



Evaluation form for external reviewers COST

May 2023

Scientific relevance, originality and topicality

Please indicate whether and to what extent the proposed project is scientifically relevant, original and topical ([show/hide extract](#))

B.1.1 Scientific relevance, originality and topicality

a Scientific relevance

Please mention here whether and to what extent the

- topic and the research problems or hypotheses of the planned project are relevant to the discipline and beyond
- proposed project increases knowledge and coherence within the discipline and beyond
- proposed project has the potential to develop approaches and methods within the discipline and beyond.

The project's relevance is generally assessed on the basis of the research plan. The following questions may be of further help for the assessment:





































- Do the applicants have an accurate and full understanding of the state-of-the-art in the relevant discipline (and beyond)?
- Are the work of third parties and the applicants' own work described accurately?

b Originality

Please indicate here to what extent the starting point or theoretical/methodical approach chosen for the proposed project is original. Originality can take the form of a question that has so far been neglected by researchers or an approach that offers unexpected or novel combinations of familiar aspects.

c Topicality

Indicate whether and to what extent the subject of the proposed project is of current interest. Indicators of topicality are, on the one hand, the importance and new insights of recent scientific publications devoted to the subject. On the other hand, a proposed project may be considered topical if it addresses a recent event that is of importance for the discipline in question or even beyond it.

Specific strengths (4000 characters (max.))	<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p>B <i>I</i> <u>U</u> ¹         abc    </p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div> </div>
Specific weaknesses (4000 characters (max.))	<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p>B <i>I</i> <u>U</u> ¹         abc    </p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div> </div>
Comments (8000 characters (max.))	<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p>B <i>I</i> <u>U</u> ¹         abc    </p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 150px;"></div> </div>

Use 5 (Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.) as a starting point and develop arguments to justify grading the application as 5, higher, or lower respectively.

- 9 Strong in all relevant aspects. No or negligible weaknesses.
- 8
- 7 Strong in most relevant aspects. Few clearly identified weaknesses.
- 6
- 5 Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.
- 4
- 3 Some strengths in relevant aspects. Several clearly identified weaknesses.
- 2
- 1 Few or no strengths in relevant aspects. Many serious weaknesses.




Added value through participation in the respective COST Network

Please indicate the added value for the project through participation in the corresponding COST Action as well as the complementarity of the project regarding the thematic scope and aims of the COST Action. [show/hide more](#)

Please mention here whether and to what extent the participation in the corresponding COST Action constitutes an added value for the project, as well as whether and to what extent the project is embedded in the thematic scope and aims of the COST Action. Please consider the fact that COST Actions do not fund research itself, but support networking activities, while the SNSF supports research projects conducted in Switzerland within the scope of a COST Action. All applicants therefore have to

- prove active participation in an ongoing COST Action; they indicate that they are either member of the Action's Management Committee, or member of a working group; other active involvement must be confirmed by a member of the Management Committee of the Action and in that case a confirmation is joined in the documentation of the proposal (this part is already checked by the administrative office of the SNSF)
- describe the importance of the Action for the project.

You will find the number of the corresponding COST Action as well as the applicant's statement to the above mentioned questions in the section entitled "Select COST Action" of the document entitled "AdminPart_Checked" in the documentation of this proposal. You can read the description of the COST Action (the MOU contains the detailed description of the Action) on the [webpage of COST](#). The direct link to the COST Action can be found in our email invitation for this review. Please notice that the COST Action has already been accepted by COST and that you do not need to evaluate the COST Action again.

Specific strengths * (4000 characters (max.))	 <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 110px;"></div>
Specific weaknesses * (4000 characters (max.))	 <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 110px;"></div>
Comments (8000 characters (max.))	 <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 160px;"></div>

Use 5 (Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.) as a starting point and develop arguments to justify grading the application as 5, higher, or lower respectively.

- 9 Strong in all relevant aspects. No or negligible weaknesses.
- 8
- 7 Strong in most relevant aspects. Few clearly identified weaknesses.
- 6
- 5 Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.
- 4
- 3 Some strengths in relevant aspects. Several clearly identified weaknesses.
- 2
- 1 Few or no strengths in relevant aspects. Many serious weaknesses.

Suitability of methods and feasibility

Please consider whether and to what extent the chosen methods are suited to answering the questions set out in the proposal and whether the project is feasible ([show/hide extract](#))





































B.2.1 Suitability of methods

Please consider whether and to what extent the methods are suited to answering the questions set out in the application. This includes the methods chosen, their combination and the research plan (timing and logical sequence of steps).

B.2.2 Feasibility

Please indicate whether and to what extent the proposed project is feasible. The following questions may be of further help for the assessment:

- Can the targets/milestones set out in the application be reached in the given time and with the available resources in terms of personnel and funds?
- Is the scope of the project (workload) proportionate to the planned duration of the project?

<p>Specific strengths * (4000 characters (max.))</p>	<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p>B <i>I</i> <u>U</u>            </p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div> </div>
<p>Specific weaknesses * (4000 characters (max.))</p>	<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p>B <i>I</i> <u>U</u>            </p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div> </div>
<p>Comments (8000 characters (max.))</p>	<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p>B <i>I</i> <u>U</u>            </p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 150px;"></div> </div>

Use 5 (Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.) as a starting point and develop arguments to justify grading the application as 5, higher, or lower respectively.

- 9 Strong in all relevant aspects. No or negligible weaknesses.
- 8
- 7 Strong in most relevant aspects. Few clearly identified weaknesses.
- 6
- 5 Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.
- 4
- 3 Some strengths in relevant aspects. Several clearly identified weaknesses.
- 2
- 1 Few or no strengths in relevant aspects. Many serious weaknesses.































Applicants' scientific track record and expertise

The **scientific qualifications of each applicant**, in particular the **track record** and the **expertise to carry out the research project**, have to be assessed on the basis of the following documents: CV(s) and research output list(s) as well as "current state of own research" of the research plan.

Reviewers are kindly asked to consider the scientific qualifications of applicants based on their entire research output (including, when applicable, datasets, software, prototypes, etc.), in addition to research publications. **In this context, the scientific quality and relevance of a paper is deemed much more important than publication metrics or the reputation of the journal in which it was published.** The scientific quality and relevance of selected research outputs may be assessed directly by the sources provided by the applicant(s) in the document "CV and major scientific achievements".

In the case of several applicants, each applicant should be evaluated individually. The assessment of the "expertise to carry out the research project" refers however to the team as a whole. The composition of the team and the roles of its individual members should be commented.

In general, **the evaluation has to be done against the background of the scientific discipline, academic age of each applicant, as well as circumstances that may have delayed his/her career** (e.g. child care duties, career breaks, etc.).

Specific strengths * (4000 characters (max.))	<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p> B <i>I</i> <u>U</u>           </p> </div>
Specific weaknesses * (4000 characters (max.))	<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p> B <i>I</i> <u>U</u>           </p> </div>
Comments (8000 characters (max.))	<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p> B <i>I</i> <u>U</u>           </p> </div>

Use 5 (Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.) as a starting point and develop arguments to justify grading the application as 5, higher, or lower respectively.

- 9 Strong in all relevant aspects. No or negligible weaknesses.
- 8
- 7 Strong in most relevant aspects. Few clearly identified weaknesses.
- 6
- 5 Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.
- 4
- 3 Some strengths in relevant aspects. Several clearly identified weaknesses.
- 2
- 1 Few or no strengths in relevant aspects. Many serious weaknesses.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Scientific relevance, originality and topicality					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Added value through participation in the respective COST Network					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Suitability of methods and feasibility					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Applicants' scientific track record and expertise					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

Please summarise the main reasons for your overall rating by pointing out the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal.

Please note that your review, except the part « comments and personal declaration », will be forwarded to the applicants, anonymously and possibly in abridged form.

Please provide a rating on the following scale for your overall assessment of the proposal, considering the strengths and weaknesses in the criteria-based assessment. Use 5 (Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.) as a starting point and develop arguments to justify grading the application as 5, higher, or lower respectively.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Rating	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Main reasons for your overall assessment *	<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 100px; width: 100%;"></div>								