

## **SNSF Starting Grants: Evaluation form for panel members and reviewers**

### **1 Introductory remarks**

All applications that meet the personal and formal requirements are evaluated scientifically. All panel members as well as all peer-reviewers (only for applications selected for phase 2) are asked the same questions, following the evaluation criteria defined in the call document (cf. [Website](#)).

### **2 Evaluation form**

#### **Questions on “Scientific quality of the research project”**

##### **Q1: Ground-breaking nature and potential impact of the research project**

- To what extent does the proposed research address important challenges?
- To what extent are the objectives ambitious and beyond the state of the art (e.g., novel concepts and approaches or development between or across disciplines)?

##### **Q2: Scientific approach**

- To what extent is the outlined scientific approach feasible bearing in mind the ground-breaking nature and ambition of the proposed research?
- To what extent are the proposed research methodology and working arrangements appropriate to achieve the goals of the project?
- To what extent are the proposed timescales, resources and PI commitment adequate and properly justified?

#### **Question on “Qualification of the applicant”**

##### **Q: Intellectual capacity and creativity of the applicant**

- To what extent has the applicant demonstrated the ability to conduct ground-breaking research?
- To what extent does the applicant provide evidence of creative and original thinking?
- To what extent does the applicant have the required scientific expertise and capacity to successfully execute the project?

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>Specific strengths *<br/>(4000 characters (max.))</p>  | <p><b>B</b> / <b>I</b> <b>U</b> <b>☰</b> <b>☷</b> <b>↶</b> <b>↷</b> <b> </b> <b>✂</b> <b>📄</b> <b>🖨</b> <b>abc</b> <b>Ω</b> <b>🖼</b></p> |
| <p>Specific weaknesses *<br/>(4000 characters (max.))</p> | <p><b>B</b> / <b>I</b> <b>U</b> <b>☰</b> <b>☷</b> <b>↶</b> <b>↷</b> <b> </b> <b>✂</b> <b>📄</b> <b>🖨</b> <b>abc</b> <b>Ω</b> <b>🖼</b></p> |
| <p>Comments<br/>(8000 characters (max.))</p>              | <p><b>B</b> / <b>I</b> <b>U</b> <b>☰</b> <b>☷</b> <b>↶</b> <b>↷</b> <b> </b> <b>✂</b> <b>📄</b> <b>🖨</b> <b>abc</b> <b>Ω</b> <b>🖼</b></p> |

**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 \*

- 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.

**Figure 2:** Screenshot of SNSF rating scale.

### 3 Overall assessment

At the end of the evaluation form, the referees and reviewers are asked to summarise their assessment:

**Q: Please summarise the main reasons for your overall assessment by listing the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal.**

“This statement is the most important part of your recommendation, as it makes the reasoning behind your assessment transparent, it prepares the panel for the decision-making, and it provides the administrative office with the necessary information for the further processing of the proposal. A summary of your statement will be forwarded to the applicant, especially in the case of negative funding decisions.”



Main reasons for your overall assessment \*

(8000 characters (max.))

The image shows a text editor window with a toolbar at the top containing icons for bold, italic, underline, list, undo, redo, cut, copy, paste, print, and font color. The main text area is empty.