



Załącznik nr 3 do uchwały Rady NCN nr 134/2022 z dnia 8 grudnia 2022 r.

**SHENG 3 – Polish-Chinese Funding Initiative
Call for proposals 2022
EVALUATION SHEET FOR REVIEWERS IN NCN**

Has the proposal been prepared in a reliable manner?¹

yes

no

In the case of “no”, please justify:

Does the project meet the criteria of a scientific proposal?¹

yes

no

In the case of “no”, please justify:

Does the project meet the criteria of basic research?^{1,2}

yes

no

In the case of “no”, please justify:

Does the proposal meet other eligibility criteria outlined in the call for proposals?¹

yes

no

In the case of “no”, please justify:

Is the project based on a balanced and complementary contribution of research teams involved in Polish-Chinese cooperation?

yes

no

In the case of “no”, please justify:

Has Data management been duly planned?³

yes

no

In the case of “no”, please justify:

Have the ethics issues been duly addressed?³

yes

no

In the case of “no”, please justify:

Has the proposal been submitted to correct panel?^{1,4}

yes

no

In the case of “no”, please justify:

¹ This criterion is not subject to assessment by external reviewers. At the same time, an external reviewer may indicate the irregularities identified in a given criterion of the proposal which are then accepted or rejected by the Expert Team in the final evaluation.

² Pursuant to Article 4 (2) (1) of the Act on Higher Education and Science of 20 July 2018, basic research shall mean experimental or theoretical work undertaken primarily to acquire new knowledge of the underlying foundations of phenomena and observable facts, without any particular commercial application or use in view.

³ If the criterion does not apply to research, a “yes” decision is given.

⁴ Does not apply to proposals (including interdisciplinary proposals) where the main scientific question/hypothesis corresponds with the scope of the panel.



Are the effects of the previous principal investigator's research projects⁵ financed by the NCN satisfactory? If no such projects or minor reservations, please select YES⁶

consider: evaluation of the final report, other circumstances,

yes

no

please justify:

I. APPLICANTS (30%)

(Principal Investigators and Co-Investigators)

How do you judge the qualifications of the research team?

Please assess the team members' expertise to conduct the proposed research project, their research portfolio, their preliminary work and previous international cooperation (applies to the Principal Investigators and Co-Investigators whose CVs are attached).

Answer

4 outstanding,

3 very good,

2 good,

1 moderate,

0 poor,

Justification – please review Principal Investigators' and Co-investigators' expertise only.

II. RESEARCH PROJECT (50%)

How do you judge the academic merits of the research project?

Please assess the innovative nature of the project, the impact of the research project on advances in the academic discipline and international cooperation, the scientific level of the objectives and work programme, the integrated approach of the project, risk management. (Please evaluate all the relevant sections of the Joint Project Description).

Answer

4 excellent,

3 very good,

2 good,

1 average,

0 poor,

Justification – please comment on all the relevant sections of the Joint Project Description.

⁵ Only completed with final report evaluated and settle.

⁶ This criterion is agreed by the expert team at stage I of merit-based evaluation.



III. FEASIBILITY AND FINANCE (20%)

How do you judge the feasibility of the project? Please assess whether the project is **fully feasible** (e.g. by the composition of the research teams, research facilities, infrastructure, the presented model of project management) or whether the project is **partially feasible** (i.e. it presents some key weaknesses as regards the composition of research teams or the development/availability of the research facilities, infrastructure and proposed model of project management) or the project is characterized as being poorly **feasible**.

Assessment of feasibility

- 2 – full feasibility of the project
- 1 – partial feasibility of the project
- 0 – poor feasibility of the project

Assessment of costs

- 2 – the cost estimate is justified
- 1 – the cost estimate is partly justified
- 0 – the cost estimate is not justified

Justification – please comment on the project's feasibility and the appropriateness of the requested funds.

IV. SUMMARY OF THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE PROPOSAL

Strengths

Weaknesses

Prof. dr hab. Jacek Kuźnicki
Przewodniczący Rady
Narodowego Centrum Nauki