the cultural context from both the Danish and Dutch side.

Word count 2a Academic profile (min. 400 and max. 700 words):	573

2b. Key output

For more information, expand the explanatory notes.

Information about the culture and standards of the scientific field [optional in max. 50 words]	

10 key outputs max. Total word limit: minimum 400 words, maximum 700 words, excl. references, URLs, output types and indicators.

Key output 1   Open
Access: Yes

Reference:	Bartholdy, B. P., Hasselstrøm, J. B., Sørensen, L. K., Casna, M., Hoogland, M., Beemster, H. G., & Henry, A. G. (2024). Multiproxy analysis exploring patterns of diet and disease in dental calculus and skeletal remains from a 19th century Dutch population. *Peer Community Journal*, *4*. https://doi.org/10.24072/pcjournal.414
URL:	https://doi.org/10.24072/pcjournal.414
Type:	Article, refereed
Quality indicators:	1) Academic interest, other 2) Stakeholder involvement 3) Academic collaboration and/or interdisciplinary engagement
Motivation:	This article is directly related to the proposed project and shows how tobacco markers can be detected in dental calculus from the Post-medieval period. It was also a collaboration between the Leiden University, Aarhus University, and stakeholders from the Beemster Historical Society.

Key output 2   Open
Access: Yes

Reference:	Bartholdy, B. P. (2024). *bbartholdy/mb11CalculusPilot: Version of record* (Version 1.0.0) [Computer software]. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11040640
URL:	https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11040640
Type:	Software
Quality indicators:	1) Reproducibility 2) Academic interest, other 3) Optional: choose a third indicator
Motivation:	This is the source code related to Key output 1. I am dedicated to the reproducibility of the results underlying my interpretations; so, in addition to the entire analysis being open source, the code was submitted to CODECHECK, and successfully reproduced.

Key output 3   Open
Access: Yes

Reference:	Bartholdy, B. P., Velsko, I. M., Gur-Arieh, S., Fagernäs, Z., Warinner, C., & Henry, A. G. (2025). Assessing the validity of a calcifying oral biofilm model as a suitable proxy for dental calculus. *Open Research Europe*, *5*, 96. https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.19129.1
URL:	https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.19129.1
Type:	Article, refereed
Quality indicators:	1) Academic interest, other 2) Optional: choose a second indicator 3) Optional: choose a third indicator

Motivation:	This article describes research to extend our fundamental understanding of dental calculus and the mechanisms by which it is formed by using an experimental lab model. It also highlights my dedication to alternative publishing, here using the diamond Open Access platform, Open Research Europe, which follows the 'publish, review, curate' model.

Key output 4   Open
Access: Yes

Reference:	Bartholdy, B. P. (2023). *Dental, pathological, and UHPLC data from Middenbeemster archaeological site* (Version 1.0.0) [Dataset]. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8061483
URL:	https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8061483
Type:	Dataset
Quality indicators:	1) Scholarly activity: Downloads, views, shares, readership and/or bookmarks on common research tools 2) Reproducibility 3) Reuse
Motivation:	This publicly available dataset contains all the data related to key outputs 1 and 2, in an interoperable format, allowing the study to be validated and reproduced by anyone. It has been downloaded 899 times.

Key output 5   Open
Access: Yes

Reference:	Yates, J. A. F., Valtueña, A. A., Hübner, A., Vågene, Å. J., Cribdon, B., Borry, M., Velsko, I., KaHea-21, Heintzman, P., DianaSpurite, Green, E., Ramachandran, S., Bravo, M., Özdoğan, K. T., iseultj, Bartholdy, B. P., Os, M. van, Warinner, C., Ibrahim, A., … Gancz, A. (2025). *SPAAM-community/AncientMetagenomeDir: V25.03: Historic Centre of Cordoba* (Version v25.03.0) [Dataset]. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15172336
URL:	https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15172336
Type:	Dataset
Quality indicators:	1) Scholarly activity: Downloads, views, shares, readership and/or bookmarks on common research tools 2) Academic collaboration and/or interdisciplinary engagement 3) Reuse
Motivation:	This project is a massive community effort to facilitate reuse of ancient DNA data, and a wonderful example of what a community can achieve over individual efforts. I am both directly involved in adding entries to the database, as well as developing documentation for the website, and serving as a member of the core team.

Key output 6   Open
Access: Yes

Reference:	Bartholdy, B. P. (2025). Supplementary dashboard to: Assessing the validity of a calcifying oral biofilm model as a suitable proxy for dental calculus. (v25.04.0). Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15152849
URL:	https://websaur.shinyapps.io/byocDashboard/
Type:	Software
Quality indicators:	1) Reproducibility 2) Originality/novelty 3) Optional: choose a third indicator

Motivation:	I like to experiment with different ways to communicate my results and make my research more transparent. This is a dashboard I developed as supplementary material to key output 3 to allow others to explore the data and make different decisions than I did in the article.

Key output 7   Open
Access: Yes

Reference:	Bartholdy, B. P. (2024). *Putting dental calculus under the microscope* (Doctoral dissertation, Leiden University).
URL:	https://myphd.bjorns.website/
Type:	Thesis/dissertation
Quality indicators:	1) Scholarly activity: Downloads, views, shares, readership and/or bookmarks on common research tools 2) Transparancy, accessibility 3) Optional: choose a third indicator
Motivation:	I host my dissertation on a website in a more web-digestible HTML format, as opposed to the PDF that is traditionally used. I also made sure to use contrasting colours and legible font for accessibility. Since publishing the website, it has been visited over 4000 times.

Key output 8   Open
Access: Yes

Reference:	Bartholdy, B.P., & Henry, A.G. (2023). Build your own calculus. **protocols.io** https://dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.dm6gpj9rdgzp/v1
URL:	https://dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.dm6gpj9rdgzp/v1
Type:	Protocol
Quality indicators:	1) Reproducibility 2) Scholarly activity: Downloads, views, shares, readership and/or bookmarks on common research tools 3) Optional: choose a third indicator
Motivation:	This is a collection of published protocols associated with key outputs 3 and 9. They cover all the steps needed to grow dental calculus in a lab environment. The protocol describing the measurement of amylase activity in the oral biofilm model is (for some reason) the most popular, with over 1700 views.

Key output 9   Open
Access: Yes

Reference:	Bartholdy, B. P., & Henry, A. G. (2022). Investigating Biases Associated With Dietary Starch Incorporation and Retention With an Oral Biofilm Model. *Frontiers in Earth Science*, 10. https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2022.886512
URL:	https://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2022.886512
Type:	Article, refereed
Quality indicators:	1) Academic interest, other 2) Scholarly activity: Downloads, views, shares, readership and/or bookmarks on common research tools 3) Optional: choose a third indicator
Motivation:	This article describes an application of the oral biofilm model described in key output 3. We show the potential biases caused by interpreting counts/quantity of dietary markers at face value. Dietary markers are entrapped in dental calculus in different quantities depending on size, morphology, and potentially other factors that we were unable to address.

Key output 10   Open Access: Yes

Reference:	Bjørn Peare Bartholdy. (2024). rchaeology/RchaeoStats: 2024.10.0 (2024.10.0).

	Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13983364
URL:	https://rchaeology.github.io/RchaeoStats/
Type:	Workshop
Quality indicators:	1) Contribution to (academic) educational programme(s) 2) Optional: choose a second indicator 3) Optional: choose a third indicator
Motivation:	The teaching materials were developed at the request (and funding) of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (DAI), and have since been delivered as workshops for researchers at DAI, early career researchers at Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut, and PhD candidates (for credit) at Leiden University.

Word count 2b. Key output (max. 700 words):	465

3. Research idea

← Expand for explanatory notes on section 3

Explanatory notes: 3. Research idea

- The word count includes all text in section 3, excluding the title and key words.
- Use of hyperlinks is not allowed.
- Use only plain text in this section. The use of, for example, figures, table, references to literature or footnotes is not allowed. It is allowed to refer to the key output items.

Above the description of the research idea, applicants should provide a title in Calibri, underlined, 9.5-point font.

Applicants should add up to 5 key words that best fit the research idea.

In this section, applicants are asked to provide a concise description of their research. For the purposes of the Veni pre-proposal, the research idea is an indication of the topic and importance of the envisioned project, rather than a summary of a fully thought-out plan.

For the D**omains Applied and Engineering Sciences (AES/TTW)** & **Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH/SGW)** you can use no more than 100 words.

As part of a pilot the word limit for the **domain Science (ENW)** is expanded to a maximum of 500 words. This pilot does not affect the assessment criterion.

Note: The 'research idea' is not assessed as an independent criterion in the pre-proposal phase. The committee uses the research idea to evaluate whether the applicant's evidence-based CV aligns with the idea, or, if it does not, whether the applicant provides a convincing plan of how such alignment will be achieved (see description of criteria in explanatory notes to section 2). NWO may use the research idea and key words to initiate the process of finding external peer reviewers for the proposal (only for the domains Science and AES).

Title:	Social and Physiological Context of Early Tobacco Adopters in Denmark
Key words (max. 5):	dental calculus, bioarchaeology, paleodietary activities, paleopathology
Research idea (Domains **AES** and **SSH**: max 100 words. Domain **Science**: max. 500 words):	In this project we will explore the early adoption of tobacco in Denmark, focusing on the social context, demographics, and health of tobacco consumers from the 15th to 17th century. Using a combination of biomolecular detection, paleodietary isotopes, skeletal analysis, and historical records, we aim to identify early adopters, the social context motivating their consumption, and the impact on health among individuals across various social strata. Through multiproxy analysis, and comparing with countries more extensively involved in tobacco trade and cultivation, England and the Netherlands, we will provide a valuable perspective on the introduction of tobacco to Danish society.
Word count 3. Research idea:	99

4. Administrative details

← Expand for explanatory notes on section 4

Explanatory notes: 4. Administrative details

Applicants are to provide only the information requested. Note that the committee may use information from section 4 as context for assessing the 'Quality of the researcher' criterion.

Explanatory notes: 4a. Name

Where asked for personal details, please provide only title(s), initial(s) and surname, and no first name(s). Be sure to complete all fields in your ISAAC/Mijn ZonMw profile in full, including gender. This information is used for administrative purposes and influences policy decisions such as the NWO *ex aequo* policy.

Please **make sure the contact details in your ISAAC/Mijn ZonMw profile are up to date** (i.e. email address, postal address at the host institute for full duration of the round, phone number).

Explanatory notes: 4b. Doctorate

The date of PhD award is the date stated on your doctoral degree.

If this date is not the same as the date of your defence, please provide the date from which you were allowed to use the doctoral title. If the date of your defence and date from which you

were allowed to use the doctoral title are more than six months apart, the date of defence applies.

If you have two doctorates, please provide information on both. The date of the second doctorate applies for the submission period. Please include information about activities since completing your first PhD under sections 4d and 4e.

Explanatory notes: 4c. Prospective host institution

Provide the name of the institution and the specific group or department at which you plan to execute your project.

Explanatory notes: 4d. Work experience since PhD completion

List your previous and current appointments chronologically, with your current appointment on the bottom row. For each appointment, state the start and end dates of the appointment. Please specify the posts you have held and currently hold. If you are not a postdoc, assistant professor, associate professor or full professor, state whether the post you hold is in or outside academia. Also specify the contract type, e.g. tenured ('*vast*') or fixed-term ('*tijdelijk*') and full-time or part-time (in FTEs), and provide the name of the institution. Add as many rows as needed.

Please specify your current post and contract type.

Explanatory notes: 4e. Net academic research time

Provide a calculation of your net academic research time since completing your PhD thesis. In other words, the amount of time you have actually spent on research work, after deducting management tasks, education, leave, interruptions and non-scientific work. This timespan between obtaining your degree and the submission of your funding application is your net academic research time, calculated in full-time equivalents (FTEs) and expressed in full months. The committee will evaluate your track record of achievements in relation to your net academic age in order to make a fair comparison with other applicants. Do NOT include your calculations on the form; only state your net academic research time in months.

Example

PhD thesis defence	September 2012

Proposal submission deadline	October 2022	
Gross academic age	**122 months**	
Deductions - Maternity - Part-time work - Teaching - Management tasks	18 months: 100% interruption deducted	18 months
	4 years: 80% full-time deducted	10 months
	8 years: 50% full-time deducted	48 months
	2 years: 25% full-time deducted	6 months
Total deductions	82 months	
Net academic research time	**40 months**	

Any special circumstances (e.g. due to COVID-19) leading to a reduction in productivity may be described in the box under the number of months. The maximum word limit for this explanation is 100 words. Additional information about the number of months spent on research will likewise help the committee interpret your academic achievements and scientific output.

4a. Personal details

Title(s), initial(s), surname(s):	Dr. B.P. Bartholdy

4b. Doctorate

University/College of higher education:	Leiden University
Date of PhD award (dd-mm-yy):	30-5-2024
Supervisor(s) ('*Promotor(en)*'):	Amanda G. Henry; Annelou van Gijn
Thesis title:	Putting Dental Calculus Under the Microscope

4c. Prospective host institution

Host institution:	Leiden University, Faculty of Archaeology
Research group:	Archaeological Sciences

4d. Work experience since completing your (first) PhD

List appointments chronologically, with your current post in the bottom row.

Past appointments	Appointment type	Period (date-date)	FTE	Institution
Please select from dropdown (If other, please specify here)	Please select from dropdown (If other, please specify here)	Start date - End date		
Current appointment	Appointment type	Period (date-date)	FTE	Institution
Please select from dropdown Other: (please specify)Data Steward	Please select from dropdown) Position: Permanent(If other, please specify here)	1-8-2022 - Present	0.7	Delft University of Technology

4e.   Net academic research time

Calculate your net academic research time, as described in the explanatory notes. Do not include the calculation, only state the actual number of months.

Number of months:	0
If applicable: describe any special circumstances causing a reduction in productivity (max. 100 words):	
I have worked 0.7 FTE as a Data Steward at Delft University of Technology since I started in 2022, before obtaining my PhD, and have continued until now. The job does not allow time for research as it is a research support role. The remaining 0.3 FTE is dedicated to childcare.	

Applicant statements

Use of extension clause

If you use the extension clause, only provide the date of the confirmation email (talent@nwo.nl) granting the extension. You only need an extension if you exceed the year limit on the reference date.

Are you using the extension clause?: No
If yes, the extension was confirmed on: Choose the date

By submitting this form, I declare that:

By submitting this form, I declare that:

- *I have completed this form truthfully and that I satisfy the nationally and internationally accepted standards for scientific conduct as laid down in the Netherlands Code of Conduct for Research Integrity 2018.*
- *I endorse the code of conduct for the use of laboratory animals and the code of conduct for biosecurity (in the event of dual use of the expected results) and will act accordingly, where applicable.*

- *The contact details in my ISAAC profile are up to date (i.e. email address postal address, phone number, personal details and correspondence language).*

Initial(s) and surname(s)[1]:

Place:

Date**:**

---

[1] To avoid gender effects, please do not state your first name.