



MEDICAL

UEFA Medical & Anti-Doping Research Grant Programme

Evaluation Sheet 2nd Stage

Applicant name:

Title of proposed research project:

Reviewer:

At least 2 jury members will evaluate each research proposal using the following scoring system:

Score	Definition	Description
0	Unsuitable	The application does not align with the given criteria for scoring.
1	Weak	The application only partly aligns with the given criteria for scoring and/or and the description lacks demonstration of the quality desired for the given criteria for scoring.
2	Adequate	The application mostly aligns with the given criteria for scoring and/or and the description demonstrates some of the quality desired for the given criteria for scoring but contains gaps or limitations.
3	Good	The application clearly describes the relevant topics given criteria for scoring and the description demonstrates the quality desired for the given criteria for scoring but contains minor gaps or limitations.
4	Excellent	The application clearly describes the relevant topics given criteria for scoring and the description clearly demonstrates the quality desired for the given criteria for scoring.

Proposals will be scored on 4 main aspects: (1) Quality of research, which has double weigh (i.e., counts double in the overall scoring), (2) Feasibility of the research project, (3) Relevant for football, (4) Applicant profile, and (5) Impact strategy.

Summative scores for the proposals will be categorised as follows

0-4	=	the proposal is categorised as 'unsuitable'
5-8	=	the proposal is categorised as 'very weak'
9-12	=	the proposal is categorised as 'weak'
13-16	=	the proposal is categorised as 'adequate'
17-20	=	the proposal is categorised as 'good'
21-24	=	the proposal is categorised as 'very good'
25-28	=	the proposal is categorised as 'excellent'

1	Quality of research	
1.1	Scientific quality, novelty, and innovativeness of research Criteria for scoring	Score (range 0-8 i.e., 2x4)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How convincing does the project appear? Is the project description comprehensive and strong? Are the research questions, aims, objectives and/or hypotheses well formulated and justified? Is the state-of-the-art in the respective research area well described? 	



MEDICAL

UEFA Medical & Anti-Doping Research Grant Programme

Evaluation Sheet 2nd Stage

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the application outline novel research that may lead to exceptionally scientific outcomes and has potential to change our view on its respective area? 	
1.2	Competence and expertise of applicant Criteria for scoring	Score (range 0-4)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does/do the applicant(s) or supervisory team for PhD candidates have a relevant research track record demonstrating the ability to conduct and deliver high-quality research? Does the project support the research progression of the applicant(s)? Does the applicant(s) possess a high level of English professional proficiency? 	

2	Implementation	
2.1	Feasibility of research plan Criteria for scoring	Score (range 0-4)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the provided preliminary data and/or infrastructure at the site of research support the feasibility of the project? Does/do the applicant(s) clearly explain how each hypothesis/objective will be assessed? Are the methods well supported and in accordance with current scientific standards? Is a Gantt chart provided visualising a reasonable timeline for the research project? Is the proposal appropriately considering all relevant risks? Are limitations clearly considered? Does the project plan clearly demonstrate the responsibilities of applicant(s) and UEFA Medical & Anti-Doping? 	
2.2	Human resources, expertise, and collaborations Criteria for scoring	Score (range 0-4)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well does the scientific expertise of the applicant(s) or supervisory team for PhD candidates fit the project proposal? Are all required skills and resources either in-house or available through external collaborations? Is there substantial expertise demonstrated through applicant(s) or supervisory team for PhD candidates? 	

3	Responsible Science	
3.1	Responsible Science Criteria for scoring	Score (range 0-4)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the number of participants used in the study justified? Is, if applicable, a power calculation included? Has diversity and inclusion been considered? Is the handling of sensitive data explained and does it align with current standards? 	
3.2	Societal effect and impact of project Criteria for scoring	Score (range 0-4)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will is the likely social effect of the project described? How well have the principles of sustainable development been considered? Does the impact strategy clearly target key stakeholders? 	



MEDICAL

UEFA Medical & Anti-Doping Research Grant Programme

Evaluation Sheet 2nd Stage

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Is the impact strategy achievable (with reasonable support from UEFA Medical & Anti-Doping)	
4	Summary assessment of project	
4.1	Main strengths	
	<i>Please list 2-3 points</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•••	
4.2	Main limitations	
	<i>Please list 2-3 points</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">••	
4.3	Concluding remarks	
	Please provide concluding remarks for applicant (2-3 sentences)	
	Cumulative score	Single applicant /24