

R'Equip: Evaluation form for external reviewers

May 2023

You are requested to provide a criteria-based assessment, according to the criteria specified by the R'Equip funding instrument. R'Equip is aimed at researchers in Switzerland to promote top-quality, innovative equipment for their research work. Three main evaluation criteria are guiding the evaluation of the proposal: Infrastructure, Project, Applicants.

The assessment questions to all criteria are given in the next tab. Comments should set out the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal. They should refer neither to the applicant's age, gender, nationality or any other personal matters, nor to other proposals and other assessments. Overly positive or critical reviews with no justification cannot be taken into account. In addition, please note that the review must be written in English.


According to the SNSF definitions:

- **Breakthrough research** addresses important challenges and presents a novel approach, it questions or goes beyond existing models, theories, doctrines, research approaches, methods etc. It opens up new lines of research and has a high potential for impact in or beyond academia.

Quality, importance and suitability of the requested research equipment

Please indicate the originality and innovation potential of the requested research equipment, its added value compared to the equipment already available, as well as its suitability for carrying out the relevant project(s).

Specific strengths * (4000 characters (max.))	 <div style="height: 100px;"></div>
--	--

Specific weaknesses * (4000 characters (max.))	 <div style="height: 100px;"></div>
---	--

Comments (8000 characters (max.))	 <div style="height: 130px;"></div>
--------------------------------------	--

<input type="radio"/>	9	Strong in all relevant aspects. No or negligible weaknesses.
<input type="radio"/>	8	
<input type="radio"/>	7	Strong in most relevant aspects. Few clearly identified weaknesses.
<input type="radio"/>	6	
<input type="radio"/>	5	Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses.
<input type="radio"/>	4	
<input type="radio"/>	3	Some strengths in relevant aspects. Several clearly identified weaknesses.
<input type="radio"/>	2	
<input type="radio"/>	1	Few or no strengths in relevant aspects. Many serious weaknesses.

Scientific quality of the research project(s) related to the requested equipment

Please indicate whether and how the research projects to be carried out using the requested research equipment are scientifically relevant, topical, and original. Please also comment on their feasibility.

Specific strengths * (4000 characters (max.))	 <div style="height: 100px;"></div>
Specific weaknesses * (4000 characters (max.))	 <div style="height: 100px;"></div>
Comments (8000 characters (max.))	 <div style="height: 100px;"></div>

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> | 9 | Strong in all relevant aspects. No or negligible weaknesses. |
| <input type="radio"/> | 8 | |
| <input type="radio"/> | 7 | Strong in most relevant aspects. Few clearly identified weaknesses. |
| <input type="radio"/> | 6 | |
| <input type="radio"/> | 5 | Strong in several relevant aspects. Some clearly identified weaknesses. |
| <input type="radio"/> | 4 | |
| <input type="radio"/> | 3 | Some strengths in relevant aspects. Several clearly identified weaknesses. |
| <input type="radio"/> | 2 | |
| <input type="radio"/> | 1 | Few or no strengths in relevant aspects. Many serious weaknesses. |

Scientific qualifications of the applicants and research groups benefitting from the equipment




Please comment the scientific qualifications of the applicants in relation to the research equipment and the research work to be carried out using the equipment as well as the number of research groups that will benefit from it.

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) as well as "current state of own research" of the research plan (if available). The SNSF has introduced a standardized CV format in October 2022. Consult the fact sheet to learn more about the format and its use in the evaluation.

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 each applicant in the section "Major achievements" of the CV.

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 disciplines and the academic age of each applicant.**

Specific strengths * (4000 characters (max.))	
Specific weaknesses * (4000 characters (max.))	
Comments (8000 characters (max.))	

- 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.

Overall Assessment

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									
Main reasons for your overall assessment *									