

Slovenian Research Agency

Public call - funding of research programmes - 2017

Evaluation form - REVIEWER'S REPORT

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

Application number:

Type of the application:

Code of the programme:

Title of the programme:

Programme leader:

Research organizations:

.....

.....

.....

.....

Research hours per year:

Scientific discipline /
research field:

Period(s) of funding:

☐ I, the undersigned, declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal in accordance with the »Statement on a conflict of interest and confidentiality« form signed.

Reviewer:

Date:

.....
(Signature)

1. Scientific excellence of researchers	
--	--

The following aspects will be taken into account:

- outstanding achievements (Indicator 1.3.);
What is the impact of publications? What is the quality of publications of the group according to the prestige of the journal or reputation of the publisher?
- status and international excellence (Indicator 1.6.);
Are the group members the recipients of prestigious awards, members of an academy of arts and sciences, members of international advisory boards or boards of scientific or professional associations, chief editors or members of the editorial board of a prominent scientific journal?
- participation in international projects or parts of international projects (Indicator 1.8.);
What is the involvement of group members in EU research programmes, other international research and development programmes; was there any other international cooperation in the last five years or in the last funding period (including the scope of one's own part and role in the project, with the exception of bilateral cooperation)?

Data source:

- *Application form: ARRS-RPROG-JP-PRIJAVA/2017, **Section B***
- *Detailed composition of the programme group with quantitative indicators*

Each criterion is evaluated on a scale from zero to five. Half point scores may be given (0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, 4, 4.5, 5).

Interpretation of the scores:

- 0 (Noncompetitive): The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information,
- 1 (Poor): The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses,
- 2 (Fair): The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses,
- 3 (Good): The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present,
- 4 (Very good): The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present,
- 5 (Excellent): The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

A written comment on individual assessment elements under criterion. The comment is obligatory and must be consistent with the score given:

--

2. Relevance of researchers' achievements

The following aspects will be taken into account:

- proven relevant economic, social or cultural achievements in economic, social and cultural activities (Indicator 2.2.),
How important (and what kind) are the economic achievements, for example, the participation in creating new products, technologies, technology solutions, innovations (if applicable)?

How important (and what kind) are the social and cultural achievements (social infrastructure, public administration, cultural development, health care, protection of natural and cultural heritage, promotion of the country, access to foreign skills, involvement in the international division of labour, human resources development) (if applicable)? What is the impact of the programme group on the development of society?
- mobility of young Ph. D.'s (Indicator 2.3.)?
How do you assess the employment of young Ph. D.'s after the completion of their education (by sector of activity)?
- dissemination of research results and intellectual property protection (Indicator 2.4.),
Does the group appropriately disseminate its research results?
Does the programme group have an appropriate approach in the field of intellectual property protection (if applicable)?
Does the programme have an appropriate approach to the open access publishing of research results? What is the impact of the open access publishing of research results on the quality of overall publishing within the group?

Data source:

- *Application form: ARRS-RPROG-JP-PRIJAVA/2017, Section C*

Each criterion is evaluated on a scale from zero to five. Half point scores may be given (0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, 4, 4.5, 5).

Interpretation of the scores:

- 0 (Noncompetitive): The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information,
- 1 (Poor): The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses,
- 2 (Fair): The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses,
- 3 (Good): The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present,
- 4 (Very good): The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present,
- 5 (Excellent): The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

A written comment on individual assessment elements under criterion. The comment is obligatory and must be consistent with the score given:

--

3. Operational capacity and vitality of the group of researchers

The following aspects will be taken into account:

- structure of the group of researchers (head, experienced and young researchers) (Indicator 3.1.),
Does the head researcher have relevant leadership references?
Is the group adequately structured to ensure long-term and quality performance (in the research field of the programme group)?
- equipment availability (Indicator 3.2.),
Is the programme group properly equipped with research equipment or does it have access to research equipment and infrastructure required to implement the research programme?
- engagement in projects (Indicator 3.3.),
How is the content integrated into the existing institutional, national and international research and development programmes and projects?

Data source:

- *Application form: ARRS-RPROG-JP-PRIJAVA/2017, Section D*

Each criterion is evaluated on a scale from zero to five. Half point scores may be given (0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, 4, 4.5, 5).

Interpretation of the scores:

- 0 (Noncompetitive): The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information,
- 1 (Poor): The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses,
- 2 (Fair): The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses,
- 3 (Good): The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present,
- 4 (Very good): The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present,
- 5 (Excellent): The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

A written comment on individual assessment elements under criterion. The comment is obligatory and must be consistent with the score given:

--

4. Scientific, technological or innovative excellence	
--	--

The following aspects will be taken into account:

- appropriateness of addressing important research challenges (Indicator 4.1.),
To what extent does the proposal of the research programme address important research challenges?
- clarity of the concept, including the interdisciplinary aspect and relevance of the objectives (Indicator 4.3)
Is the concept of the research programme, including the interdisciplinary aspect and relevance of the objectives, clearly formulated?
- originality of the ideas (Indicator 4.4.),
To what extent are the ideas original?

Data source:

- **Section E - Pdf Attachment**

Each criterion is evaluated on a scale from zero to five. Half point scores may be given (0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, 4, 4.5, 5).

Interpretation of the scores:

- 0 (Noncompetitive): The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information,
- 1 (Poor): The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses,
- 2 (Fair): The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses,
- 3 (Good): The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present,
- 4 (Very good): The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present,
- 5 (Excellent): The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

A written comment on individual assessment elements under criterion. The comment is obligatory and must be consistent with the score given:

--

5. Potential impact due to the development, dissemination and use of the expected research results	
---	--

The following aspects will be taken into account:

- importance for the development of science or profession (Indicator 5.4.),
What is the potential significance of the research programme proposal for the development of science and profession?

- potential impact on economic, social and cultural development (Indicator 5.1.),
What is the potential economic impact, for example, the participation in creating new products, technologies, technological solutions, innovations?
What is the potential impact on social and cultural development, for example, social infrastructure, public administration, cultural development, health care, protection of natural and cultural heritage, promotion of the country, access to foreign knowledge, involvement in the international division of labour, human resources development?

Data source:

- **Section F - Pdf Attachment**

Each criterion is evaluated on a scale from zero to five. Half point scores may be given (0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, 4, 4.5, 5).

Interpretation of the scores:

- 0 (Noncompetitive): The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information,
- 1 (Poor): The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses,
- 2 (Fair): The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses,
- 3 (Good): The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present,
- 4 (Very good): The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present,
- 5 (Excellent): The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

A written comment on individual assessment elements under criterion. The comment is obligatory and must be consistent with the score given: