**REVIEWER EVALUATION FORM**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **P.I.**: First name, SURNAME |  | | | |
| **Title of project**: | | | | |
| 1. **Project Concept, objectives and impact:**   Could the proposed research address important challenges in the field(s)? Does and in what extend the proposal fits the state-of-art on the subject?  In the evaluation the reviewer shall take into account:   * + Scientific Project Proposal   + State-of-the art, objectives and expected results |  |  | 1 ‐ Poor |  |
|  | 2 ‐ Fair |  |
|  | 3 ‐ Good |  |
|  | 4 ‐ Very Good |  |
|  | 5 ‐ Excellent (Outstanding) |  |
|  | | | |
| 1. **Project Feasibility:**   What is the technical and economic feasibility of the project?  In the evaluation the reviewer shall take into account:   * + Proposed Methodology   + Work organization   + Available instrumentation (HW & SW)   + Cost estimates |  |  | 1 ‐ Poor |  |
|  | 2 ‐ Fair |  |
|  | 3 ‐ Good |  |
|  | 4 ‐ Very Good |  |
|  | 5 ‐ Excellent (Outstanding) |  |
|  | | | |
| **c) Principal Investigator qualification and Research Team Composition:**  How well qualified is the Principal Investigator (PI) to conduct the project? To what extent are the publications of the PI demonstrative of independent creative thinking?  Does the PI demonstrate project management capabilities and leadership potential, with possibility of establishing international cooperation on the research topic?  Is the research team composition adequate to carry out the scientific project?  In the evaluation the reviewer should take into account:   * + PI Curriculum Vitae   + Team composition   + Scientific proposal |  |  | 1 ‐ Poor |  |
|  | 2 ‐ Fair |  |
|  | 3 ‐ Good |  |
|  | 4 ‐ Very Good |  |
|  | 5 ‐ Excellent (Outstanding) |  |
|  | | | |
| 1. **Multidisciplinary project approach:**   To what extent the proposed project can promote a synergetic cooperation among different disciplines? In the evaluation the reviewer shall take into account:   * Scientific proposal * Team composition * Work organization |  |  | 1 ‐ Poor |  |
|  | 2 ‐ Fair |  |
|  | 3 ‐ Good |  |
|  | 4 ‐ Very Good |  |
|  | 5 ‐ Excellent (Outstanding) |  |
|  | | | |
| **Total points**: /20 | | | | |  |  | 3 ‐ Good |
| Reviewer Confidence Level: High Average Low | | | | |  |  |  |