**SFI Frontiers for the Future - Proposal Peer/Expert Evaluation Form**

**The following documents should be reviewed:**

* CV’s: Applicant DORA Compliant CV (template, max. 5 pages)

Co-applicant if relevant (template, max. 5 pages)

* Abstract (200 words)
* Alignment and justification to SFI’s legal remit (250 words)
* Research Programme section (max. 8 pages Projects)
* Impact section (max. 3 pages)
* Sex & Gender Dimension in Research Statement (max. 1,000 words)

**Frontiers for the Future Projects stream provides funding for high risk, high-reward research that facilitates highly innovative and novel approaches to research.**

**Comments should take the form of a statement and explanation of key strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, in light of the evaluation criteria:**

1. ***Quality, significance, and relevance of the research record of the applicant and co-applicant (if relevant), commensurate with their career stage and research discipline.***
2. ***Quality, significance, novelty, and strategic relevance of the research plan***
3. ***Potential impact and value to Ireland***

These SFI review questions allow the reviewer to score each of the 3 sections with a maximum of 5 marks per section. An overall score will be calculated using score weighting system (see [call document](https://www.sfi.ie/funding/funding-calls/frontiers-for-the-future/SFI-Frontiers-for-the-Future-Programme-2022-Call-Document.pdf) p. 43).

**SECTION 1: Questions pertaining to Applicant(s)**

SFI is a signatory of the San Francisco Declaration of Research Assessment (DORA). As such, SFI is aligning its review and evaluation processes with DORA principles. To this end, all types of research output are recognised by SFI and we are committed to assessing the quality and impact of research through means other than journal impact factors. Furthermore, in the spirit of supporting open research and as a signatory of Plan S, SFI will positively consider where there is a commitment to making data and other types of research open and accessible. Please take these positions into account during your assessment of the DORA-compliant CV(s) submitted by the applicant(s).

Please comment on the quality, significance and relevance of the applicant’s and co-applicant’s (if relevant) key achievements and research track record as demonstrated in the CV(s), commensurate with their career stage and research discipline, taking any periods of leave into account. Please include in your review comments how the applicant(s) has addressed each of the following areas:

1. Generation of Knowledge

COMMENTS:

1. Development of Individuals and Collaborations,

COMMENTS:

1. Supporting Broader Society & the Economy and

COMMENTS:

1. Supporting the Research Community.

COMMENTS:

With your review, please also consider whether the expertise and experience of the lead applicant, co-applicant(s), mentor and collaborator(s), if relevant, are appropriate given their proposed contribution to the research programme.

COMMENTS:

There are **two stages** to the scoring of the applicant(s):

First, please score the quality, significance and relevance of the applicant’s and co-applicant’s (if relevant) key achievements and research track record with regard to the individual categories in the CV(s):

1) Generation of Knowledge

|  |
| --- |

Score:

2) Development of Individuals and Collaborations

|  |
| --- |

Score:

3) Supporting Broader Society & the Economy,

|  |
| --- |

Score:

1. Supporting the Research Community. Half scores are permitted.

|  |
| --- |

Score:

* 1 = Applicant(s) not internationally competitive for this category
* 2 = Applicant(s) track record has considerable weaknesses for this category
* 3 = Applicant(s) track record lacking in one or two critical aspects for this category
* 4 = High-quality applicant(s) in nearly all respects for this category
* 5 = Outstanding applicant(s) for this category

Second, taking into account the four categories referred to above, please use your judgement to provide one overall score based on the quality, significance and relevance of the lead applicant’s and co-applicant’s (if relevant) key achievements and research track record, commensurate with their career stage and research discipline, taking any periods of leave into account. Please consider the quality and relevance of the collaborators and/or mentor, if relevant. This score will be the final score used to assess the applicant(s). Half scores are permitted.

* 1 = Applicant(s) not internationally competitive
* 2 = Applicant(s) track record has considerable weaknesses
* 3 = Applicant(s) track record lacking in one or two critical aspects
* 4 = High-quality applicant(s) in nearly all respects
* 5 = Outstanding applicant(s)

|  |
| --- |

**Section 1 score:**

**SECTION 2: Questions pertaining to Research Plan**

**Questions pertaining to Research Plan**

Please comment on:

1. the quality, significance, novelty, and strategic relevance of the research plan

COMMENTS:

1. importance, timeliness of the proposed research

COMMENTS:

1. quality of institutional support

COMMENTS:

1. communication and description of the research

COMMENTS:

1. comprehension of the current state of the art

COMMENTS:

1. value for money

COMMENTS:

1. Sex and Gender dimension, etc..

**Sex and Gender Dimension in Research**

**This section should not** include information on gender equality, diversity and inclusion in the research team/environment.

* Has the applicant adequately addressed the sex and/or gender dimension/s in their proposal? Yes/No
* If the applicant **has not** included a sex and/or gender dimension/s in their research proposal, are you satisfied that they have justified this position sufficiently? If not, please explain.
* If the applicant **has** included a sex and/or gender dimension/s in their research proposal, is the design/analysis described sufficiently rigorously to test for differences between the sexes and/or genders? If not, please explain.
* If the applicant is only studying one biological sex and/or gender, has the applicant provided sufficient justification with reference to the scientific literature, preliminary data, or other relevant consideration in their proposal?

COMMENTS:

Please rate the quality, significance, novelty, and strategic relevance of the research plan, including the Sex and Gender Statement aspects (half scores are permitted)

* 1 Research proposed is not worthy of funding
* 2 Research proposed has serious deficiencies
* 3 Research proposed is lacking in one or more critical aspects; key issues need to be addressed
* 4 High-quality research programme in most respects
* 5 Outstanding research programme in all respects

|  |
| --- |

**Section 2 Score:**

**SECTION 3: Questions pertaining to Impact**

**Questions pertaining to Impact**

Please comment on:

* the applicant’s ability to demonstrate the potential impact and value to Ireland.

COMMENTS:

Please consider points such as:

* Appreciation of how research may be developed and exploited in the medium-to-long term;

COMMENTS:

* realistic and convincing evaluation of the benefits that will result from a successful research programme;

COMMENTS:

* areas and fields where impacts are likely to be made.

COMMENTS:

Please rate the applicant’s ability to demonstrate the potential impact and value to Ireland (half scores are permitted)

* 1 Very low impact potential
* 2 Low impact potential
* 3 Good impact potential
* 4 High impact potential
* 5 Outstanding impact potential

|  |
| --- |

**Section 3 Score**

**SECTION 4: Other questions – Budget, ethical issues (no scores)**

* 1. **Question pertaining to Budget, Team & Project/Award Duration**

Please comment on:

* Is the budget appropriate/realistic given the track record of the applicant(s)?

COMMENTS:

* appropriateness of the skills, composition and size of the team requested, the appropriateness of the resources requested and award duration.

COMMENTS:

* 1. **Question pertaining to Ethical Issues**

Please comment on any ethical issues, particularly related to any aspects of the proposed research that involves animals, human participants, human biological material, or identifiable/potentially identifiable data?

COMMENTS: