

RESEARCH PROJECTS (IP-06-2016)
2nd Round Evaluation Criteria (B)
Peer Review

DECLARATION OF PREVIOUS COOPERATION WITH THE APPLICANT

Please state if you know the applicant personally or if you have previously encountered the applicant's work, cited his papers or assessed his work.

--

Please grade the following criteria by using grades from 1 to 5:

- 1- Poor**
- 2- Fair**
- 3- Average**
- 4- Very good**
- 5- Excellent**

Note: Please use whole/integer numbers only. Decimal numbers (4.2., 3.5, etc.) are not allowed.

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY AND RESEARCH RELEVANCE	Grade (1-5)
What is the importance of the proposed topic, i. e. <i>importance of the research question</i> , in relation to the entire research area?	1-5
What is the quality and innovativeness of the research plan? To what extent is this project proposal competitive in relation to existing research on the topic?	1-5
What is the potential for publication of project results in top journals (first quartile of the journals in the corresponding scientific area according to Web of Science database), book publication or the possibility of patenting?	1-5
<i>Please describe the scientific quality and research relevance briefly.</i>	
<i>Total</i>	

PROJECT PROPOSAL FEASIBILITY	Grade (1-5)
How do you assess the feasibility and soundness of the work plan? (While assessing, please take into consideration the planned time, goals and results as well as the available resources. To what extent are the planned goals, milestones and deliverables realistic? Does the project proposal state all potential risks and ways of dealing with them?)	1-5
How do you assess the number of team members with regard to the work planned? Is the estimated number of team members too big, too small or optimal?	1-5
How do you assess the compliance of scientific qualifications of team	1-5

RESEARCH PROJECTS (IP-06-2016)
2nd Round Evaluation Criteria (B)
Peer Review

members with the work planned?	
To what extent is the proposed methodology appropriate and up-to-date?	1-5
<i>Please describe the project proposal feasibility briefly.</i>	
<i>Total</i>	

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR'S QUALITY	Grade (1-5)
What is the total scientific and professional contribution of the Principal Investigator in the research area?	1-5
What is the production of the Principal Investigator in the last 5 years in the context of publishing papers in journals with an IF greater than average in a particular area or in high-quality journals in area of social sciences and humanities? Does the Principal Investigator have several publications in leading international journals in the area of research in which he is the lead or corresponding author, in the first quartile of the finest journals in the observed scientific area according to Web of Science database or registered patent(s)? <i>If the disciplinary background of the Principal Investigator is the area of humanities or social sciences, does he have several papers published in peer-reviewed books, conference papers or high-quality papers?</i>	1-5
How do you assess Principal Investigator's research group management competencies (on the basis of previous mentorships and quality of work published with the existing research group)?	1-5
<i>Please describe the Principal Investigator's quality briefly.</i>	
<i>Total</i>	

<p>PROJECT PROPOSAL'S MAIN STRENGTHS <i>(Please describe briefly using a minimum of 50 words.)</i></p>
<p>PROJECT PROPOSAL'S MAIN WEAKNESSES <i>(Please describe briefly using a minimum of 50 words.)</i></p>

RESEARCH PROJECTS (IP-06-2016)
2nd Round Evaluation Criteria (B)
Peer Review

Recommendations for project proposal funding (please choose one of the following options):

A - I propose the funding of the project proposal in this form. (over 40 points)

B - I propose the funding of the project proposal with minor finishing. (over 35 points)

C - Project proposal requires significant changes. I do not propose the funding of the project proposal in this form.