REVIEW FORM

CORE 2020 Call

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Acronym** |  |
| **Principal Investigator (PI)** |  |
| **Reviewer Code** | *To be filled out by FNR:*  C20/ |

Please consult the ‘CORE 2020 Peer Review Guidelines’ (in particular the chapter ‘Guidelines for Reviewers’) to complete this form.

**Please write beneath the boxes.**

Part 1: Ethical considerations

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Does the project give rise to ethical issues?** |  | Yes   |  | | --- | |  | | No   |  | | --- | |  | |
| **Have they been appropriately addressed by the applicants?** |  | Yes   |  | | --- | |  | | No   |  | | --- | |  | |

***IF not appropriately addressed, please comment:***

Part 2: Evaluation of the proposal

Please write a **short assessment and justify your statements** for each of the following sub-criteria. Explanations are available in the ‘Peer Review Guidelines’. For CORE Junior track proposals, the assessment of the criteria has to take into account the specifics detailed therein.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Scientific quality and originality of the project** |
| **Innovativeness of idea and scientific relevance (min ¼ page)** |

“Please, write here”

|  |
| --- |
| **Appropriateness of approach (min ¼ page)** |

*“Please, write here”*

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **General feasibility of the project** |
| **Competence and expertise of the PI and the applicant team (min ¼ page)** |

“Please, write here”

|  |
| --- |
| **Feasibility and efficiency of project plan (incl. appropriateness of allocated human resources and budget) (min ¼ page)** |

“Please, write here”

|  |
| --- |
| ***If applicable:* PhD training** (see ‘Peer Review Guidelines’) |

“Please, write here”

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Expected outcome and impact of results** |

“Please, write here”

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **CORE Junior Track (if applicable): Feasibility and contribution to advancement of career** |

“Please, write here”

Part 3: Overall assessment

The overall assessment of the proposal has to be consistent with your **funding recommendation** in ‘Part 4: Scoring of the proposal’.

|  |
| --- |
| **Justification of funding recommendation (½ - 1 page)** |

(Why do you or don’t you recommend the project for funding?)

“Please, write here”

Part 4: Scoring of the proposal

Please **rate each sub-criterion** by marking the check boxes with an ‘X’. Weightings of the criteria and explanations of the scales are available in the ‘Peer Review Guidelines’.

All scores should be consistent with your previous comments.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Scientific quality and originality of the project: | | Fair/Poor | | Good | | | | Very Good | | | Excellent | | |
| **Innovativeness of idea** | | | |  | | --- | |  | | | |  | | --- | |  | | | | | |  | | --- | |  | | | | | |  | | --- | |  | |
| **Appropriateness of approach** | | | |  | | --- | |  | | | |  | | --- | |  | | | | | |  | | --- | |  | | | | | |  | | --- | |  | |
| 2. General feasibility of the project: | | Fair/Poor | | Good | | | | Very Good | | | Excellent | | |
| **Competence and expertise of the PI and the applicant team** | |  | | --- | |  | | | | | | |  | | --- | |  | | | | |  | | --- | |  | | | | | |  | | --- | |  | |
| **Feasibility and efficiency of project plan (incl. appropriateness of allocated human resources and budget)** | |  | | --- | |  | | | | | | |  | | --- | |  | | | | |  | | --- | |  | | | | | |  | | --- | |  | |
| 3. Expected outcome and impact of results: | | Fair/Poor | | Good | | | | Very Good | | | Excellent | | |
| **Dissemination and valorisation of the research results** | | | |  | | --- | |  | | | | | |  | | --- | |  | | | | |  | | --- | |  | | | |  | | --- | |  | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | C | B | A | A+ |
| **FINAL SCORE** | |  | | --- | |  | | |  | | --- | |  | | |  | | --- | |  | | |  | | --- | |  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Please shortly indicate your domain of expertise** | “Please, write here” |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Final Score** | **Explanation** |
| A+ | Proposal of excellent quality and outstanding international standards that should be funded as proposed. The proposal scores excellent on all or most criteria. |
| A | Proposal of very good quality and high international calibre that should be funded. The proposal scores very good (and even excellent) on all or most criteria. |
| B | Proposal of very good quality, but with shortcomings on one of the selection criteria. The proposal could be improved to become an excellent proposal. |
| C | Proposal of insufficient quality and with major shortcomings on one or more selection criteria. |