



MEDICAL

UEFA Medical Research Grant Programme (UEFA MRGP)

Evaluation Sheet 2nd stage

Applicant's name:

Title of research proposal:

Reviewer:

The Jury members will evaluate each of the research proposals using the following criteria:

- 0 = this item scores 'unacceptable'
- 1 = this item of the proposal is weak
- 2 = this item of the proposal is adequate
- 3 = this item of the proposal is good
- 4 = this item of the proposal is excellent

An average individual proposal will be scored between 13-16 points. Individual proposals will be categorised per scores as follows:

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

An average joint proposal will be scored between 13-17 points. Joint proposals will be categorised per scores as follows:

- 0-4 = the proposal is 'unacceptable'
- 5-8 = the proposal is very weak
- 9-12 = the proposal is weak
- 13-17 = the proposal is adequate
- 18-22 = the proposal is good
- 23-27 = the proposal is very good
- 28-32 = the proposal is excellent

1 Quality of research (x2)			
1.1	Scientific quality, novelty and innovativeness of research	Score x2 (0 – 4)	Comments
	Criteria for scoring <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How convincing does the project seem?• Is the project description comprehensive and strong?• Are the research questions, objectives and hypotheses well formulated and justified?• Is the state-of-the-art in the respective research area well described?• How high does the scientific impact of the project seem?		



MEDICAL

UEFA Medical Research Grant Programme (UEFA MRGP)

Evaluation Sheet 2nd stage

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the application outline novel research that may lead to exceptionally significant outcomes and has potential to change our view on it's respective area? 		
1.2	Competence and expertise of applicant	Score (0 – 4)	Comments
	<p>Criteria for scoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How promising is the applicant? How strong is track record of the applicant at the stage of their career? Is the applicant a relatively early-career researcher placed in a wide international network of relevant researchers? Is the applicant is in the process of setting up a research team / already have experience of research project management / leading a research team? Is the applicant is an expert in a certain field and has an outstanding record of achievement in these areas? Does the project support the applicant's independence and career progress? Does the applicant show promise, international competitiveness and capacity for renewal? Does the applicant's previous mobility support the proposal? Is there a doubt they can thrive in the new research environment? 		
Total Score "Quality of research"			
2 Implementation			
2.1	Feasibility of research plan	Score (0 – 4)	Comments
	<p>Criteria for scoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the provided preliminary data / the infrastructure at the site of research support the feasibility of the project? Does / Do the author(s) clearly explain how each hypothesis will be tested? Is the research plan very well thought out, including the methods? Are the methods well supported? Does an outstanding figure provide a clear idea of synergies and the logical flow of the proposal? Does the application include well planned division of resources to complete the project with? Is the proposal appropriately considering all the relevant risks? Are the limitations clearly imposed by the applicant? Does the management plan include a clear description of overall responsibility for the activities? 		
2.2	Human resources, expertise, and collaborations	Score (0 – 4)	Comments



MEDICAL

UEFA Medical Research Grant Programme (UEFA MRGP)

Evaluation Sheet 2nd stage

	<p>Criteria for scoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well does the scientific expertise of the applicant and their team fit the project proposal? • Are all required expertise and resources either in-house, or available through external contributors? • Does / Do the applicant(s) have / has an extensive track record and the publications of the applicant clearly demonstrate an ability to target high quality research? • Is there a substantive experience in supervisory and research project management roles? • Is the list of national and international collaborators strong and brings the necessary range of expertise in the different fields of research? • Is the mobility plan is well justified and creates unique training and networking opportunities for the early career researchers in this project? 		
2.2.1	If applicable: Research consortium	Score (0 – 4)	Comments
	<p>Criteria for scoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The added value of the consortium parties comes from ... • The links between the consortium parties are complementary, and it is unlikely such an ambitious research plan could be achieved without this consortium. 		
Total score "Implementation"			
3 Responsible science			
3.1	Responsible science	Score (0 – 4)	Comments
	<p>Criteria for scoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have responsible science aspects been explained and thoroughly addressed? • Are the number of animals/patients used in the study justified? • Are power calculations included? • Are gender balance / equality aspects considered? • Is the handling of sensitive data explained in detail and according to the current standard? 		
3.2	Societal effects and impact of project	Score (0 – 4)	Comments
	<p>Criteria for scoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well are the social effects described? • How well have the principles of sustainable development been considered? 		
Total score "Responsible science"			



MEDICAL

UEFA Medical Research Grant Programme (UEFA MRGP)

Evaluation Sheet 2nd stage

4	Summary assessment of project		
4.1	Main strengths and their justifications:		
	Please provide here <u>main strengths</u> of the application and their justifications.		
4.2	Main weaknesses and their justifications:		
	Please provide here <u>main weaknesses</u> of the application and their justifications.		
4.3	Concluding remarks		
	Please provide here your <u>concluding remarks</u> on the application.		
	Cumulative Score		
	Average score (Cumulative score / 6 or / 7 if joint application)		