EVALUATION FORM – SHORT PROPOSALS

Version_02, 01.06.2024 for Call 2024/25

CLINICAL RESEARCH GROUPS (CRG) 2024

Proposal Details

Name of the Clinical Research Group	
Head	

Reviewer Information (Confidential)

Name of Reviewer	
Affiliation	
Date of review	

Note for reviewers:

Applicants to be invited to submit a Full proposal must fulfil all criteria listed below to a complete and excellent extent.

Part A of the Evaluation Form remains confidential, except for scores. **Part B** will be forwarded to applicants, together with scores, after the first selection step has been concluded as a feedback on their application. Reviewer identity will not be revealed to applicants at any moment.

Please ensure to **give a numerical score as well as written evaluation** and **to not leave any blanks**.

PART A: Confidential part

Table 1: Evaluation scheme

Score	Explanation	Description
6	Excellent	The research project meets the criterion very well and fully.
5	Good	The research project meets the criterion well and to a predominant extent.
4	Average	The research project meets the criterion in a sufficient manner.
3	Poor	The research project meets the criterion to an inadequate extent. There are significant weaknesses.
2	Very poor	The research project addresses/meets the criterion to a very inadequate extent. The weaknesses clearly outweigh the few strengths.
1	Insufficient	The research project does not meet the criterion.

Table 2: Evaluation of criterions

Criterion	Score (1-6)	Comment
1) Fit to the scope, relevance, potential ▪ Fit to objectives, aims, and topics of the call text ▪ Feasibility of aims and objectives of the research project		
2) Excellence, innovativeness, originality ▪ Originality, innovativeness, and contribution to new strategic knowledge and breakthrough implementation ▪ Potential impact of the research project		

Criterion	Score (1-6)	Comment
3) Research design and methods Appropriateness of the conceptual approach: ▪ Are the research questions clearly formulated? ▪ Are the proposed methods appropriate for the proposed project? ▪ Is the project well-structured and designed? ▪ Are the objectives achievable within the duration of the CRG? ▪ Are the deliverables for the first funding period (4 years) and, in case of extension, the expected outcomes of the 8-year funding period, clearly described? ▪ Are the work packages/sub-projects appropriately selected in terms of number and content, and are the relevant experts assigned? Is something missing? Appropriateness of project- and people management		

Criterion	Score (1-6)	Comment
4) Team composition, collaborative/ interdisciplinary aspects, gender aspects, career development ▪ Suitability of expertise, balance of substantial contributions of team members to the CRG ▪ Composition of the CRG compared to the topic's needs and international relevance ▪ Interdisciplinary, cross-sectorial collaboration, and co-creation ▪ Career development of young researchers ▪ Are the Head/Mentor well qualified to carry out the proposed research? ▪ How would you assess the academic qualifications of the Head/Mentor? ▪ Track record and/or other key expertise of the CRG members ▪ Gender balance of CRG team		
5) Financial plan/budget ▪ Appropriateness of costing		

Proposal Details

Name of the Clinical Research Group	
Head	

PART B: This part of the evaluation will be forwarded to applicants once the first selection step has been concluded, together with scores above, as feedback on their application. Please list reasons for your answers, taking as much space as you need, and inserting at least 500 characters for question 1.

1) Overall assessment: What is your overall impression of the CRG proposal? (500 characters min, with spaces)

2) Specifically, what would you consider its three key strengths and three weaknesses?

- **Key strength 1:**

- **Key strength 2:**

- **Key strength 3:**

- **Key weakness 1:**

- **Key weakness 2:**

- **Key weakness 3:**