

SNSF Swiss Postdoctoral Fellowships Call 2024: Evaluation form for discipline-specific experts

1 Introductory remarks

All applications that meet the personal and formal requirements are evaluated scientifically. All discipline-specific experts are asked the same questions on the applicant, the project and the hosting arrangements, following the assessment criteria in section 5 of the [Call document for SNSF Swiss Postdoctoral Fellowships 2024](#). The evaluation criteria are also reflected in the various sections of the research plan template.

2 Evaluation form

Questions on ‘Excellence’

‘Excellence’ is about:

- Quality and pertinence of the research and innovation objectives
- Soundness of the methodology
- Relevance of interdisciplinary approaches, gender and diversity aspects
- Quality of the planned open science practices
- Quality of the supervision
- The researcher’s existing professional experience

1.1 Quality and pertinence of the project’s research and innovation objectives (and the extent to which they are ambitious, and go beyond the state of the art)































Specific strengths * (4000 characters (max.))	<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <div style="font-size: 0.8em; margin-bottom: 5px;"> B <i>I</i> <u>U</u>           </div> <div style="height: 100px;"></div> </div>
Specific weaknesses * (4000 characters (max.))	<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <div style="font-size: 0.8em; margin-bottom: 5px;"> B <i>I</i> <u>U</u>           </div> <div style="height: 100px;"></div> </div>
Comments (8000 characters (max.))	<div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 5px;"> <div style="font-size: 0.8em; margin-bottom: 5px;"> B <i>I</i> <u>U</u>           </div> <div style="height: 150px;"></div> </div>

Figure 1: Screenshot of comment fields.

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.

Rating *	
<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.

Figure 2: Screenshot of SNSF rating scale.

1.2 Soundness of the proposed methodology (including interdisciplinary approaches, consideration of the gender dimension and other diversity aspects if relevant for the research project, and the quality of open science practices)

See the [SNSF open research data policy](#). A Data Management Plan (DMP) is only requested for approved grants according to the requirements issued by the SNSF. Please refer in your evaluation of the

research data management **to the points addressed in the research plan as integral part of the proposed methodology.**

[Text boxes related to specific strengths and weaknesses as well as for comments (cf. Figure 1) and rating scale (cf. Figure 2)]

1.3 Quality of the supervision, training and of the two-way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host

[Text boxes related to specific strengths and weaknesses as well as for comments (cf. Figure 1) and rating scale (cf. Figure 2)]

1.4 Quality and appropriateness of the researcher's professional experience, competences and skills

[Text boxes related to specific strengths and weaknesses as well as for comments (cf. Figure 1) and rating scale (cf. Figure 2)]

Questions on 'Impact'

'Impact' is about:

- The enhancement of the researcher's career perspectives and skills development expected through the proposal implementation
- Dissemination, exploitation and communication of the research
- Direct scientific, societal and economic impact of the proposal

2.1 Credibility of the measures to enhance the career perspectives and employability of the researcher and contribution to their skills development

[Text boxes related to specific strengths and weaknesses as well as for comments (cf. Figure 1) and rating scale (cf. Figure 2)]

2.2 Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities

[Text boxes related to specific strengths and weaknesses as well as for comments (cf. Figure 1) and rating scale (cf. Figure 2)]

2.3 The magnitude and importance of the project's contribution to the expected scientific, societal and economic impacts

[Text boxes related to specific strengths and weaknesses as well as for comments (cf. Figure 1) and rating scale (cf. Figure 2)]

Questions on 'Quality and efficiency of the implementation'

'Quality and efficiency of the implementation' is about:

- Quality and effectiveness of the work plan
- Risk assessment and contingency plan
- Quality and capacity of all participating organisations, including non-scientific hosting arrangements

3.1 Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages

[Text boxes related to specific strengths and weaknesses as well as for comments (cf. Figure 1) and rating scale (cf. Figure 2)]

3.2 Quality and capacity of the host institutions and participating organisations, including hosting arrangements

[Text boxes related to specific strengths and weaknesses as well as for comments (cf. Figure 1) and rating scale (cf. Figure 2)]

Question on 'Overall appreciation'


Please write a **summary about 8-10 lines** including the **overall appreciation (strengths and weaknesses)** with the following **structure**:

1. **Excellence** (strengths and weaknesses)
2. **Impact** (strengths and weaknesses)
3. **Implementation** (strengths and weaknesses)

Your summary (points 1-3) may be integrated (as a whole or in part) in the decision letter (in case of a rejection). Please make sure to formulate your criticism, whether it is positive or negative, with respect to the evaluation criteria.

Main reasons for your overall assessment *

(8000 characters (max.))



A rich text editor toolbar with icons for Bold (B), Italic (I), Underline (U), Bulleted List, Numbered List, Undo, Redo, Cut, Copy, Paste, Print, Spell Check, Font Color, and Background Color.

A large, empty white rectangular area for text input, framed by a thin border.