

Evaluation form for external reviewers – Projects on health and wellbeing

Start Comments/personal declaration Project Applicants Overall Assessment Finish processing

Comments & declaration concerning conflicts of interests (will not be forwarded to applicants)

Below you can enter a comment. It is not forwarded to the applicants and is only accessible to internal and external SNSF experts. Your comments should not contain information about the evaluation of the project, your special field or conflicts of interests.

If your employees contribute to the review, please add their names and contributions here.

Furthermore, if you suspect scientific misconduct in relation to the application or if you would like to comment on the evaluation procedure, please do not do so here. Such points should be addressed directly to the Administrative Offices of the SNSF.

Comment for the SNSF
Administrative Offices

B *I* U

Discipline/Area of specialisation

Please indicate with a cross whether the topic of the project falls into your discipline or area of specialisation:

is within my area of specialisation <input type="radio"/>	is within my wider discipline <input type="radio"/>	other <input type="radio"/>
--	--	--------------------------------

Declaration concerning conflict of interests

By crossing the box, you confirm that your assessment has not been affected by any conflict of interests or that you have declared any potential conflicts of interests by inserting a comment.

Potential conflicts of interests can be deemed to exist if you:

- are a co-applicant of the project or a mentioned collaboration partner;
- have jointly published with the applicants or the project partners in the last five years;
- professionally depend on or compete with the applicants, or have done so until recently or will do so in the foreseeable future;
- work at the same institute as the applicants (or in the same or in a closely linked organisational unit);
- have close personal ties with the applicants (partnership, family ties, friendship);
- are currently having an application evaluated by the SNSF;
- are otherwise biased.

I have no conflicts of interests or have declared potential conflicts of interests.

Declaration of conflicts of interests

B *I* U

Save

Continue

Scientific relevance, originality and topicality

Please indicate whether and to what extent the proposed project is scientifically relevant, original and topical (see Guidelines Part II 8.1.1 [show/hide extract](#))

Specific strengths * (4000 characters (max.))	<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p>B <i>I</i> <u>U</u> ^{1/3} <ul style="list-style-type: none">☰☷ ↶ ↷ ✂ 📄 🗑️ 🖨️ abc Ω 🖼️</p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px; width: 100%;"></div> </div>
Specific weaknesses * (4000 characters (max.))	<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p>B <i>I</i> <u>U</u> ^{1/3} <ul style="list-style-type: none">☰☷ ↶ ↷ ✂ 📄 🗑️ 🖨️ abc Ω 🖼️</p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px; width: 100%;"></div> </div>
Comments (8000 characters (max.))	<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <p>B <i>I</i> <u>U</u> ^{1/3} <ul style="list-style-type: none">☰☷ ↶ ↷ ✂ 📄 🗑️ 🖨️ abc Ω 🖼️</p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 150px; width: 100%;"></div> </div>


Please provide a rating on the following scale. Use 5 as the entry point from which to develop your arguments to grade lower or higher.

- 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.

Broader impact (forms part of the assessment of scientific relevance, originality and topicality)

Please indicate whether and to what extent the proposed project has a broader impact and what this impact is (see Guidelines Part II B.1.2 [show/hide extract](#))

Comment (8000 character limit)




A rich text editor toolbar with the following icons: Bold (B), Italic (I), Underline (U), Bulleted List, Numbered List, Link (Ω), Undo (↶), Redo (↷), Cut (✂), Copy (📄), and Print (🖨).

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 (see Guidelines Part II B.2 [show/hide extract](#))

Specific strengths *
(4000 characters (max.))




A rich text editor interface with a toolbar containing icons for bold, italic, underline, bulleted list, numbered list, undo, redo, link, unlink, print, font color, background color, and insert image. The main text area is empty.

Specific weaknesses *
(4000 characters (max.))



A rich text editor interface with a toolbar containing icons for bold, italic, underline, bulleted list, numbered list, undo, redo, link, unlink, print, font color, background color, and insert image. The main text area is empty.

Comments
(8000 characters (max.))



A rich text editor interface with a toolbar containing icons for bold, italic, underline, bulleted list, numbered list, undo, redo, link, unlink, print, font color, background color, and insert image. The main text area is empty.

Please provide a rating on the following scale. Use 5 as the entry point from which to develop your arguments to grade lower or higher.

- 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.

Save

Continue

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) 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.))	 <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div>
Specific weaknesses * (4000 characters (max.))	 <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 100px;"></div>
Comments (8000 characters (max.))	 <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 150px;"></div>

Please provide a rating on the following scale. Use 5 as the entry point from which to develop your arguments to grade lower or higher.

- 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.

Save

Continue

Start Comments/personal declaration Project Applicants Overall Assessment Finish processing

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Scientific relevance, originality and topicality									
Suitability of methods and feasibility									
Applicants' scientific track record and expertise									

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 as the entry point from which to develop your arguments to grade lower or higher.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Rating	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input 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 #ccc; height: 100px;"></div>								

Save

Continue