**MNI9040 – Peer review guidelines (you can extend this table to max 2 pages)**

**Name of the applicant:**

**Proposal title:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Guiding questions** | **Score 1-5[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **Reviewer comments** |
| **Excellence** (40%) | 1. Is the scientific background of the project well thought through and are the relevant research gaps and current state of the art appropriately defined? 2. Are the proposed methods and approach adequate and justified? 3. Is the proposed research project original, interdisciplinarity and innovative enough? |  |  |
| **Impact** (30%) | 1. Are the expected contributions of the project to the development of the research field sufficient? 2. Has it been clearly outlined where and how the expected results of the project could be used and is there potential for further research? 3. Are the key impacts (scientific, social etc) of the project well thought through and justified? 4. Are the dissemination and communication activities of project results well planned and justified? |  |  |
| **Implementation** (20%) | 1. Is the research plan clear and appropriate for its’ stated purpose and the elaboration on tasks, deliverables and milestones justified and appropriate? 2. How well does the applicant acknowledge potential scientific or methodological problems are the risk reduction measures and a back-up plan though through and appropriate? |  |  |
| **Quality of the PI and the institution** (10%) | 1. Is the track-record and competences of the applicant appropriate and sufficient for the proposed project? 2. Does the research environment (incl. the research infrastructure of the institution) support achieving the objectives of the proposed project? |  |  |

1. The evaluation is provided to a level of precision of 0.5 points: Outstanding (5); Very good-Outstanding (4.5); Very good (4); Good-Very good (3.5); Good (3); Satisfactory-Good (2.5); Satisfactory (2); Unsatisfactory-Satisfactory (1.5); Unsatisfactory (1). *The substance of the proposal will be evaluated against the following budget rules:* ***A) Individual post-doc application*** *(logic of ETAG post-doc, MC IF first individual research grant): 12 or 24 months of average national researcher salary + 1 or 2 x 10000 EUR of travel and research costs + 15% of overheads:* ***B) Starting group grant*** *(ETAG start-up grant to set-up a new research topic and team): 48 months of PI + 2x48 months of post-doc/PhD researcher salary + 4x20000 EUR of travel and research costs + 15% of overhead;* ***C) ERC Starting Grant type application*** *(to set-up a new ambitious top-excellent research topic and team): 48 months of PI + 2x48 months of post-doc + 4x48 PhD salary + 4x40000 EUR of travel and research costs + 15% of overhead* [↑](#footnote-ref-1)