



Załącznik nr 2 do uchwały Rady NCN nr 114/2023 z dnia 7 grudnia 2023 r.

DAINA 3 – Polish-Lithuanian Funding Initiative

Call for proposals 2023

EVALUATION SHEET FOR REVIEWERS AT NCN

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

yes

no

In the case of “no”, please justify:

A. PROJECT ASSESSMENT (60%)

A1. SCIENTIFIC QUALITY OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT (30%)

Has the proposal been prepared in a reliable manner? Does the project meet the criteria of basic research?² Does the project meet the criteria of a scientific proposal? Assess scientific relevance, importance, originality and novelty of research or tasks to be performed; relevance of the research methodology and work plan in relation to the scientific objectives of the project, including (if applicable) appropriate integration of sex and/or gender dimension in the project's content; quality ought to be evaluated in an international context.

SCORING

5 Excellent

The research project is of the world-class quality: it addresses a problem of very high importance and interest, demonstrates exceptional novelty and innovative approaches, and has no weaknesses.

4 Very good

The research project is of high quality: it addresses a problem of high importance and interest, and no significant elements have to be improved. May have some minor weaknesses.

3 Good

The research project is of good quality: it addresses an important problem but contains a few elements that could be improved.

2 Moderate

The research project is of moderate quality: it addresses a problem of moderate importance or contains important elements that could be improved.

¹ EN: This criterion is evaluated by the Expert Team at the first stage of merit-based evaluation.

² EN: 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.



1 Fair

The research project is of low quality: it addresses a problem of low importance, or it needs substantial modification or improvement.

0 Poor

The research project is of very low quality: it addresses a problem of low or no importance and it contains structural flaws.

The proposal has not been prepared in a reliable manner/ The project does not meet the criteria of basic research/ The project does not meet the criteria of a scientific proposal.

Justification:

A2. POTENTIAL IMPACT OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT (15%)

The potential for substantial international impact on the research field(s) and for high quality research publications and other research outputs, taking into account the specifics of the research field and the variety of forms of impact and output; impact ought to be evaluated in an international context.

SCORING

2 High

The project will have a substantial impact on the advancement of the research field(s) or discipline(s) and the project results are likely to be published by academic publishers or journals of the highest academic rank.

1 Moderate

The project will have some impact on the advancement of the research field(s) or discipline(s) and the project results are likely to be published by academic publishers or journals that are widely recognized.

0 Low

The project will have no impact on the advancement of the research field(s) or discipline(s) or the project results are unlikely to be published by academic publishers or journals that are widely recognized.

Justification:

A3. FEASIBILITY OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT (15%)

The feasibility of the proposed project (also with regard to foreign partners), including the appropriateness of the research methodology to achieve the goals of the project, the risk management description, the principal investigator's qualifications, the structure of the research team, research facilities and equipment, international cooperation (if any), other factors affecting the feasibility of the project.

SCORING

2 High

The implementation of the project is very well planned: the proposed timescale and methodology are relevant and suitable to achieve the goals of the project; project risks and mitigation plan are clearly described; the qualifications of the research team and the allocation of research tasks are appropriate; the available research facilities and equipment are sufficient for the proposed research.

**1 Moderate**

The implementation of the project is reasonably planned, but it contains some gaps or shortcomings, or it leaves room for improvement with respect to: the proposed timescale and methodology, project risks and mitigation plan, the qualifications of the research team, the allocation of research tasks or the available research facilities and equipment.

0 Low

The implementation of the project is not feasible, or it cannot be evaluated due to missing or incomplete information.

Justification:**B. QUALIFICATIONS AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS (40%)**

Evaluation of scientific qualifications and achievements presented in the section “Academic and Research Track Record”; including: the DORA recommendations³, the stage of scientific career, career breaks, and the diverse range of research outputs evaluated from an international perspective, in particular: (1) reliable preparation of the academic track record, (2) important contribution to the field(s) or discipline(s), (3) publication record; for research in art, artistic achievements and achievements in research in art, (4) presentations at internationally established conferences, including invited talks, (5) scientific or artistic prizes/awards or membership in well-regarded international organizations, (6) international recognition, (7) other research activities, (8) other research performance and research outputs of previous grants, not listed above.

Direct references to journal impact factors (IF, CiteScore, SJR, etc.), h-index and total number of publications are not allowed and will be disregarded in the final evaluation.

SCORING**5 Excellent**

The scientific track record and research achievements are excellent, internationally recognized and highly valued in terms of quality and contribution to science, the publication and artistic track record and other research activities. The principal investigator (principal investigators) is among the top researchers in the research field(s).

4 Very Good

The scientific track record and research achievements are very good and internationally recognized in terms of quality and contribution to science, the publication and artistic track record and other research activities. The principal investigator (principal investigators) is an internationally recognized researcher in the research field(s).

3 Good

The scientific track record and research achievements are good; however, they are of limited international recognition in terms of quality and contribution to science, the publication and artistic track record and other research activities. The principal investigator (principal investigators) has limited international recognition in the research field(s).

³ EN: NCN is committed to promoting the DORA recommendations and to not using journal-based metrics, such as Journal Impact Factors, as a surrogate measure of the quality of individual research articles to assess an individual scientist's contributions. In the assessment of the publication component of the Principal Investigator's track record, experts and reviewers should take into account their expert knowledge of their field of research, as well as the citation and publication practices of that field. Track record assessment should take into account the overall quality, contribution to the field, and impact of publications.



2 Moderate

The scientific track record and research achievements are average and of limited recognition in the field(s) in terms of quality and contribution to science, the publication and artistic track record and other research activities. The principal investigator (principal investigators) has limited recognition in the research field(s).

1 Modest

The scientific track record and research achievements are less than average and lack recognition in the research field(s) in terms of quality and contribution to science, the publication and artistic track record and other research activities. The principal investigator (principal investigators) lacks recognition in the research field(s).

0 Poor

The principal investigator (principal investigators) has poor or no scientific or artistic achievements.

The track record was presented in an unreliable manner.

Justification:

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

yes

no

In the case of “no”, please justify:

Are the costs to be incurred well justified with regard to the subject and scope of the research?⁴

yes

no

In the case of “no”, please justify:

Has the data management been duly planned?^{4,5}

yes

no

In the case of “no”, please justify:

Have the ethics issues in the research been duly addressed?^{4,5}

yes

no

In the case of “no”, please justify:

Has the proposal been submitted to the correct panel?^{4,6}

yes

no

In the case of “no”, please justify:

⁴ EN: 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.

⁵ EN: If the criterion does not apply to research, a “yes” decision is given.

⁶ EN: 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 projects⁷ financed by the NCN satisfactory? If no such projects or minor reservations, please select YES¹
consider: evaluation of the final report, other circumstances

yes

no

please justify:

STRENGTHS OF THE PROPOSAL:

WEAKNESSES OF THE PROPOSAL:

⁷ EN: Only completed with final report evaluated and settled.