**Proposal Review Report**

**Proposal ID**:

**Proposal title**:

**Proposal Coordinator:**

**Overall evaluation**

Short summary of the evaluation (3-4 lines)

**Strengths**

* List strenghts

**Weaknesses**

* List weak aspects

**Scientific Merit**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Score****(0-100)** | **Weighting Factor** | **Weighted Score** |
| Significance |  | 0.30 |  |
| Approach |  | 0.20 |  |
| Innovation |  | 0.25 |  |
| Feasibility |  | 0.25 |  |
|  | **Total** |  |

**Scientific Merit** (scoring range 0-100)

* Excellent  100 - 91 points
* Very Good  90 - 76 points
* Good  75 - 61 points
* Fair  60 - 51 points
* Inadequate  50 - 0 points

A minimum threshold of 61 points (Good or higher) and an overall threshold of 71 (Very good or higher) have been applied to select the proposals.

The following sub-criteria has been used in determining the merit score:

***Significance*** (*30%*): Is there a clear, well-grounded and elaborated scientific justification and motivation provided in the proposal? Are the scientific objectives, research questions and hypotheses clearly formulated? Does the proposed study address an important problem or challenge? If the aims of the study are achieved, will this benefit the advancement of scientific knowledge? Will the outcome of the study have an important impact on the concepts, methods, or products that drive this field of research?

***Approach*** *(25%):* Are the conceptual framework, design, methods, and analyses adequately developed, well integrated, and appropriate to the aims of the project? Does the present proposal build upon a successful foundation of previous studies? Is the proposed approach likely to yield the desired results? Does the applicant acknowledge risks and provide mitigation?

***Innovation*** (*20%*): Does the project employ novel concepts, approaches, or methods? Is the scientific proposal novel? Are the aims original and innovative? Will the project result in a significant advancement of science by challenging existing paradigms or develop new methodologies or technologies?

***Feasibility*** (*25%*): Does the scientific team have the appropriate level of experience? Are there sufficient and appropriate personnel dedicated to the project? Is there evidence of the science team’s satisfactory productivity and scientific track record? Has the team demonstrated experience with irradiation facilities? Does the amount of requested hours fits with the experimental plan?