

ANEXA 4 – Fișă de evaluare (Evaluation sheet)

Please deliver your comments for each sub-criterion as a bullet point list of strengths (+) and weaknesses (-)

Please respond to all relevant tasks indicated in the Evaluation sheet

1. Principal Investigator (PI) - 40% of the total score;

Note: When evaluating the academic achievements of the PI (Research output / Visibility and impact of the PI's research output), the evaluators are advised to take into account the current debates at the level of the international academic community concerning the dissemination of research results. This concerns, in particular, the doubts and reservations articulated regarding the qualitative standards practiced in the framework of the process of research evaluation/peer-review by certain academic publishers/journals. The Romanian National Research Council (CNCS) strongly advises against and discourages the publication of research results in „predatory publishers/journals”, according to the definitions/lists currently in use by the academic community in countries with advanced academic standards.

1.1 Quality of the PI's research output - 40% of the total score of Criterion 1 (see sections B1 and B4).

- Evaluate to what extent the PI's research has led to progress in their field of expertise, in general (i.e. not only in the narrow field/theme of the project). In relation to the specificity of each particular field of research, evaluate to what extent the PI has contributed to establishing new research directions and to elaborating new theories/ research methods/ research strategies/techniques.
- Comment on the importance of the PI's scientific discoveries, as reflected in their track record or other achievements.

1.2 Visibility and impact of the PI's research output - 30% of the total score of Criterion 1 (see section B2).

- Evaluate to what extent the PI's scientific output is internationally recognized.
- Comment regarding the extent to which the research directions /theories /methods /strategies /techniques developed by the PI have been widely accepted and recognized by the international scientific/academic community.
- Comment regarding the international academic visibility of the PI, particularly on how this visibility can be assessed on the basis of scientific/scholarly articles published in Q1 and Q2 academic journals.
- Comment on the statistical charts of H-index (according to WoS Core Collection/Scopus), citations and average citations per item/publication (excluding self-citations), Q1/Q2 articles and chapters and books published by international publishers (for the Humanities and Social Sciences) of all competing PIs, for use if relevant. Comment on the most relevant 10 citations in Q1/Q2 journals regarding the PIs published articles. In the case of the humanities comment on the most relevant book-reviews regarding the PIs publications.
- Use the list of the most representative works (according to the specificity of each particular field of research) to assess the PI's research output. Please take into account the relative weight/relevance of the articles published by the PI in Q1/Q2 journals. In the case of the humanities and social sciences (where relevant and appropriate), please take into account the academic reputation and status of the international academic publishers, as well as of the Romanian academic publishers and journals, according to the current classification system of the Romanian National Research Council (CNCS) (Annex 7a, 7b) and according to the academic quality standards, as currently defined in (Annex 1).
- In the case of the Humanities, please take into account the relevance and impact of the journals and publishers within the professional sub-field of the PI, as well as the presence and

dissemination of the PI's publications in the most important and relevant foreign libraries (according to Annex 1).

- In the field of Mathematics, while the use of numerical indicators in evaluating the PI is permitted, it is not particularly encouraged. The evaluation of this criterion should not be based exclusively on such indicators, and should rather include the evaluator's objective assessment of the intrinsic value of the PI's scientific contributions and of its actual impact on advancing the state-of-the-art in the specific mathematical field.

1.3 Match between the PI's previous research output and the proposed topic - 30% of the total score of Criterion 1 (see section B3).

- Evaluate to what extent the PI's research output is relevant for the present project. Assess the quality and appropriateness of the researcher's existing professional experience in relation to the research proposal.
- Comment on how the previously published work or previous projects of the PI relates to the proposed research.

2. Research Project - 60% of the total score.

2.1 State-of-the-art and originality/innovation - 30% of the total score of Criterion 2 (see section C1).

- Evaluate whether the problem/issue addressed by the project is clearly identified in relation to the state-of-the-art in the field.
- Comment on the originality and novelty of the proposed solution and assess the extent to which the proposed work is ambitious and goes beyond the current state of the art in the field.
- If previous projects of the applicant addressing a similar topic are mentioned, comment on the novel aspects investigated in the present project.

2.2 Research objectives, methodology and work plan - 30% of the total score of Criterion 2 (see section C2).

- Evaluate the clarity and coherence of the research and innovation objectives. Are the research and innovation objectives realistically achievable, measurable and verifiable?
- To what extent is the proposed methodological approach suitable for reaching these objectives? Comment on the soundness of the methodology, including the concepts, models and assumptions that underpin the project, and on whether important methodological challenges are identified, including the proposed measures to tackle these challenges.
- How effective is the work plan (timelines, milestones, deliverables) in terms of achieving the proposed objectives?
- Assess whether the Gantt Chart (mandatory) is consistent and complete, in relation to the whole work plan (taking into account WPs, scientific deliverables, milestones).
- Comment on the coherence of the project's approach in terms of activities and time scales.

2.3 Feasibility (resources, research team and preliminary results) - 20% of the total score of Criterion 2 (see section C3).

- To what extent will the infrastructure support and human resource (research team) available at the host institution ensure the successful implementation of the project?
- Are there any preliminary results presented in support of the hypothesis and the proposed solution? A lack of preliminary results is not considered a weakness and should not be

penalized; however, when preliminary results are presented, this could be considered as a strength, supporting the project’s feasibility.

- Evaluate to what extent the personnel structure of the research team will be appropriate for developing a young research team.

2.4 Risks and contingency plans - 10% of the total score of Criterion 2 (see section C4).

- Comment on the research risks that might endanger the achievement of the objectives. To what extent does the risk analysis correctly identify potential pitfalls?
- Comment on the effectiveness of the alternative solutions proposed.

2.5 Expected impact and dissemination plan - 10% of the total score of Criterion 2 (see section C5).

- To what extent is the expected scientific/scholarly output of the proposed work realistically described and how likely is it to lead to significant progress in the field?
- How will the proposed research impact (the visibility of) the host institution, the PI and the research team?
- Comment on the project’s social, economic, or cultural impact, **only if relevant for the proposed research**. Please take into account that these are **fundamental research projects**. This is valid also for the potential social or economic impact.
- Comment on the quality of the proposed measures to disseminate the scientific/scholarly output of the proposal.
- Assess how the appropriate open science practices are implemented, as an integral part of the proposed methodology.

3. Budget; this section will not be scored (see section C6).

- Please provide an overall assessment of the research budget requested and evaluate to what extent it is justified by the proposed research activities.

Note: There will be no score associated with this criterion, but the assessment will be useful to the funding agency in negotiating the final terms of the financial award.

Recommendations for Evaluators/Rapporteurs:

1. Propose a score **only after** wrote the comments; make sure that the comments are **concrete, complete** (i.e. address all questions) and **consistent** with the semantics of each score, namely:

Table 1.

0	ABSENT	The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to <i>missing or incomplete information</i> .
1	UNSATISFACTORY	The criterion is addressed in an <i>inadequate manner</i> , or there are <i>serious inherent weaknesses</i> .
2	SATISFACTORY	While the proposal <i>broadly addresses</i> the criterion, there are <i>significant weaknesses</i> .
3	GOOD	The proposal addresses the criterion <i>well</i> , although <i>improvements would be necessary</i> . A <i>number of weaknesses/shortcomings are present</i> .
4	VERY GOOD	The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although <i>certain improvements are still possible</i> . A <i>small number of weaknesses/shortcomings are present</i> .
5	EXCELLENT	The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

2. When scoring each subcriterion use the full scale, from 0 to 5 – in 0.5 increments.
3. The scores must reflect the strengths and weaknesses and they must be in line with the comments. Scores **below 5, including 4.5, must be in accordance with the identified weaknesses, which should be clearly indicated** in the Individual Evaluation Report/Consensus Report! **If no weakness is identified, the score is 5.**
4. Each strength and weakness must be reflected **only once** in the report and the scores, i.e. there is **no double penalty, no double reward.**

Note: The final score will be calculated as a weighted sum of the scores for each subcriteria multiplied by 20 (final score between 0 and 100);

Final grade = 20[(s1.1*40/100 + s1.2*30/100 + s1.3*30/100)*40/100 + (s2.1*30/100 + s2.2*30/100 + s2.3*20/100 + s2.4*10/100 + s2.5*10/100)*60/100], where si,j is the score for criterion i,j*