

## Research Grant Reviewer Info

This is the information that reviewers will see on their review forms. When you make sure that you have targeted all points in your proposal in a precise and brief way, it will help the reviewer during the review and will most likely lead to a better score than a proposal not addressing the questions to be assessed by the reviewer.

---

Reviewer statement: While reviewing, I am aware that this granting scheme is for younger scientists (up to 40 years of age) to receive possibly one of the first grants (of up to EUR 20'000) in their career. [Reviewer will have a box to tick]

### Section One: Principal clarity (answer required)

Does the applicant clearly identify how ESCMID funds will be used to deliver the stated objectives? If the proposed project combines different funding sources, does the applicant clearly declare which part(s) will be funded by the ESCMID grant and for which part(s) of the project funding is sought or already guaranteed through other sources?

Yes, please proceed with Section Two.

No, please do not examine this application further.

### Section Two: Scientific value of the grant application

Please consider

Strength of the research proposal – is a significant question/knowledge gap being addressed?

Limitations of the research proposal

Level of innovation

Feasibility of methodology

Identification of likely impact

#### Scoring (required):

0= Does not meet the stated objectives or the objectives are not logical;

1= Very poor; addressed in a cursory and unsatisfactory manner;

2= Poor; there are serious inherent weaknesses;

3= Fair; broadly addresses the stated objectives but with significant weaknesses;

4= Good; addresses the objectives but minor improvements are possible;

5= Excellent; successfully addresses all the objectives.

Reviewer comment (min. 120 words, answer required)

### **Section Three: Practicability of the grant application**

Please consider

Justification of essential resources (including animal numbers if necessary)

Appropriateness of timeframe of the project

Investigator time and involvement

Value for money

Objectives are clearly achievable within the stated budget and timelines

**Scoring (required):**

0= No attempt to do so;

1= Rather poor; with serious inherent weaknesses either in timeliness or feasibility within the stated resources;

2= Rather good; feasible but minor improvements are possible;

3= Excellent; in that it addresses all the objectives in a timely and resource-feasible manner.

**Reviewer comment (optional)**

### **Section Four: Quality of CV/background of grant applicant**

Please consider

Suitability of research environment and group

Level of host support

Track record of individuals

Is it apparent from the CV/references/support letters that the applicant has the necessary competences to progress this topic? Areas where the applicant has little experience should be mentioned by the applicant and the letters of support should make clear that there is adequate mentoring for the project to proceed.

**Scoring (required):**

0= No attempt to do so;

1= CV and references and support letters do not reassure the referee;

2= Minor issues only;

3= There are no concerns.

**Reviewer comment (optional)**

### **Section Five: Declaration of conflicts of interests of reviewers (required)**

Do you have any possible conflict of interest to declare in relation to this project?

**Yes, please detail:**

**No**

*Last update: June 2015*