

Call 6/2022

Phase 2 – review form

On a scale of 1 to 3, where 1 = strongly disagree and 3 = strongly agree, please rate the following statements:

1) Quality of the proposal

1.1) Originality: The applicant's proposal is original.

The proposal cannot merely repeat previous research.

1.2) Boldness: The applicant's project is bold and creative.

1.3) Question: The applicant's project addresses a big question.

1.4) Impact on science: The applicant's work has the potential to broadly impact the field beyond a specific research domain.

1.5) Structure and presentation: The applicant's proposal is well structured and presented.

2) Viability

2.1) The composition of the team meets the demands proposed for the development of the project.

2.2) The financial resources requested and deadlines are adequate.

3) Risk

3.1) Hypothesis conception risk: The assumptions behind the hypothesis might be incorrect or the hypothesis might not answer the major question- e.g., a proposed effect could either not exist or not generalize, be unrelated to the major question, some other hypothesis might better explain the data, it might go against established knowledge or the mainstream position of the field.

3.2) Approach risk: The proposed methodological approach, even if successful, will not provide adequate and useful information to test the proposed hypothesis - e.g., the object of study is too complex or variable for the proposed approach, the data that will be obtained bears little relation to the hypothesis, the field considers it impossible, the approach is unconventional/heterodox.

3.3) Technical risk: It is technically challenging to obtain the data following the proposed methodology - e.g., the methods are hard to implement, have critical steps that might fail, require a lot of persistence and trial-and-error, manipulation of complex equipment, require extensive field work or experiments, the object of study has a long natural time (geological timescales or animals/plants with long life cycles) or have many uncontrollable conditions.

Briefly explain your rationale for the risk evaluation (i.e., the three previous questions).

Open answer (max. 300 characters with spaces)

4) Quality of the candidate

4.1) Scientific capacity: The candidate has the ability to develop rigorous research.

The rigor of the research developed to date will be evaluated, regardless of the number of published articles.

4.2) Creativity and independence

4.2.1) The scientist is creative and able to generate their own ideas.

4.2.2) The candidate has a broad national and international network.

5) I know the research around this particular proposal very well.

6) Oral presentation and interview

6.1) The candidate demonstrates the ability to defend and contextualize their overarching question.

6.2) The candidate shows a comprehensive understanding of their area of expertise.

Comments

Submit