



Załącznik nr 3 do uchwały Rady NCN nr 115/2024 z dnia 14 listopada 2024 r.

**SHENG 4 – Polish-Chinese Funding Initiative  
Call for proposals 2024  
EVALUATION SHEET FOR REVIEWERS IN NCN**

**Does the proposal meet eligibility criteria outlined in the call for proposals?<sup>1</sup>**

yes

no

In the case of “no”, please justify:

**A. PROJECT ASSESSMENT<sup>2</sup> (65%)**

**SCIENTIFIC QUALITY** – scientific relevance, importance, originality and novelty of research or tasks to be performed; relevance of the 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; the scientific quality of the project should be evaluated in an international context.

**FEASIBILITY** – the work plan and the methodology in relation to achieving the proposed objectives within the given timeframe; risk management plan; the composition and qualifications of the research team members already named in the application; allocation of the research tasks; research facilities and equipment; international cooperation (if any); other factors affecting the feasibility of the project.

**POTENTIAL IMPACT** – the potential for impact of the project results and for high-quality scientific publications and other research outputs of the project; the potential impact of the project should be evaluated within an international context, taking into account the specifics of the research field and the variety of forms of impact and output.

**SCORING**

- 5** Excellent project with no significant weaknesses.
- 4** Very good project with minor weaknesses.
- 3** Good project with moderate weaknesses.
- 2** Mediocre project with major weaknesses.
- 1** Weak project with numerous weaknesses.
- 0** Project with critical structural flaws / Project cannot be assessed due to incomplete information / Project has not been prepared in a reliable manner / Project does not meet the criterion of basic research<sup>3</sup> / Project lacks a scientific character.

---

<sup>1</sup> This criterion is evaluated by the Expert Team.

<sup>2</sup> In case of SHENG proposal, please include also all the relevant sections of the Joint Project Description.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

Justification:

Please fully justify your assessment, explicitly indicating the strengths and weaknesses of the project in relation to all subcriteria (scientific quality, feasibility, potential impact). In identifying the strengths and weaknesses, please state which of them are most significant and why.

**B. APPLICANTS (Principal investigators and Co-Investigators)<sup>4</sup> (35%)**

Evaluation of scientific qualifications and achievements presented in the section “Academic and Research Track Record”. The assessment should take into account the DORA guidelines<sup>5</sup>, the stage of scientific career, career breaks, and the diverse range of research outputs evaluated within 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.

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).

## SCORING

**5 Excellent**

The scientific track record and research achievements are excellent, widely recognized internationally and highly valued for their quality and contribution to science, publications/artistic output and other research activities. The Principal Investigators and Co-Investigators are among the top researchers in their research field.

**4 Very good**

The scientific track record and research achievements are very good and internationally recognized for their quality and contribution to science, publications/artistic output and other research activities. The Principal Investigators and Co-Investigators are widely recognized in their research field.

---

<sup>4</sup> In case of SHENG proposal, evaluation should also include qualifications and achievements of the Principal investigators and Co-Investigators whose CVs are attached.

<sup>5</sup> NCN is committed to promoting the DORA recommendations and to not using journal-based metrics for evaluation of journals, 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.



**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, publications/artistic output, and other research activities. The Principal Investigators and Co-Investigators have limited recognition in their research field.

**2 Moderate**

The scientific track record and research achievements are average and of limited recognition in the research field in terms of quality and contribution to science, publications/artistic output, and other research activities. The Principal Investigators and Co-Investigators have very limited recognition in their research field.

**1 Modest**

The scientific track record and research achievements are below average and lack recognition in the research field in terms of quality and contribution to science, publications/artistic output, and other research activities. The Principal Investigators and Co-Investigators lack recognition in their research field.

**0 Poor**

The Principal Investigators and Co-Investigators have poor or no scientific/artistic achievements / The track record was presented in an unreliable manner.

Justification:

Please fully justify your assessment, explicitly indicating the strengths and weaknesses of qualifications and achievements of the principal investigators and co-investigators. In identifying the strengths and weaknesses, please state which of them are most significant and why.

**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:

**Are the costs to be incurred well justified with regard to the subject and scope of the research?<sup>6</sup> (Is the Polish budget to be incurred well justified with regard to the subject and scope of the research?)**

yes

no

In the case of "no", please justify:

---

<sup>6</sup> 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.



**Has Data management been duly planned?<sup>6,7</sup>**

yes

no

In the case of “no”, please justify:

**Has the proposal been submitted to correct panel?<sup>6,8</sup>**

yes

no

In the case of “no”, please justify:

**Are the effects of the previous principal investigator’s research projects<sup>9</sup> financed by the NCN satisfactory? If no such projects or minor reservations, please select YES<sup>1</sup>**

*consider: evaluation of the final report, other circumstances,*

yes

no

please justify:

**Have the ethics issues been duly addressed?<sup>6,10</sup>**

yes

no

In the case of “no”, please justify:

*Additional merit-based evaluation*

**A. Does the project description ensure that ethical research will be conducted?**

yes

no

In the case of “no”, please justify:

**B. Is there any risk of ethics breach by a partner?**

yes

no

In the case of “no”, please justify:

**C. Could research result in uncontrolled personal data processing/sharing?**

yes

no

In the case of “no”, please justify:

---

<sup>7</sup> If the criterion does not apply to research, a “yes” decision is given.

<sup>8</sup> Does not apply to proposals (including interdisciplinary proposals) where the main scientific question/hypothesis corresponds with the scope of the panel.

<sup>9</sup> Only completed with final report evaluated and settle.

<sup>10</sup> If the criterion does not apply to research, a “yes” decision is given.



**D. Could research result in human rights violation?**

yes

no

In the case of "no", please justify:

**E. Does the research involve the use or manufacturing of dual-use items (e.g. pathogens, software, technologies) requiring export authorization under Commission Regulation (EC) No 428/2009 of 5 May 2009?**

yes

no

In the case of "no", please justify:

Prof. dr hab. n. med. Anetta Undas  
Przewodnicząca Rady  
Narodowego Centrum Nauki  
/– podpisano cyfrowo/