

7th Call for Ludwig Boltzmann Institutes

Evaluation Form

Name of the Reviewer	
Name of the proposed Institute	
Acronym of the proposed Institute	

Ludwig Boltzmann Institutes (LBI) are established through a competitive tendering process that begins with a call for proposals. The current seventh call by the Ludwig Boltzmann Gesellschaft (LBG) focuses on the establishing one Ludwig Boltzmann Institute that will conduct research in Medical and/or Health Sciences.

LBI are established for a period of up to ten years. In the third and seventh year the LBG conducts an evaluation, during which the LBI has to provide a detailed plan for the next phase of its research. For the proposal, applicants were required to describe the research programme and provide a corresponding cost plan for the first four years in detail. We kindly ask for your assessment of the presented proposal, bearing in mind that it must provide the basis for another six years of research.

Selection process

The call follows a two-stage selection process: the proposal stage and the hearing stage. Initially, All submitted proposals are reviewed by LBG programme managers to ensure they meet all formal criteria. Proposals that pass this review then undergo a pre-selection by an international expert jury of external experts. The expert jury evaluates the proposals based on the sections “Institute Director and Team” and “Research Programme Abstract” of the Proposal Form to select proposals to undergo international peer-review. Pre-selected proposals are then subjected to a detailed review by international experts in the relevant scientific field. These reviewers are nominated by the Expert Jury in cooperation with LBG. Based on external peer reviews, the expert jury recommends which applicants should proceed to the Hearing Stage. During the Hearing, applicants deliver brief presentations to the Expert Jury followed by a questions-.and-answer session. Additionally, applicants will also discuss their applications with experts in the field of Open Innovation in Science and of Career Development, whose feedback will be communicated to the Expert Jury and incorporated into the assessment of the proposal. Following the Hearing, the Expert Jury will hold an executive discussion to rank the applicants and make a joint decision on which institute to suggest for funding. The final funding decision are made by the Board of the LBG based the Expert Jury’s recommendation.

Selection criteria

These Ludwig Boltzmann Institutes will be established on the principle of “**people, not projects**”. We are looking for outstanding scientists (Institute Directors) who are able to open up new areas of research and conduct research of consistently high quality. Scientific excellence should not only be demonstrated by the Institute Director but should also be evident in the research proposal through its combination of topic, personnel, ambition, and scientific approach.

LBG’s assessment criteria and processes follow international best practice, in particular the “[Agreement on Reforming Research Assessment](#)” developed by the Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment (CoARA).

Throughout the assessment, the expert jury and reviewers will focus on **two main principles**:

1. Quality and Impact

The assessment criterium emphasizes quality, with recognition given to the originality of ideas, research that goes beyond the current state of the art, the use of open science approaches, and the potential for scientific, technological, economic, and/or societal impact.

2. Open Science, Diversity, Equity & Inclusion, and Training & Mentoring:

The criterium recognizes the diversity of research activities and career paths in research. It considers roles such as peer review, training, mentoring and supervision of graduate students, leadership positions, science communication, public engagement, entrepreneurship, and industry-university collaboration. Gender equity, equal opportunity, and inclusion are also recognised as critical factors.

We kindly ask you to evaluate the attached proposal based on the questions below. Please submit a written assessment, including a clear recommendation on whether the applicants should advance to the next stage of evaluation and be invited to participate in the Hearing.

Please note that the identity of reviewers will remain confidential and will not be disclosed to the applicants. Additionally, the received proposal must be treated as confidential. For further details concept of Ludwig Boltzmann Institutes and on this Call please refer to the Application Guidelines.

Reviewers shall refrain from evaluating an application if there are concerns about impartiality. By accepting to review an application, the reviewer confirms that no conflict of interest exists¹.

¹ Conflict of interest exists if the evaluator has an ownership, service or contractual relationship with one of the applying institutions. Conflict of interest cases include common publications, projects or co-operations with any person involved in the submitted application within the last seven years, student-teacher-relations, financial benefit derived from co-operations with said person, or any other interest that is likely to bias the review.

Please assign a score from 1 (poor) – 100 (world leading) for the categories “Profile of the Institute Director and Research Team, including Leadership potential and career development perspectives for director and team”, “Research at the Planned Institute including OIS/Citizen Science/Outreach potential of the planned project” and “Host Institution and Partners including OIS/Citizen Science/Outreach potential of the planned project”. Each of the categories has a distinct weighting in the final score, with the breakdown shown below. The final score will be calculated based on this weighted distribution.

Categories	Weighting
Institute Director and Research Team (40%) including Leadership potential and career development perspectives for director and team (10%)	50 %
Research at the Planned Institute (25%) including OIS/Citizen Science/Outreach potential of the planned project (5%)	30 %
Host Institution and Partners (15%) including OIS/Citizen Science/Outreach potential of the planned project (5%)	20%
Total	100 %

Please list keywords that best describe the reviewer’s expertise as it relates to this proposal:

Assessment

[Numbering corresponds to numbering used in the Proposal Form]

3. Institute Director and Team

including leadership potential and career development perspectives for director and team

3.1. Institute Director's personal profile and motivation

3.2. Institute Director's track record

3.3. Institute Director's statement on vision

3.4. Institute Director's current lab census

Attachment: CV Institute Director

- Evaluate the scientific qualification of the Institute Director and his/her/their track record. Comment on the ability of the Institute Director to successfully implement the proposed research plan.
- Assess the Institute Director's demonstrated ability or potential to conduct ground-breaking, innovative research, and for effective leadership.
- Provide feedback on the Institute Director's motivation for establishing the new LBI and his/her statement on vision.
- Evaluate to what extent the Institute Director has demonstrated or has the potential for sound leadership in the training and advancement of young scientists?
- Assess to what extent the Institute Directors' CV stands within the scientific community, and to what extent does it show excellence or innovation in his/her/their field?

Comments (Please provide your input, maximum 200 words):

3.5. Qualification of the Research Group Leaders and Adjunct PIs

Attachments: CVs of Research Group Leaders and Adjunct PI

- Evaluate scientific qualification and motivation to contribute to the proposed institute of any Research Group Leader(s) or Adjunct PI(s) identified at proposal stage (skip if none have been identified).
- Please address how they are essential to the overall vision and scope of the proposal, and what specified value they bring to the proposed institute.

Comments (Please provide your input, maximum 200 words):

3.6. Research Culture (Open Science, Diversity, Equity & Inclusion, and Training & Mentoring)

- Please evaluate how the planned institute encourages an open and inclusive lab culture that actively promotes the sharing of scientific findings. Additionally, evaluate if effective mentorship and professional development to enable scientists from all backgrounds to thrive is demonstrated in the proposal.

Comments (Please provide your input, maximum 200 words):

Score for Institute Director and Team, including leadership potential and career development perspectives for director and team from 1(poor) -100 (world-leading):

5. Research at the planned Institute

including OIS/Citizen Science/Outreach potential of the planned project

5.1. State of Research, research questions and objectives

5.2 Research Plan including methodology

5.3 Relevance and Innovativeness

5.4. Work and Time plan

- Evaluate the attractiveness of the proposed institute.
- Assess how realistic the implementation of the proposed objectives is. Please compare the objectives of the institute to the current state of the art and evaluate the degree of innovation.
- Evaluate the proposed research plan. Based on your experience, to what extent does the research plan constitute a coherent research agenda? How do you see the prospects that the institute will be sustainable beyond the funding period? If there is room for improvement, please offer suggestions to prevent the programme lines from becoming a collection of loosely connected projects.
- Evaluate whether the organisational structure effectively supports the execution of the research programme.

Please focus on:

- Scientific quality and international competitiveness of the research plan
- Feasible research objectives (defined goals and the expected scientific output)
- Theoretical and methodological approach (state of the art, hypothesis, degree of innovation, timeframe, research lines, partners)
- Milestone plan
- Translational approach
- Interdisciplinary approach
- Integration into the international research community.

Comments (Please provide your input, maximum 200 words):

5.5. Implementation of the Open Innovation in Science/ Citizen Science/ Outreach aspects

- Evaluate the planned institute's efforts to implement open innovation in science, citizen science, and outreach activities. Assess how these initiatives are integrated into the research program and how effectively they engage the public and broader scientific community.

Comments (Please provide your input, maximum 200 words):

Attachment: Cost Financing Sheet

- Assess whether the calculated costs are reasonable and aligned with the objectives and organisational planning of the proposed institute.
- Evaluate the cost and financing -contributions from the individual partner organisations (as outlined in the Letters of Institutional Commitment) and if these contributions are appropriate and justified in relation to the intended outcomes of the research programme.

Comments (Please provide your input, maximum 200 words)

Score for Research at the planned Institute including OIS/Citizen Science/Outreach potential of the planned project on a scale from 1(poor) - 100 (world-leading):

6. Host Institution and Partners

including OIS/Citizen Science/Outreach potential of the planned project

6.1. Host Institution

- Evaluate the contributions () of the host institution in terms of expertise, know-how, resources and roles and its ability to carry out the research plan and to contribute to the development of the institute's envisioned profile.
- Assess the motivation, composition and ability of the host institution to achieve the defined goals. To what extent will the host institution together with its (network) partner(s) be able to implement a coherent and substantial research plan that may not be carried out by the host institution independently?

Comments (Please provide your input, maximum 200 words):

6.2. Partner Organisations / 6.3. Network partners

- Evaluate the contributions of the partner(s) in terms of expertise, know-how, resources and roles and their ability to carry out the research plan and to contribute to the development of the institute's envisioned profile.
- Assess the motivation, the composition and the ability of the host institution together with (network) partner(s) as well as (the) individual partner organisation(s) / (the) network partner(s) to achieve the defined goals. To what extent will the host institution together with its (network) partner(s) be able to implement a coherent and substantial programme that may not be carried out by the respective partner(s) independently?

Comments (Please provide your input, maximum 200 words):

Score for Host Institution and Partners, including score for OIS/Citizen Science/Outreach potential of the planned project on a scale from 1(poor) - 100 (world-leading):

Conclusion

Criteria	Score	Weighting	Weighted Score
Institute Director and Research Team including leadership potential and career development perspectives for director and team		40%	
Research at the Planned Institute including OIS/Citizen Science/Outreach potential of the planned project		25%	
Host Institution and Partners including OIS/Citizen Science/Outreach potential of the planned project		15%	
Total	-	100%	

Based on the calculated total weighted score, the application falls within one of the following categories:

Category	Score
Excellent	100-85
Good	84-70
Average	70-55
Poor	< 55

Summarise the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal here. This will be communicated to the applicant (max. 200 words):

Strength 1:

Strength 2:

Strength 3:

Weakness 1:

Weakness 2:

Weakness 3:

Overall summary of the assessment for the applicants (including recommendations). This will be communicated to the applicants (max. 200 words):