Net4Mobility+

Network of the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Action National Contact Points for the mobile scientific and innovation community

Marie Skłodowska-Curie Individual Fellowships (IF) 2017 Evaluation Summary Reports Analysis *(ST-CAR-RI-GF Panels)*

Task 3.1: MSCA Evolution Guide
Issued by: TÜBİTAK - Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey
Issued data: 20 June 2018
Work Package Leader: InnovationAuth

N4M+ project is receiving funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the grant agreement No 785632

Table of Content

1. Introduction

This document has been prepared by Marie Skłodowska Curie Actions (MSCA) National Contact Points (NCPs) of Turkey, Belarus, Bulgaria, Egypt, Greece, Iceland and Israel working together under N4M+ project to show the MSCA Individual Fellowships (IF)[1] applicants the crucial points noted by the evaluators on the "Evaluation Summary Reports - ESRs".

"Evaluation Summary Reports-ESRs" of the project proposals submitted to the H2020 - MSCA – IF – 2017 call have been taken into account during the preparation of this document. Due to the huge number of ESRs available, NCPs had to choose some of them by creating a pool with different scores. 210 ESRs from Standard Panel (ST), 30 ESRs from Career Restart Panel (CAR), 100 ESRs from Global Fellowships Panel (GF) and 40 ESRs from Reintegration Panel (RI) have been analysed in this document. (For the analysis of 60 ESRs from Society and Enterprise Panel (SE) a separate document has been prepared.)

During the preparation of this analysis document, NCPs:

- copied and pasted "the strengths" and "the weaknesses" under different titles for each evaluation criteria of MSCA-IF which are: 1) Excellence; 2) Impact; 3) Implementation;
- deleted the specific names or scientific topics;
- kept most of the field specific notes (such as a specific health, technology, science terms) in order to show the applicants the real comments of the evaluators so that they might assume the same strengths and weaknesses could be similarly noted in their own research field as well;
- tried to note the most frequent comments of the evaluators (However, very specific ones have also been noted in order to show the applicants how important to provide "to the point information" under each section);
- have noted in parenthesis as (ST) or (GF) or (CAR) or (RI) at the end of each comment to mention from which panel this comment has been taken (note: a comment taken from any panel might serve to all panel applications);

Some of the **"strengths and weaknesses"** may have similar meanings but intentionally noted. This does not mean that they are more important than the others. This only means that they are written by different evaluators by using some other words with similar meanings.

[1] For further information about H2020 MSCA IF calls: https://ec.europa.eu/research/mariecurieactions/

With this document, NCPs wish to underline some hints that cannot be seen in the Evaluation Criteria given under the third title of this document. With those **"strengths and weaknesses"** NCPs aim at showing the applicants what the evaluators are really caring about during the evaluation process, of course according to the instructions given by the European Commission.

2. General Information on Evaluation Procedures

It is well noted in **"Guide for Applicants of H2020 – MSCS – IF – 2018 call on page 22-23-24"**:

Proposals are submitted in a single stage and evaluated in one step. The evaluation of proposals is carried out by the REA with the assistance of independent experts. REA (Research Executive Agency) staff ensures that the process is fair and in line with the principles contained in the Commission's rules on Proposal submission and evaluation and the relevant sections of the MSCA Work Programme.

Experts perform evaluations on a personal basis, not as representatives of their employer, their country or any other entity. They are required to be independent, impartial and objective, and to behave throughout in a professional manner. They sign an expert contract, including a declaration of confidentiality and absence of conflict of interest, before beginning their work. Confidentiality rules must be adhered to at all times before, during and after the evaluation.

In each of the **eight scientific areas (panels)** a **Chairperson** ("**Chair**"), assisted by several **Vice-Chairs** (depending on the size of the panel) will assist REA staff with the management of the evaluation. **Chairs** and **Vice-Chairs** are distinguished members of the scientific community who do not evaluate proposals. Their tasks include the following: finalizing the **assignment of three experts** to each proposal, providing guidance to **evaluators**, checking the quality and consistency of the experts' reports, attending the panel review meetings to endorse the final ranked lists of proposals for funding. In addition, an **independent observer** will be appointed by the REA to observe and report on the evaluation process. The observer gives feedback and advice to the REA and the European Commission on the conduct and fairness of the evaluation sessions, on the way in which the experts apply the evaluation criteria, and on ways in which the procedures could be improved. The **observer** does not take part in the evaluation and will not express views on the proposals under examination or on the experts' opinions on the proposals.

Under the terms of their contract, all experts must declare beforehand any known conflicts of interest, and must immediately inform the responsible REA staff member if they detect a conflict of interest during the course of the evaluation. The expert contract also requires experts to maintain strict confidentiality with respect to the whole evaluation process. They must follow any instruction given by the REA to ensure this. Under no circumstance may an expert attempt to contact an applicant on his/her own account, either during the evaluation or afterwards.

Each proposal will be assessed independently by at least **three experts**. For each proposal one expert will be designated as the "**rapporteur**" and will assume additional responsibilities in the evaluation phase (drafting of Consensus report, moderation of the remote consensus, implementation of comments from the Vice-Chairs). The proposals will be evaluated against the **MSCA-IF award criteria** applying weighting factors, both set out in the Work Programme. Proposals are evaluated remotely. Evaluation scores will be awarded for each of the three criteria (see table below). All of the separate elements of each criterion will be considered by the experts in their assessment.

3. Evaluation Criteria for MSCA-IF-2018 Call

IF - Marie Skłodowska-Curie Individual Fellowships		
Excellence	**Impact**	**Quality and efficiency of the implementation**
Quality and credibility of the research/innovation project; level of novelty, appropriate consideration of inter/multidisciplinary and gender aspects	Enhancing the future career prospects of the researcher after the fellowship	Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources
Quality and appropriateness of the training and of the two way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host	Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results	Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures, including risk management
Quality of the supervision and of the integration in the team/institution	Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the project activities to different target audiences	Appropriateness of the institutional environment (infrastructure)
Potential of the researcher to reach or re-enforce professional maturity/independence during the fellowship		
50%	**30%**	**20%**
Weighing		
1	**2**	**3**
Priority in case of *ex aequo*		
NB: An overall threshold of 70% will be applied to the total weighted score.		

In MSCA - IF, proposals will normally be evaluated by one of **eight 'main evaluation panels'**: Chemistry **(CHE)**, Social Sciences and Humanities **(SOC)**, Economic Sciences **(ECO)**, Information Science and Engineering **(ENG)**, Environment and Geosciences **(ENV)**, Life Sciences **(LIF)**, Mathematics **(MAT)**, Physics **(PHY)**.

For IF, there are – in addition to the main evaluation panels – **three separate multidisciplinary panels:** Society and Enterprise Panel **(SE)**, Career Restart Panel **(CAR)** and the Reintegration Panel **(RI)**.

The distribution of the indicative budget of the call will be proportional to the number of eligible proposals received in each panel, except where a specific budget for a multidisciplinary panel has been fixed in the call. However, there is a higher weighting for the proposals of the IF Career Restart Panel **(CAR)** and the IF Reintegration Panel **(RI)**. During the budget distribution, the **CAR** eligible proposals will have a weighting of 2 times the weighting of the eligible proposals in the other panels. The same applies to **RI**, except the weighting will be 1.5 times higher than normal. If the budget allocated to any panel exceeds the requirements of all proposals positively evaluated in that panel, the excess budget will be reallocated to the other panels based on the distribution as above. Equally, if the allocated funding to a panel is insufficient to fund the highest ranked proposal in that panel, the necessary budget will be transferred from the other panels based on the distribution as above, in order to ensure that the highest ranked proposal can be funded. In order to ensure budget optimisation and an equitable success rate across panels, the excess budget remaining after the initial allocation of funding to the proposals in the panels may be transferred between panels.

4. Contact information of Net4Mobility+ Project

Please do not hesitate to contact us for further information about this document via contact details of Turkey, Belarus, Bulgaria, Egypt, Greece, Iceland and Israel Marie Skłodowska Curie Actions (MSCA) National Contact Points which are available on http://net4mobilityplus.eu

5. Comments of Evaluators to various proposals submitted to ST, GF, CAR and RI Panels:

Please find them below separately under **"strengths" and "weaknesses"** titles for each evaluation criterion and sub-criterion:

Criterion 1 – Excellence

Strengths:

Quality and credibility of the research/innovation action (state-of-the-art, research methodology and approach, research programme, interdisciplinarity aspects of the action etc.)

- The objectives are well presented against the state-of-the-art and involve novel concepts and clear advances in the field. (ST)
- The project is highly innovative, with unprecedented experiments integrating replication and metabolism in a chemical system. If successful, it will open up new lines of research in Systems Chemistry. (ST)
- The project is innovative and its scientific contribution is expected to make a significant advance in the research field considered. (ST)
- The methodology is clearly presented, suitable for the objectives of the project and appropriate controls are included to ensure the significance of the results. (ST)
- Project objectives are clearly defined and the proposed research methodology is appropriate and credible. The authors rely on preliminary results and previous expertise of both the host group and the researcher. (ST)
- The project is interdisciplinarity in its concept: the academic laboratory studies in the field of organic synthesis are combined with approaches practiced in chemical industry. (ST)
- The preliminary results validate the feasibility of the proposed methodology, which potentially opens new avenues in the synthesis of various heterocycles in unconventional ways. (ST)
- The state-of-the-art in the field and the timeliness of the proposed research are adequately defined, by focusing on the latest achievements and their limitations, and compared to the proposed results. (ST)
- The project combines a range of scientific synthesis methods, which are comprehensively described, planned and explained. (ST)
- Novel concepts in chemical design are well identified and innovative aspects has been justified. (ST)
- The research objectives are coherent and clearly defined. (ST)
- İnnovative character with respect to the state-of-the-art is discussed in a very good way. Also, there is good level of multidisciplinarity. (ST)
- The research methodology and approach are appropriate; both lab scale and pilot scale experiments are considered to ensure that the developed technology will have real applications. (ST)
- The project well complements the researcher's existing knowledge and will extend it further in the area of expertise at the host research group. (ST)
- The proposed research will open up the career possibilities for the researcher in both academia and industry.
- The proposal contains a good state-of-the-art description and convincingly demonstrates the need for a better device as proposed in the project aimed at early cancer detection. (ST)
- The proposal is highly multidisciplinary covering many areas of science including chemistry, engineering, biology, and medicine. (ST)
- The proposed research addresses an emerging social need. (ST)
- The state of the art is clearly presented and defines unresolved issues in the field of epigenetics. (ST)
- The topic of the research proposal is highly relevant. (ST)
- The state-of-the-art on the use of inks in inkjet printing is well summarized; the need of water-born dyes along with good printability and long term stability is well explained. Considering the current market and the use of dyes with organic solvents, developing such waterborne BCP dyes may help to reduce VOCs use in the packaging industry. (ST)
- The main goal is of good added-value. (ST)
- The researcher has clearly identified the positive role that DFT calculations can provide for this project. (ST)
- The proposal addresses an important research target, important both for science and society, the development

of simple and reliable gas sensors. Hereby, the application intended represents an innovative approach. (ST)

- The proposal is timely and relevant to the EU strategic areas such as sustainable feedstock and resources using dearomatisation strategy. (ST)
- The project represents an innovative synthetic challenge that can lead to a significant industrial application. (ST)
- The project is well-written with an excellent background and the state of the art. (ST)
- The objectives of the action are well defined. Studying the creation/destruction process of sulfur-containing molecules with simulations is a valid scientific target. (ST)
- The importance of the proposed topic is well justified. (ST)
- The global challenges and drivers for the research in the area are well-summarized. (ST)
- The proposal presents a subject of significant interest both to the local region as well as the European Union. (ST)
- The candidate proposes both short and long term goals. The scientific skills that the candidate will obtain during the fellowship have been identified. (ST)
- The proposal is focused on an interesting topic such as the understanding of the role of metallodrugs in cancer therapy and it very clearly describes the state-of-the-art of some particular metal-based drugs objective of this project. (ST)
- The overall research methodology is appropriate, consistent with the expected goals and adequately detailed, including some background explanations that illustrate the various practical steps that will be carried out.
- The project shows high level of multidisciplinarity related to the subject, characterization techniques and approach. (ST)
- The state-of-the-art is fully described and well referenced. The current challenges and issues in the field are identified and solutions to solve them are proposed. (ST)
- The need for this fundamental research is well argued by a comprehensive analysis of the current state-of-the-art, the remaining challenges and the potential future applications. (ST)
- A straight-forward and very convincing research methodology is presented. (ST)
- The proposed research is multi-disciplinary and this aspect is well demonstrated in the proposal. (ST)
- The project addresses a challenging research problem; the research objectives are clear and ambitious. (ST)
- The proposal is highly innovative, merging interesting concepts for wearable high-performance supercapacitors, built on a very well presented state of the art and relevant partners. (ST)
- The proposal is highly multidisciplinary, covering a large range of fields to maximize the knowledge and the success rate, and combining various scientific topics. The interdisciplinarity and intersectoral character of the research is well articulated. (ST)
- The open problems to be addressed are well identified from a suitable analysis of the state-of-the-art. (ST)
- The presentation of the research approach through the game proposed, describes how the research is going to be carried out with a suitable level of detail. (ST)
- The proposal shows multidisciplinary aspects by addressing several scientific areas such as e-commerce, operational research, logistics planning, operations management. (ST)
- The proposal has an extremely interdisciplinarity character, bringing together knowledge from several specialists. (ST)
- An appropriate degree of interdisciplinarity by linking microbiology and crop sciences is evident. (ST)
- Although very complex, this proposal is well elaborated, embedding the research questions into the current knowledge and choosing appropriate approaches to tackle the specific questions. (ST)
- The researcher lays down a logical pathway for the success of the project and sufficiently described the interdisciplinarity approaches focused on the biophysics/mass-spectrometry and the other devoted to structure, which link well together. Alternative approaches are discussed. (ST)
- Gender aspects are well taken into account as individuals from both sexes are included as participants.
- The Applicant will also acquire project management and grant writing skills that will be of use when embarking on a career as an independent researcher. (ST)
- The proposal clearly identifies key gender-related aspects of the proposed work, and considers these in line with current guidelines. (ST)
- The field is introduced thoroughly and adequately; this includes the state-of-the-art with sufficient detail. Consecutive objectives of the project are clearly defined and go beyond the state-of-the-art. (ST)
- This is an excellent project featuring a strong and convincing mix between functional analysis, mathematical physics, and fundamental problems in quantum mechanics. (ST)
- The proposal is very innovative and timely, as it represents a research field that is a recent addition to academia. (ST)
- The proposal includes a concise and consistent state of the art, which is a good starting point for further

research. (ST)
- The researcher presents a coherent and relevant set of goals and an innovative comparative strategy for achieving them. (ST)
- Gender issues are taken into account in the design of the study. (ST)
- The proposed research-topic deals with an issue that is relevant for both society and several research fields. The level of novelty is promising and potentially high. (ST)
- The relationship between the research and the state-of-the-art is clearly articulated; major sources and several high-grade recent studies are taken into due consideration. (ST)
- The proposal briefly but convincingly states the interdisciplinarity commitment of the research project. (ST)
- Clear formulation on how the project is going to contribute to, in particular, the explanatory factors that are appropriate for an analysis of the conditions under which parliaments play a role. (ST)
- The project addresses a timely, important and understudied theme that has global relevance. It is also important from a theoretical and policy-making point of view in the framework of the EU. (ST)
- Quality and credibility of the research action in terms of the level of novelty is high: the project will combine the training possibility of executive functions using computer games, with an aim to ameliorate the effects of intellectual disabilities (ID), by using brain research methods (EEG and fNIRS) as outcome measures. (GF)
- Gender aspects are documented to a sufficient degree with regard to the organizational principles of the beneficiary well as the participants and their gender. (GF)
- This project is innovative in some approaches, particularly in the systems approach proposed following a plant-pollinator-herbivore interactions analysis and further development of joint species distribution models. (GF)
- The research objectives are described clearly and in a well-integrated way. The plans for digitisation and networking are extensive and accord with international standards. (GF)
- The research action is of the highest scientific quality in terms of its solid theoretical framework, limpid research questions and operational hypotheses, and the importance of the phenomenon under study (trust/cooperation) for understanding social life. The proposal clearly defines the methodology and approach to trust-based cooperation via experimental study. (GF)
- İnnovative aspects of the project concern relations between trust, sharing and fairness, within an evolutionary and developmental approach. İnterdisciplinary aspects are credible and appropriate, at the intersection of psychology, biology, philosophy and economics. (GF)
- The novelty of the proposal lies in the subject matter; it is giving a new light to the relevant cultural sources and neglected aspects of this rich cultural heritage. (GF)
- The topic is innovative and cutting edge. It brings to light the importance of the underestimated role of collective memory and myths in the process of the collapse of the Soviet Union. (GF)
- The project is based on multiple source materials in several languages in different archives. (GF)
- The proposed research is of high quality as it builds on previous research; it has realistic objectives and is clearly focused. (GF)
- Science knowledge building community and creating design principles. During the in- and out-going phase different adequate samples in different countries will be investigated. The research approach includes qualitative and quantitative methods. (GF)
- The overall quality of the project is very good; it presents a very good overview of the current knowledge and of the novelty component of the proposed research. The project has clear novelty aspects, by addressing the eco-physiological challenges of a migrant with an extreme strategy using state of the art approaches. (GF)
- The research is innovating, as it focuses on an under-researched topic, and investigate from a new point of view the complex entanglement between national and transnational, non-governmental and state institutions. (GF)
- The proposal has very ambitious goals focusing on poorly-known aspects of early human diets and technologies. (GF)
- The research methodology and approach are excellent and justify the use of presented technologies. The researcher's intercontinental activity is thoroughly planned and justified. (GF)
- İnterdisciplinary aspects are appropriately considered, with the project combining expertise from domains of geography, sociology and gender. (GF)
- The research methodology clearly explains the idea and the steps to be taken with a well-presented rationale for doing the research. (GF)
- The outgoing host offers an exceptional research environment, combining scientists and clinicians, and offers opportunities for high quality interdisciplinarity research. (GF)
- The state-of-the-art description provides an excellent overview of the current status of the area, contextualizing the challenging character of the goals. (GF)
- The proposal has excellent level of interdisciplinarity aspects (biology, ecology, computer sciences, anthropology, and environmental sciences). (GF)

- Both institutions (partner and host) have strong interdisciplinarity teams, and the host institution has arranged ways to promote the transition between the outgoing and returning phase (i.e. a seminar). (GF)
- The applicant presents an interesting conceptualization of the airport space and its relationship to the body. A comprehensive account of the state of the art is presented. The proposal makes competent use of concepts from different disciplinary fields, demonstrating a commitment to interdisciplinarity. (GF)
- The state-of-the-art is described very well, providing numerous references to the most critical publications on the topic. (GF)
- The research methodology is accurately described for each work package. The approach is outlined in terms of realistic tasks and goals supporting the credibility of the project. (GF)
- The project is very timely and novel, addressing a new frontier for paleontological research, by using an original approach merging geography and mathematical algorithms for the estimation of extinct animal occurrences. (GF)
- The excellent and complementary qualifications and experience of the outgoing and incoming host supervisors very well match the interdisciplinarity field of research of the proposed action and provide very good ground for transfer of knowledge to the researcher, which is clearly listed in the proposal. (GF)
- The state of the art is well argued, convincingly demonstrating the researcher's familiarity with the field and the current academic debates, and identifying the gaps in the existing literature. (GF)
- The proposal is timely, innovative, and is credibly built on know-how available at the host institutions, the outgoing phase is clear and realistic. (GF)
- The project is innovative, interesting and relevant. It will use a novel combination of methodologies to pioneer the study of a biological problem with clinical implications. The project is comprehensively presented and the specific research objectives are clear and credible. The working hypothesis is supported by a number of experimental evidences. (GF)
- Methods are well planned, the presented combination of quantitative and qualitative tools is convincing. Also, the extent of work is well specified. (GF)
- The objectives and overview of the action are very well addressed. The research project discusses at length and explicitly its scope and is excellently placed in a broader discussion on xxx. (GF)
- The proposed case studies are appropriately selected on the basis of adequate criteria. (GF)
- While gender is not relevant for this proposal, with regard to sex, the researcher will match equal numbers of female and male animals (GF)
- The research project focuses on a target organism for which the outgoing host institution has profound expertise, data, samples and facilities for carrying out experiments (dedicated ponds), thereby increasing the likelihood of success. (GF)
- The proposal specifies how the main research objectives will be achieved. (GF)
- The research contains elements of originality in that it aims to bridge two distinct areas of research which are not often addressed in combination. (GF)
- The overall research approach is well thought and it is appropriate to meet the identified research objectives. (CAR)
- The proposal presents very well the topic and existing literature, highlighting the necessity of a complex approach of the subject and combining xxxx approach and the study of xxxx. (CAR)
- The proposed theoretical and practical approaches (a combination of xxxx and xxxx research) respond very well to the questions raised by the existing literature. The question of xxxx and its impact on or interference with xxxx and subjectivity at xxxx level is highly relevant, innovative and interesting. (CAR)
- The proposed mixture of quantitative and qualitative methods will enrich the project and provide a more complete, nuanced answer. (CAR)
- The project is innovative and original, as it introduces a novel approach and considers an interesting emerging field in business economics. (ST)
- The proposal convincingly proves the originality in focusing on team perspective in entrepreneurial actions in Chinese start-ups which is an interesting research direction. (ST)
- The proposal addresses a relevant and timely research area for the EU, namely developing information-theoretic measures of regularity and predictability in fitness behavior which can be used as new measures of habits that better predict future retention. (ST)
- The state-of-art makes a comprehensive overview of the literature, a compelling argument for the importance of the subject. (CAR)
- The proposal adequately describes its research goals and questions. It convincingly conveys that the action would address a novel and so far understudied research object, with an original focus on understudied languages and cross-linguistic comparison. The description of the state of the art is sufficient given the project goals. (CAR)

- The interdisciplinarity of the project is adequately explained by referring to the different disciplines involved (from social sciences to computer sciences). (ST)
- The proposal addresses a cross-cutting interdisciplinarity topic between health and labour economics. (CAR)
- The interdisciplinarity aspects are well articulated and provide a credible justification for the secondment. (ST)
- Data-collection is excellently and thoroughly considered and adequate. Interdisciplinarity is excellently argued. (CAR)
- The proposal covers a wide area in the legal domain (tax law, international private and public law, internet law) and links to the technological infrastructures that allows certain business models to arise, thereby showing interdisciplinarity. (CAR)
- The research objectives of the proposal are original and innovative in light of the background of the researchers' previous work. (ST)
- The researcher proposes a very interesting critical insight into the literature on the so-called migration crisis, promising to nourish rich debates. While "buffer zones" at the EU external borders have been largely investigated particularly in concomitance with the EU enlargements, there are internal "buffer zones" that deserve further attention from researchers and policymakers. (CAR)
- The novelty of the proposed project is adequately explained by linking it to the four objectives of the project. (ST)
- The methodology is properly discussed and represented by lab experiments which correctly enable experimenters to control all the factors effective on participants' strategic interactions and using incentives. (ST)
- The topic is a relevant one to study, and the proposal gives reason to trust that the proposed research has not previously been undertaken, which ensures its originality. (CAR)
- The proposal described a combination of a variety of techniques to facilitate characterisation of the new materials. (CAR)
- The proposal addresses a gap in research into xxx migrant nurse recruitment process by offering a comparative study of practices in three European countries, the selection of which for the study is well-justified. (CAR)
- The research question is pertinent. (ST)
- The project proposal has policy relevance, and has been appropriately linked with the literature and aims to make major contributions. (ST)
- The gender dimension, which is relevant in the data collection phase, is adequately tackled. Specific statistical analysis will be run to discuss the effect of gender on the results. (ST)
- The proposed methodology is novel, combining technical measurements such as heart rate/variability, blood pressure, with qualitative data collection (observations and interviews). (CAR)
- The research methodology and approach, underpinned by the use of a set of state-of-the-art techniques are interdisciplinarity and highly appropriate. Specifically, the approach of co-expressing the fusion protein with neutralizing antibodies is ideally suited to study pre-fusion and intermediate states by cryo-electron microscopy. (RI)
- The proposal describes very well an interesting research on C/Si oxides, which can have an impact on other scientific fields, and specifically on the understanding of the earth structure and the carbon cycle. (RI)
- Objectives and methodology are well presented. The combination of experiments and computer simulations has the potential to push forward the state-of-the-art in high pressure research. Besides the materials science approach, the project also aims at delivering new tools for computer modelling of solids under pressure. (RI)
- The proposal addresses a timely issue from an academic and policy-making point of view. (RI)
- The multidisciplinary and interdisciplinarity aspects of the proposal are outlined, including food science, agriculture science, bioengineering, electric engineering and food quality analysis. (RI)
- The proposal presents clear research objectives, focusing on archaeoacoustics and digital archaeology. These objectives are related to the methodological steps. They all reveal a clear focus on a relevant archaeological site which the researcher has previously researched. (RI)
- Far from being merely incremental, the project proposes to take a significant step further ahead from previous work based on a similar proposal, particularly from a technological viewpoint. (RI)
- The proposal is both innovative and multidisciplinary, as it involves a stimulating balance of in-depth knowledge in the field of archaeology, epigraphy, as well as an updated experience in the field of acoustics. The research methodology and approach are very promising using archaeoacoustics and virtual3D reconstruction. (RI)
- The beneficial side-effects on the environment, i.e. seaweed utilisation and invasive plant reduction is seen as a plus. (RI)
- The proposal will be potentially instrumental in the initiation and increasing the attractiveness of a new interdisciplinarity Center of Excellence on building energy efficiency and green building design at the host

institution as the researcher will bring new competences needed for establishing the center in the host organisation. (RI)
- The research planned is interesting and credible, because the issue to be addressed (an analysis of the work and impact of UNSR), the aspects to be studied (such as advocacy and policy-making), and expected results are clearly delineated and traceable. (RI)
- The proposal clearly addresses timely and important issues, with an innovative approach to explore the impact of ART on households. The project builds on the expertise that has been developed through past research. (RI)
- The placement of the project as compared to the state-of-the-art in the field is well defined and specific research aims are well formulated. The choice of the model system is appropriately motivated, and rationales and proposed experiments are clearly explained, which makes the proposal credible. (RI)
- The researcher's intention to innovate the state of the art is very credible, especially in the application of recently declassified data that allow for a very long time series. The research will enable and help other researchers to use a unique new data source. (RI)
- The research methodology and approach for addressing the research aims of the action are well justified and innovative with clear interdisciplinarity aspects via the integration of cellular, molecular, and murine biology. (RI)
- The proposal develops an interesting topic, investigating the balance between masculinities and femininities in a gendered perspective, focusing particularly how traits are adopted across genders by youth. (RI)
- The proposal is planned in a cleverly restricted interdisciplinarity fashion. The proposed study of the mechanical properties and plasticity of the islands with the optical tweezers is a creative step forward towards interdisciplinarity applications. It is expected to be of interest to wider community, outside colloid science. A benchmarking of the proposed experimental work to existing theory and simulation results is planned.(RI)
- The proposed research is ambitious in its scale (cross-sectional and longitudinal, multi-level analyses, multiple research sites) and sufficiently presents interdisciplinarity aspects. (RI)
- There is a complete and detailed state-of-the art, and the progress beyond the present knowledge is well identified by pointing out what the proposal could bring; a comprehensive reference list is included. (RI)
- The proposal is original and will very plausibly generate innovative knowledge on the subject. (RI)
- The gender aspects are pervasive of the whole proposal and outlined in depth. The researcher would put light on the gender relations in the leadership by socio-psychological research, appropriately combined with gender studies to form interdisciplinarity approach in epistemology and methodology of the action research activities. (RI)
- The topic is novel and timely, concerning a field not yet investigated in detail with likely implications in several neurological conditions. (RI)
- The literature review is up to date and brings together several different novel questions. (RI)
- The proposed methodology includes machine learning methods based on artificial intelligence to process remote underwater video surveys and drone-based surveys. It presents a very good level of novelty with respect to common techniques already in use and is consistent with the data to be collected and studied. (RI)
- The methodology in general is plausible, as it includes longitudinal data collection, which would result in the open database. The online survey was appropriately chosen to gather data on mobile populations. (RI)

Quality and appropriateness of the training and of the two way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host (including secondments)

- The previous experience of the researcher matches perfectly the objectives of the project, and previous knowledge will be incorporated into the project research plan. Furthermore, the researcher will also get into a new field of study. (ST)
- High quality training for the researcher and high quality knowledge transfer from the host to the researcher are foreseen in the project. The researcher will be trained in skills in replicator chemistry, a wider variety of new analytical techniques and kinetic simulation software. (ST)
- A wide range of complementary training (official programme for scientific staff, project management skills, leadership skills, supervising MSc and PhD students, waste management, etc.) is planned at the host institution. (ST)
- The quality of the training of the fellow is directly related to the proposed project and includes enhancing technical experience on engineering applications (agrochemistry) but also on data interpretation and transferable skills in innovation, enterprise and commercialization. The fellow will build a network of international relationships with the help of the supervisor. (ST)
- The fact that the industry partner is involved is very positive given the application-oriented goals of the project.

The 4-months secondment period will be a great opportunity for the applicant to have an experience of doing research in industry. (ST)

- The transfer of knowledge from the researcher to the host organization is sound. (ST)
- The collaborative opportunities offered by the host will open new possibilities for the career prospects of the researcher. (ST)
- The proposal matches the previous scientific training and current skills of the researcher. The transfer of knowledge for the development of the researcher is clearly explained and is justified. (ST)
- The host will transfer the knowledge in the field of synthetic chemistry, as well as the needs of industrial partners. (ST)
- The host will benefit from the knowledge and skills of the applicant, particularly in view of his previously acquired dual experience in academic and pharmaceutical industrial settings. (ST)
- The project and collaboration with internationally recognized research groups provides very good prerequisites for opening the career possibilities for the researcher. (ST)
- The transfer of knowledge and training objectives from the host to the researcher are very well defined and include all aspects of research training (scientific training, complementary skills, transferable skills). (ST)
- A clear plan for transferring the researcher's knowledge to the host group is presented. (ST)
- The two way transfer of knowledge is feasible and convincingly presented. The researcher has a solid background in materials/photocatalysts while the host has a sound experience in analytical techniques and reactor design. (ST)
- The researcher will gain new knowledge during the fellowship at the host organization in the fields of chemical manipulation and analysis of DNA. The training process will be efficiently supported by the established collaborative contacts with specialists of synthetic chemistry. (ST)
- The proposal offers the potential for an effective two way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host group. The secondment will help to develop cross-disciplinary skills and intersectoral transfer of knowledge. (ST)
- The researcher will train host laboratory students in X-ray crystallography. (ST)
- Training in a third laboratory and the interest of such collaboration are appropriately described and justified. (ST)
- The knowledge transfer from the host to the researcher is well described and the researcher brings valuable knowledge from previous experiences and institutes in the same area.The resulting mutual knowledge transfer in complementary fields will create an added value. (ST)
- The support and guidance at the institution to deal with the practical, administrative and career-related aspects of the fellowship are evident from the proposal. (ST)
- The transfer of knowledge to the host organisation is of good quality. Both laboratories involved will benefit from the researcher’s knowledge in IPC and their structural behaviour as well as from his practical skills in utilization of IPC electrolytes in rechargeable batteries. (ST)
- The proposal clearly shows how the researcher's expertise will complement the training in an array of new techniques. (ST)
- The researcher training program covers a wide range of techniques and subjects. (ST)
- The researcher will acquire experience of supervision teaching which will be of value for a future academic career. (ST)
- The researcher will transfer his special expertise in NMR structural analysis to the host group, which is relevant for the proposed project. (ST)
- The relevant past experience of the ER in organic synthetic chemistry and characterization techniques, has been suitably described. (ST)
- A specific training will be given to the researcher both in terms of research knowledge (new techniques) and soft skills (e.g. teaching, supervising students). The host offers a number of courses which will be made available for the researcher. (ST)
- The researcher will receive hands-on technical and scientific trainings, in particular in some advanced techniques available at large scale facilities. The scientists that will train the applicant are adequately identified and have the necessary expertise to fulfill the training tasks. (ST)
- The knowledge gained by the researcher during the fellowship has been described in good detail, with concrete examples. (ST)
- Objectives and means for training of important soft skills are very convincingly addressed. Training will be

implemented by an excellent mixture between special courses and complementary practical experience in project management, teaching and scientific writing. (ST)

- The professional training opportunities that the fellowship will offer, such as group management and teaching activities, have not been elaborated in the proposal. (ST)
- The planned research will further strengthen the researcher's expertise within the field of inverse problems. (ST)
- Transfer from researcher to host is clearly articulated with concrete strategy. The researcher will be well trained by world-leading Physics of Fluids group on precise topics such as core fluid mechanics topics such as immersed boundary technique and FSI which will be utilised in clinical environment providing very good knowledge and competence on physiology and pathology matters. (ST)
- The two-way transfer is sufficiently demonstrated. The researcher will clearly gain new knowledge on root and rhizosphere analysis, which will complement previous experience, and will also transfer knowledge on a wide range of relevant topics to the host institution. (ST)
- Transfer from the host institution to the researcher is natural both from the scientific point of view and as concerns career development strategies. The proposed training objectives are very well designed and of great relevance for the action and for the researcher. (ST)
- The proposed research reflects a complementary approach between the researcher's previous experience and the research program. (ST)
- pursued in the host laboratory. As a result, the researcher will gain knowledge and learn new techniques from the host lab, which will significantly increase the researcher's skills. (ST)
- The project provides an appropriate addition to the current CV of the researcher, which shows evidence of a productive international track record in science, that is already very relevant for the proposed project and will add to the maturation of the applicant as an independent researcher by providing new skills related to structural biology, and improving the international visibility. (ST)
- How the ER will gain new knowledge from the hosts is adequately presented and comprises knowledge gained from participating in the project, and attending training at the host. The ER will transfer acquired knowledge and skills to the host, complementing their research profile and expertise across different areas of study. (ST)
- The training would involve training-through-research, attendance to courses and collaboration with different team members, and acquisition of transferrable skills including project management and grant writing. (ST)
- The transfer of knowledge to the host is described in detail; the host will surely benefit from the ER's expertise. The ER will join a group working on a model system that is different from ER's background. As a consequence, the ER will have evident scientific benefits from the training received during their stay. (ST)
- The proposed strategy allowing knowledge transfer from host to researcher is very clear and detailed. It identifies interacting players (researchers) and anticipates the respective outcomes, i.e., how such interactions will result in terms of knowledge transfer, advanced training and consolidation of researcher skills and expertise. (ST)
- The secondment is also well described and it has a strong connection to the topic and the supervisor team. (ST)
- The training of the researcher fully encompasses the work packages and the other aspects of the project, for the whole time of the action, and is very clear and sound. (ST)
- Moving to Europe, the researcher will find several recognized leaders in the field of interest. In particular, he will strongly benefit from the host's experience in different fields (laboratory experiments and theory) including in situ Mars exploration (analysis of data from instruments/experiment currently on the Martian soil). The researcher will bring to the host good experience and knowledge of meteorite discovery and weathering. (ST)
- The expertise of the proposal will provide the researcher with a new network of collaborators in another EU country. (ST)
- The researcher has a broad academic experience in different fields which would be brought to the host institution and benefit to the ongoing research there (in particular, competences related to the field of the specific action) (ST)
- Active and appropriate methods for two-way transfer of knowledge are planned.
- Specific training objectives are outlined and descriptions provided of how each objective will be achieved, which include specific training programmers for particular skills and working with named research teams. (GF)
- The presented table comprehensively presents the very well planned transfer, including how the experience in Japan will benefit the work in EU. (GF)
- Quality and appropriateness of the two way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host are well documented: The researcher has a versatile background including programming skills, and the plan for sharing these skills in the host organizations is adequate. (GF)
- There will be a very good two-way transfer of knowledge, the researcher will positively impact on the

knowledge at the hosts related to ecology, evolutionary biology, study system and experience of field work, while receiving training on chemical ecology and advanced statistical modelling. (GF)

- A very detailed plan of training on specific and adequate scientific courses, management, dissemination, communication and on grant proposal preparation is outlined in the proposal being very beneficial for the ER. (GF)
- The explanation of how the researcher will gain new knowledge from the host organisation, including language skills, expertise in US teaching methods and digitisation, is clear and excellent. (GF)
- Transfer of knowledge from the researcher to the beneficiary (incoming phase) is clearly described and appropriate. (GF)
- The researcher describes well the scientific skills reached during the project. (GF)
- The relevance and quality of additional research training, transferable skills, intellectual property management and fostering gender equality are well organized both in the outgoing and return phases and are appropriately demonstrated. (GF)
- There is a clear description of how the researcher will transfer knowledge acquired during the outgoing phase to the host institution and these transfers are translated into deliverables. (GF)
- The fellowship would contribute to enhance collaborative networking between the host institution and the outgoing institution. (GF)
- The training objectives are clearly defined and realistic; the researcher will have the opportunity to acquire novel skills related to training interventions, motion tracking and measurements of neural activity and the host labs have large experience in training and mentoring of postdocs. Moreover, the applicant is already familiar with the host laboratory through working there. (GF)
- The researcher will have good opportunities to transfer their area expertise through seminars, presentations, supervision and teaching. (GF)
- The knowledge and skills acquired in the third country that the researcher will transfer to the host organization in the incoming phase are fully established. The researcher will contribute significantly to bringing American scholarship to the host institution. (GF)
- Training through-research will be effective in both phases, outgoing and incoming, and relevant to the subject. (GF)
- The two way transfer of knowledge plan is very well balanced and far-reaching. It practically leaves not a single area untouched, including research, teaching, networking, training-through-research, acquisition of additional skills and competences (modern technologies and foreign languages between these), career development. (GF)
- The researcher has significant knowledge linked to the PhD research they undertook in one of the case study areas that can be transferred to the international host and secondment institution; the researcher will offer appropriate seminars and research support to host institutions on previously acquired expertise and skills. (GF)
- The proposal includes a solid plan for two-way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the partner institution in the third country. The outgoing phase of the fellowship will enable the researcher to gain high quality skills and knowledge working with leading scholars in the field. This knowledge transfer plan includes specific courses as deliverables. The knowledge transfer from the researcher to the host during the outgoing phase is also plausible. (GF)
- The proposal highlights the relevance of the host institution, underlining the importance of the training for the strengthening of specific skills: Research and teaching, methodology, presentation skills. (GF)
- The researcher's expertise in xxx studies will offer a significant asset for the partner organisation. (GF)
- The researcher would enhance competencies, knowledge, and skills both in the outgoing and the return phases, and the researcher's move between host and partner would imply direct transfer of knowledge. (GF)
- The two way transfer of knowledge between the hosts both in the outgoing phase and incoming phase are well described and convincing. (GF)
- The quality of the return and outgoing hosts in training is very good and supported by the successful participation in several other national and international training initiatives. (GF)
- The actions taken to transfer the new skills and knowledge acquired in the third country to the host institution are appropriate and are discussed in sufficient detail. (GF)
- Appropriate training activities are described that include attendance of courses in entrepreneurship, innovation, management and transferable skills during both the outgoing and the incoming phases of the project. (GF)
- Training activities are very well presented in detailed tables. They are well formulated and appropriate. (GF)
- The EU community will be enriched by the researcher overseas experience, because the acquired competencies and databases will be transferred to a European research community. (GF)
- Transfer of knowledge and skills from the researcher to the host organisation is credible and promising, and

good examples are described in the proposal. The proposal includes a convincing description of how the new skills and knowledge acquired in the third country would be transferred back to the host institution in Europe. (GF)

- The proposal clearly defines a range of training needs, including enhanced knowledge on the topic as well as methodological skills, better teaching capacities, improved language skills, enhancing the publications record, developing dissemination skills, learning European project management etc, which would be viable to reach through training at both host institutions. (GF)
- There is a convincing plan for knowledge transfer from both host institutions to the researcher, which would help the researcher reach the objectives in terms of attaining new desired skills. (GF)
- The complementarity of knowledge/skills of the researcher and participating institutions is very well presented, with mutual benefits for an effective two-way transfer of knowledge. The training through research is credible and promising, including new specific expertise for the researcher. The transfer of knowledge foreseen in the returning phase will make a valuable transmission from Third countries back to the European host institution. (GF)
- There is also comprehensive training in soft skills for the researcher at the outgoing host, relevant for academic success. (GF)
- The transfer of knowledge from the host to the researcher is convincingly described, providing details of the different topics of knowledge learned during the fellowship. The researcher will gain expertise in big-data computing, complex system and urban studies during the outgoing phase and this knowledge will be transferred to the host institution. (GF)
- The proposed training at the outgoing host is very good. The researcher will learn important competences in science and soft skills, and will have the opportunity to build high quality scientific networks. (GF)
- The transfer of knowledge from the researcher to the European host is adequate, with the skills acquired during the outgoing phase clearly being of interest for this beneficiary. (GF)
- The transfer of knowledge from the hosting organizations to the researcher is relevant and can complement their expertise. (GF)
- The transfer of knowledge from the host and partner institutions to the researcher is extensively detailed. Clear scientific training objectives and complementary training objectives are presented and the means to achieve them through research and training activities are made clear. (GF)
- Both the host and the third country institutions are prestigious centres of research and training and will provide the researcher with an excellent scientific environment. (GF)
- The two-way transfer of knowledge is described in a highly concrete manner, and is associated to a feasible plan. (GF)
- The way the researcher will gain new knowledge during the fellowship at the hosting organisations is presented adequately. The proposal includes a minute description of training in the host institution abroad and in the host institution in Europe. (GF)
- A detailed programme concerning research training activities and soft skills is illustrated. This will ensure that the researcher will receive highest quality training both the outgoing and incoming phases of the project. (GF)
- The two-way transfer of knowledge is clear and appropriate. The candidate will share expertise on the prototype developed at the former institution and will acquire knowledge about data analysis and integration at the host institution. (GF)
- An overview and timing of training activities is given in a chart.(CAR)
- The proposal displays an accurate training plan for the researcher such as courses on research instrument or management of intellectual property, which are in line with the skills required for the specific research proposal. (CAR)
- The host institution offers a good array of training opportunities that will be beneficial to the researcher for re-launching an academic career. (CAR)
- The researcher would gain new knowledge and would profit from the xxxx orientations of the researchers within the group. (CAR)
- The mechanisms and avenues for the host institution to gain new knowledge from the researcher are sufficiently outlined.(CAR)
- The proposal adequately explains how the researcher will transfer their previously acquired knowledge and skills to the host institution; their expertise is complementary and will enhance the research environment at the host and contribute directly to several ongoing projects. (CAR)
- The researcher would further strengthen their academic skills during the research period through trainings with the staff at host institution, where the researcher will have also take the opportunity to consolidate his/her xxxx and xxxx knowledge on the topic. (CAR)
- The researcher is expected to strongly contribute to the teaching activities at the host institution such as xxxx in

courses with xxxx or supervision of research projects (PhD / master level) involving agricultural demand/production systems. (CAR)

- The proposal provides extensive details on training opportunities that are part of the researcher's stay at the host; the training plan is well detailed and covers many aspects, combining and balancing new knowledge acquisition and skills training. (ST)
- The researcher will get access to resources/knowledge which are available at universities through training, academic networks, collaboration partners, databases etc. A range of appropriate training actions is proposed by the host organization so as to improve the development of transferable skills. Explanation of the type and forms of the training are adequately described.(ST)
- Positive information is provided with reference to the collaboration with the host organization which contributes actively to the training and research activities. The host institution has in addition to general academic reputation, also research groups working in the areas relevant for the project. Beyond cooperation with the host institution, think-tanks have been identified as cooperation partners.(ST)
- The training from host to researcher is adequate with an accurate description of different and complete training areas (e.g. teaching skills, research project management skills, entrepreneurial attitude, etc). (ST)
- The proposed scientific research training is presented in detail and it is consistent with the needs of the proposed project. (ST)
- The training and the two-way transfer of knowledge have important complementarities and synergies. (ST)
- The proposal clearly identifies several forms of transfer of knowledge from the host institution to the researcher (e.g., training-through- research in econometric theory and computational implementation, policy paper writing skills), which are deemed appropriate and relevant to the researcher. (ST)
- The quality of the training program for the knowledge transfer from the host institution to the researcher is clearly and adequately explained such as attending courses (option trading, banking strategies). This will open up the best career possibilities for the researcher. (ST)
- The envisaged two way transfer of knowledge is sensible and realistic. Some of the strategies to have these experiences transferred from both sides (particularly through direct training which includes training courses, seminars and dissemination events) have been carefully indicated in the proposal. (ST)
- The proposal precisely specifies the knowledge that both the researcher and the host institution will provide to each other, as well as the positive implications for them. Thus, a description of the researcher's fields of activity and of their collaboration with the partner organizations is provided within the proposal to underline the quality of the transfer of knowledge. The researcher will complement the prevailing econometric focus at the host organization with expertise in formal mathematical modelling, such as non-parametric models. (ST)
- The proposal gives very credible and solid information about the benefits that the researcher would bring to the host institute such as conducting workshops by using the network of the researcher in the previous institute and giving courses at the host institute. (ST)
- The transfer of knowledge from the researcher to the host institution and the team work is clear and adequate. The host university would benefit from the researcher's specialist area, US experience and network of contacts. (CAR)
- The proposal contains evidence of the researcher's capacity to foster and enhance international research collaborations and networks leading to expanding knowledge of chosen field areas alongside advancements in methodology and skills, as also attested by evidence for international mobility (2 European fellowships) to date. (CAR)
- The transfer of knowledge from the host institution to the fellow is well described. The researcher will gain new knowledge on both technical and non-technical skills, such as instrumentation techniques and funding requests, among others. (CAR)
- The researcher will greatly benefit from the experimental expertise and facilities in the host institution and their knowledge in high pressure physics. (RI)
- The expertise of the researcher in calculations will be of great use for the research host group. The researcher will be the first computational expert in the research group, guiding and conducting this type of research. The researcher describes a sound strategy on effective transfer of knowledge in modelling and simulation to the host group. (RI)
- The researcher will be trained in management and coordination skills by coordinating the project and training other researchers. The researcher will improve educational skills by teaching dedicated courses. (RI)
- Two way transfer of knowledge and synergy between the applicant and supervising team are well outlined and are a crucial combination for successful project accomplishment. The applicant's background in the field of lithium –ion batteries, material synthesis and structural analysis, will be of support to the host institution. (RI)
- The experienced researcher will contribute their expertise in measuring physical activity and functional capacity. They will help with applying the interventions developed within the XXX project coordinated by the

host institution and will take part in tutoring activities. (RI)
- The gained knowledge that the researcher will acquire during the fellowship at the host institution is well presented and appropriately itemized. (RI)
- The applicant will transfer to the host institution expertise in the field of scattering techniques; during the fellowship, the applicant will also work with Ph.D. candidates and other researchers allowing transfer of knowledge. (RI)
- There is a number of innovative aspects on each side of the approach, which both parties will benefit from. This process is well described. (RI)
- The researcher has acquired relevant knowledge during the PhD and previous post-doctoral training. The implementation of the researcher's technical skills will speed up data acquisition and contribute to the host laboratory's competitiveness. (RI)
- There is a potential for bidirectional knowledge sharing. (RI)
- The comprehensive expertise of the host laboratory in the biological and technical aspects of the project, and the frequent active exchange between lab members provide an appealing training environment. Adequate opportunities for training in complementary skills will be available at the host institution. (RI)
- Two way knowledge transfer is described in detail and shows a sound plan to establish synergies between researcher and host institution and other experts (secondment) through direct training, workshops and data transfer. Both supervisors will work very closely together with the researcher, thus fostering scientific knowledge gain as well as transfer of soft skills (very clearly stated which kind). The research will enable the ER to gain greater knowledge in completely new application fields. Simultaneous transfer of knowledge from researcher to the host organisation is clearly stated by the commitment to share processing routines, teach undergraduate and graduate students, and to prepare joint publications. The researcher has impressive experience in remote sensing and long-term land use change analyses which will contribute to enriching the host institution with another perspective. (RI)
- The researcher will be trained in innovative new research approaches such as the use of mouse models and live cell imaging. (RI)
- The host environment and secondment in the partner organization will undoubtedly provide the researcher with excellent complementary practical and theoretical training. (RI)
- The overall training objectives are clearly and convincingly described, including training in communication, management and organization of scientific meetings and international training courses. (RI)
- Specific information about scholarly impact, innovation and technology transfer of the main host institution are provided; the host institutional environment is appropriate in terms of excellence. (RI)
- Due to the already shown international mobility of the researcher and the well-embedded host institution in the European soft matter research community there is certainly a benefit for both researcher and host institution in terms of future networking expected. (RI)
- Transfer from the Experienced Researcher to the host organization of previously acquired knowledge and skills is sufficiently evident. (RI)
- The researcher would train some graduate students in the host organization. In specific, being experienced with computational techniques (Fortran, Matlab and C), the researcher has potential to transfer this knowledge to the graduate students who are expected to work in the project. (RI)
- The research would help the researcher and the host to gain new knowledge through several activities. (RI)
- The researcher's expectations to gain new knowledge on bio-based production chains during the fellowship at the hosting organisation are realistic and well outlined in the proposal. (RI)
- The host offers non-technical training modules which the researcher is committed to take. (RI)
- The proposal demonstrates that the researcher will have access to numerous institutions and be able to draw upon experience and expertise of many individuals. (RI)
- Being part of a leading research group including a secondment at a renowned institution the researcher will substantially gain new methodological and thematic knowledge and acquire new cutting edge skills. The action will clearly improve the competitiveness for a research career in Europe. (RI)

Quality of the supervision and of the integration in the team/institution (qualifications and experience of the supervisor(s), hosting arrangements etc.)

- The supervisor is a world-leading expert in the field of dynamic combinatorial and Systems Chemistry, with a significant output record. (ST)
- The scientist in charge is a recognised researcher with an established scientific reputation and vast experience with the training and supervision at an advanced level within the research field. (ST)
- The supervisor has previous experience in supervising MSC fellows, who have ultimately reached mature positions in academia or other science-related fields. (ST)

- The project would create new collaborations for the host research group. (ST)
- The hosting arrangements are well described, and are of high quality to ensure the integration of the researcher within the host group. (ST)
- The host laboratory is an excellent research institute with a high level of expertise in the subject, a proven track record of work, as well as established international collaborations. (ST)
- The hosting arrangements allow a smooth integration of the researcher into the team and institution. (ST)
- The ability of the supervisor to mentor early stage researchers is demonstrated. (ST)
- The track record and expertise of the supervisor on the topic of the proposal is excellent and the experience on the project management is convincing. (ST)
- The measures for integrating the researcher to the team and institute are convincing, as the researcher is already affiliated to the host institute. (ST)
- The supervisor is a well-established scientist, with extensive experience in both research and in training experienced researchers. Also, the host has a large international network of collaborations which the researcher will have access to. (ST)
- The supervisor shows an appropriate experience in the management of large research projects, in the mentoring of scientists and in the scientific field of the project. (ST)
- The host organisation has clear plans for integrating the researcher into the group and has experience in hosting international researchers. (ST)
- The host supervisor is a world expert on bioelectronic and diagnostic tools and possesses solid and extensive list of publications. Additionally, he is highly successful in securing research funding. (ST)
- It has been well demonstrated that appropriate methods and measures are foreseen and will be taken at host and secondment units to facilitate the researcher integration into the host institution. (ST)
- The mentoring capacity of the supervisor is excellent based on the great number of PhD students and postdoctoral fellows that has already supervised. (ST)
- The researcher is well-integrated already at the hosting laboratory, has already produced preliminary data necessary for the action, and their training in complementary skills is foreseen by their participation in workshops organized by career development services of the hosting institution. (ST)
- The qualifications of the supervisors are clearly demonstrated. Academic and industrial supervisors have very strong CVs. (ST)
- The international team, involving two countries, will contribute to the development of the researcher's network of collaborations. (ST)
- The host's international projects will provide the basis for the researcher to establish international networks and collaborations. (ST)
- The supervisor and the co-supervisor of the researcher are both internationally recognized and have extensive track records in the training of students and post-docs. The host and secondment host team (computational team) are excellent and will provide a high level working environment. (ST)
- The way of integration of the researcher within the team/institution is well articulated, the established contacts between the host and researcher will provide a smooth start of the project. (ST)
- The main supervisor shows a strong track record in borohydrides and structure investigation. The co-promoter has complementary skills in battery chemistry supported by a good scientific track record. (ST)
- The proposal describes well several ways of integration of the researcher (group meetings, informal discussions, communication between groups) in the host organization. (ST)
- The hosting arrangements are credibly addressed in terms of available office space, good communication between different groups, group meetings. (ST)
- The host institute provides an excellent environment to foster innovation, international networking and individual career development. (ST)
- The researcher will be fully integrated into the host institution's structure including into personal and professional development programmes and will have access to all relevant information and networking opportunities. (ST)
- The supervisor is the recipient of two prestigious ERC grants and has been involved with the mentoring of many researchers. (ST)
- A very detailed and fitting description of the hosting arrangements for the integration of the ER within the institution and the research group has been provided. Specific integration actions, such as induction program for new researchers and newcomers club, are suitably identified. (ST)
- The opportunities for the establishment of new academic contacts through the network of the host institution and group have been discussed at length. (ST)
- The host is perfectly capable and willing to supervise the work of the researcher due to an established successful record in similar supervision of previous EU grantees and postdoctoral fellows. (ST)

- The host institution holds the label HR excellence in research and offers a world class research environment for the researcher. A good administrative support and integration of the ER is granted. (ST)
- Hosting arrangements and the integration of the researcher within the hosting research group are expected to go smoothly, taking into account the internationally-recognized history of the host institution in welcoming foreign scientists. (ST)
- The proposal shows that the applicant will be integrated into three groups at the host and will benefit from the involvement of world leaders in complementary scientific domains such as chemistry and materials engineering. (ST)
- The outlined research program represents a logical extension of preliminary results with inputs by both the supervisor and the researcher, which provides an incremental but solid foundation regarding feasibility. (ST)
- The involvement of an additional mentor for studying self-assembled monolayers is a particular asset. (ST)
- The quality of the supervisor in terms of participation in EU programmes and industrial collaborations is clearly demonstrated. (ST)
- The previous experience of the researcher in the host group and the joint publication with the host group leader will assist in a successful completion of the research work. (ST)
- The supervision quality is shown to be very high, and the level of experience is very relevant to the proposed research. (ST)
- Institutional accommodation of the researcher is very well prepared. (ST)
- The research expertise of the two supervisors and further researchers as well as their relevance for the project is clearly described. (ST)
- The supervision team is very strong in the proposed topic and has sufficient expertise and supervision experience. (ST)
- The track record of the host laboratory has not been described in sufficient detail. (ST)
- The Host has a solid scientific reputation in (endogenous) retrovirus biology and experience in guiding PhD and post-doctoral fellows and leading a research group. (ST)
- Expertise of both supervisors is excellent as assessed from a large number of publications, many in very high impact journals, involvement in productive international collaborations, the fundraising and successful supervising many scientists. The project draws greatly on the host supervisor who is an expert on animal movement, which is the main topic of the proposal. (ST)
- Both participating research groups are of very high quality with respect to scientific achievements. They provide creative environment that will strengthen current collaborations and create new ones. External advisors are an added value, which will guarantee a productive network and high quality results. (ST)
- The integration of the ER in the new environment is described in detail and will allow their work, as well as their everyday life, to smoothly proceed along the entire duration of the fellowship. (ST)
- Good examples of integration into the researchers' community are presented in the proposal, which are feasible to be realized as there is previous collaboration and visits to the host institution. (ST)
- The qualifications and know-how of the outgoing host supervisor perfectly match the planned research and illustrate an impressive track record in professional scholarship, recognition by the community, and substantial postgraduate supervision experience. Moreover, individual additional support is identified. (GF)
- Quality of the supervision is well documented: in the outgoing host organization, the supervisor has an excellent track record in science and in game development. The overall supervisor in the beneficiary has complementary expertise in training with regard developmental studies. (GF)
- The supervisory team has extensive experience in supervision at the PhD/post-doctoral level. (GF)
- Appropriate consideration has been given to regular supervisory and progress-monitoring meetings. (GF)
- The outgoing institution has been hosting one of the strongest groups worldwide in the area of computational geosciences with a strong history and open-source philosophy in training and community access to the simulation toolbox.(GF)
- The return host institution is a strong interdisciplinarity research institute. (GF)
- The ER will be supported by several scientific and administrative services that may contribute to their integration at both hosts.(GF)
- The host institution would provide an appropriate working environment both in terms of cooperation with the research staff as well as in terms of research infrastructure. The plan for the integration of the researcher within the team/host institution during the fellowship is very good. (GF)
- The quality of the supervision has been well presented. A Supervisory Committee will include both supervisors and other researchers working at the hosting institutes and the institute chosen for secondment. All members of the supervisory board are to be involved in the planning and implementation of specific work packages. The way the Committee and its members shall be working to support the experienced researcher has been explained with sufficient detail. Both supervisors have sound academic background that is well suited to the

proposed research project.(GF)

- Both research groups feature highly vibrant intellectual research environments that enable the best working conditions for the proposed work. (GF)
- Hosting arrangements at the outgoing host institution are clearly outlined. (GF)
- Quality of the supervision to be obtained during the outgoing phase is of the highest quality given the excellent scientific credentials and experience in supervision of researchers of the supervisor. (GF)
- The supervising scientist of return phase is the leader in the field of human development, with high-level expertise and scientific impact via high-level publications and strong competencies in supervising PhD students. (GF)
- İntegration into the host institution in the outgoing phase would be excellent, given the possibility for the researcher to manage a small research team as well as the vibrant intellectual climate of the host institution.(GF)
- İntegration in the incoming phase is of very high quality, given the fact that technical/human resources support would be provided to the researcher.(GF)
- The hosting institution and partner organization have great research facilities and infrastructure, moreover, both are intellectually stimulating environments.(GF)
- The supervisor for the return phase demonstrates excellent track record and impact in the field; the host group regularly publishes in high- rank leading journals.(GF)
- The integration in the two research teams and the hosting arrangements are appropriate for the proposed type of research.(GF)
- The host institution has a significant amount of contacts with industry.(GF)
- The experience of the proposed supervisors is very good. They both have numerous publications concerning the expertise required for the project and experience of supervising research projects and students.(GF)
- The quality of the outgoing phase laboratory corresponds to a favorable environment for the development of a postdoctoral researcher.(GF)
- It is positive that both supervisors are involved in the creation of a career development plan.(GF)
- At both outgoing and host institutions the researcher will be included in a number of beneficial projects and activities, including co- organization of academic events.(GF)
- The (outgoing) host institution's long tradition of academic excellence involving research projects and active research groups is well- presented and is sufficient for integrating the researcher in the relevant activities (project discussions, seminars, among others). (GF)
- Both host organizations have planned the wholesome integration of the researcher. Beside both supervisors with the previous supervising experiences, there are a few other professors at both locations planning to assist in the training process of the researcher according to their expertise and institutionalization options; the researcher has been acquainted with all the institutional options for the inclusion.(GF)
- Arrangements for the integration of the researcher into the team, at the outgoing host, are of high quality with a dedicated office that supports visiting scholars and appropriate practical, administrative and financial support.(GF)
- The proposed international host and secondment supervisor are of international standing as evidenced by numbers of publications and supervisory roles in the last five years.(GF)
- The proposed supervisors in the beneficiary and partner institutions have very strong research profiles and are very well-placed to supervise the proposed research action.(GF)
- The host research units in both the beneficiary and host institutions offer a very productive environment for the proposed project.(GF)
- The researcher would be properly integrated in the third-country host institution and actively participate in two consolidated research groups.(GF)
- The action is planned in such a way that the existent contacts of the researcher would be consolidated and credibly give him/her the opportunity of developing new international academic relationships. (GF)
- The principal supervisor in the Third Country is a young and talented scientist with a very good track record for the level of experience.(GF)
- The researcher is already integrated in the team at the partner organization.(GF)
- The means planned for integrating the researcher in both research institutions, during the outgoing and return phase, are credible.(GF)
- The exposure of the researcher to the pre-existing network of collaboration of both the host organisations offers realistic international networking opportunities.(GF)
- İntegration in the team and institution is described well and may be fostered by the social dynamics of a relatively small (<10 members) group of researchers.(GF)
- The researcher has already spent a 3-month period working in the team and so integration will

be straightforward.(GF)

- The hosting arrangements are in place and the respective units of the host institution are well identified in the proposal. (GF)
- İnternational networking opportunities for the researcher are clearly demonstrated with hosting institutions in three different countries, one of which is overseas. In addition, all institutions have very wide and good networks of collaborations. There is a very high chance that the researcher will be included into a worldwide scientific network. (GF)
- Both supervisors (outgoing and return phases) are experienced scientists, and have relevant expertise in complementary fields, lending credibility to the proposal. (GF)
- Both institutions and their supervisors are internationally well-known with a comprehensive network in the field, excellent track-records and have demonstrated experience with running research projects and integrating new people into their successful laboratories. (GF)
- The supervisors at the host institution and the third country institution are scholars with a strong record of research experience and supervision. They are very well positioned institutionally to support the researcher's activities during the fellowship. (GF)
- The researcher's CV shows a strong track record and an international profile, with over 10 years' experience as a teacher and researcher including numerous awards, fellowships, publications, supervisions and professional memberships. The stay in Australia will offer the opportunity of becoming internationally visible and exchanging with like-minded scholars to a much greater extent than currently possible in Europe. (GF)
- The supervisor at the outgoing host is an expert in the field of the proposal. The supervisor at the return host has some expert knowledge in some aspects of the proposed research. Both supervisors have a good publication track record and adequate experience in supervision. (GF)
- Both host teams have high scientific reputations. The outgoing host is a world-leader in the field, with extensive track record in the supervision of early-career researchers. During the outgoing phase, the fellow will work together with graduate students involved in similar activities. During the return phase the researcher will be introduced to technology transfer skills by collaborating with a spin-off company. (GF)
- The set of skills and knowledge obtained by the researcher at the two institutions (host institution and partner organisation) during the outgoing and return phases, and through secondment are well and convincingly described. (GF)
- Quality of the supervision is very high in both institutions; the hosts are at leading level in the field of developmental neuroscience and have committed to offer training to the researcher during meetings, courses, seminars, and laboratory work for data acquisition and analyses during all phases of the programme. (GF)
- The researcher will have the opportunity to work in a research institution of high level under the guidance of a well-recognised supervisor. (CAR)
- The supervisor has extensive experience in research projects, international collaborations and training at advanced level researchers, which is in line with the planned research. (CAR)
- The supervisor is shown to be experienced in fields relevant to the project activities, and demonstrates suitability to monitor the research. (CAR)
- The level of experience of the host supervisor, including his track record of scientific publications/patents, awards, collaborative network with the industry as well as mentoring of early stage researchers, is very convincing and relevant to the scope of the project. The supervisor is also experienced in training researchers including Marie Skłodowska Curie fellowships and PhD students. (CAR)
- The proposal convincingly demonstrates that the researcher will benefit from high-level academic support from several members of the host institution (an additional academic mentor has been agreed upon). (CAR)
- The researcher will particularly benefit from the joint supervision of several scholars with complementary expertise. (CAR)
- The researcher demonstrates a solid professional consultancy experience. (CAR)
- Co-mentors would help the researcher in their field of work, also during the secondment. (CAR)
- The proposal highlights the international environment of the hosting institution and the high quality of the team. (CAR)
- The proposal clearly demonstrates that the host institution research environment is of very high quality and is exceptionally well suited to hosting the proposed project. (CAR)
- The host institution has experience in looking after Marie Skłodowska Curie fellows with appropriate hosting arrangements. The researcher will have a "personal review and development plan" (PRDP) which is supported by xxxx. (CAR)
- A career development plan will be drafted and the host network will enable the researcher to broaden both academic and industrial contacts internationally. (CAR)
- The researcher would also participate in a network for Marie Skłodowska-Curie Action fellows, which would

offer the opportunity to meet researchers from other disciplines and thus to establish new collaborations. (CAR)

- The proposed supervisor and the other proposed co-advisors are adequately qualified to assist in this project. The supervisor has an academic track of quality and a significant experience in post-graduate mentoring. (ST)
- The supervisor's extensive experience in the supervision of PhD theses, as well as their considerable experience in different and related research topics has the potential to positively contribute to the achievement of the foreseen objectives. (ST)
- The supervisor has a strong list of publications and also a considerable experience in the research topics discussed in the project. (ST)
- The supervisor also has an extensive international network of cooperation and well-documented management capacity thus being able to provide appropriate supervision to the researcher. (CAR)
- The proposal clearly demonstrates the adequacy of the qualifications, experience, relevant publications and international collaborations of the supervisor. (ST)
- The primary mentor leads a prestigious research organisation after years of experience in the target field and has an impressive bibliography in several languages. (CAR)
- The supervisor is an excellent specialist with proved high qualities in coordinating research teams and projects, and with very good management abilities. (CAR)
- The host institution is sufficiently and convincingly described, it will provide an appropriate research ecosystem for the researcher. (ST)
- The proposal convincingly demonstrates a good quality of the host institution in terms of its strong interdisciplinarity team with experience in innovation and SMEs. (ST)
- The nature and quality of the research group and environment is high and matches the needs of the proposal; the host has a well-established expertise in the subject area. (ST)
- The integration of the researcher within the team and the host institution is well articulated, as the hosting arrangements are credibly presented (for example, specific names of research centres and researchers involved are provided). (ST)
- Researcher will benefit from the experienced research group at the host institution, while the latter will benefit from the novel data constructed by the researcher and learn from findings of empirical study. (ST)
- Discussion of the researcher's plans to participate in the existing and relevant working groups within the hosts is excellent and most adequate. (CAR)
- The proposal presents a sufficiently structured training programme with foreseen training in terms of methodology (computational analysis) and managing skills (project, etc.). (ST)
- The supervisor has a remarkable experience in the high pressure field. The bibliographic indices are excellent and the scientific qualification is remarkable. The host group and host supervisor are well experienced in (European) projects and in the training of junior and advanced researchers. (RI)
- The researcher will get a personal supervisor to plan and perform the experimental work. This will help the researcher to gain the relevant capabilities and to find a well-defined position within the host group. (RI)
- A clear added value of the researcher's strong international network on the development of new collaboration opportunities for the host organization is attractively presented. (RI)
- The supervision to be provided is of high quality. The supervisor has a very extended and compatible experience with the MSCA action and this will benefit the researcher. The experienced researcher will benefit also on trainings through different collaborations. The host is well equipped to support the proposed researcher. (RI)
- The supervisor has outstanding publication record, exceptional professional track record, and outstanding international reputation as evidenced by prestigious personal grants. The supervisor has supervised and trained numerous PhD students to successful graduation and postdocs to successful career achievements and has a strong industry and international network. (RI)
- The proposal convincingly outlines the integration of the researcher into the existing research team and research environment. Moreover, the proposal identifies opportunities for networking and further training via existing collaborations, including for example partners from industry. (RI)
- The proposal includes references to the possibility of counting with further support in technological aspects provided by other professors affiliated to the host institution. (RI)
- The researcher has already published many papers with the host supervisor. That indicates very good integration between the researcher and the host as well as the integration in the team/institution. (RI)
- The group has a very good quality research tracked demonstrated from the journals in which research is published, and from the fund raising level and an international visibility provided by the participation at a large number of European projects. (RI)
- The frequent meetings with the host members will strengthen the collaborative research. Since the project is

within the research focus of the host group, there is high probability that the experienced researcher will be well integrated into the team. (RI)

- The experience in training advanced researchers is appropriately demonstrated. High-quality scientific international connections and networking exist at the laboratory and institutional level. (RI)
- The supervisors at the secondment institutions have relevant expertise; this facilitates the interdisciplinarity vocation of the research project; potential to build interesting international network exists. (RI)
- The existence of a supervisory group (rather than a sole supervisor), composed by experts with high track record and complementary expertise in areas pertinent to the proposed action, and of relevant networks, would provide a comprehensive oversight of the research and support for the researcher. (RI)
- The supervision, co-supervision and integration of the fellow in the host team are of very high quality. Both the supervisor and the cosupervisors are very-well established researchers in the field and have long-standing complementary experiences to supervise the proposed project. (RI)
- The choice of the two supervisors, one dealing with marine biodiversity and ecosystem functioning, the other with signal, image and video processing, is fully in line with the research action and guarantees appropriate consideration of multidisciplinarity. (RI)
- The two supervisors are both leading figures in their research fields, related to the topics of the proposal. They will provide high quality supervision to the researcher. (RI)
- The researcher will collaborate with a variety of researchers and PhDs in the two hosting departments. Working closely with supervisors and their teams is a very well assessed measure to integrate the researcher in different areas of expertise and disciplines. (RI)
- The two hosting departments will provide abundant networking and collaboration opportunities at a national and international level. (RI)
- The supervisor's experience in supervising doctoral and postdoctoral researchers is suitable for providing an appropriate support for the researcher's return to Europe and reintegration into a longer-term research position. (RI)
- The proposal presents good support to the integration of the researcher within the supervisor's research group at the host institution and the measures proposed to be taken are very plausible. The host research group has an established record of accomplishment and international recognition in the proposed research and supervision. (RI)
- The multidisciplinary team of the department where the project is proposed to be conducted has good expertise in conducting research on the topic of the proposal. (RI)
- The researcher will be integrated within a multidisciplinary collaborative environment at the host institution at a level that is appropriate for becoming an independent researcher. There are relevant training objectives. It is specified how new knowledge and technical skills will be gained. (RI)

Capacity of the researcher to reach or re-enforce a position of professional maturity/independence (Career development plan etc.)

- The researcher has an outstanding track record of publications, demonstrating interdisciplinarity knowledge, leadership skills and independent thinking. This scientific track record strongly supports the possibility to achieve significant outcomes from the project. (ST)
- The hosting arrangements are adequate and clearly described, and include a Career development plan for monitoring the researcher's training progress. (ST)
- The track record of the fellow is highly productive (twelve papers in relevant journals - four as first-author). The researcher's expertise in synthetic chemistry matches very well the proposed project. (ST)
- This proposal clearly explains how the fellowship will increase the potential of the researcher to reach professional maturity by acquisition of new skills and knowledge about chemical synthesis and to develop successful collaboration with industry. (ST)
- The list of scientific publications authored by the researcher documents his proficiency in the field of organic chemistry, which is in line with the proposal objectives and proves an excellent potential for improving his professional independence. (ST)
- The science activity shows that the researcher is able to carry out the research in an interdisciplinarity team, and publish papers in a very good high impact journals. (ST)
- The researcher has expertise and suitable background for the proposed project. (ST)
- The researcher has previous international experience and scientific publications published in good level international journals. The researcher has also national patents and some experience in supervision and teaching (master and high school level). These facts indicate a very good potential to increase professional maturity. (ST)
- An ambitious programme and a career development plan are described. The researcher will acquire a broader

experience (thus adding value to a future career) by implementing previous knowledge of DES in REE recovery. The researcher will gain new knowledge in transferrable skills (e.g. in project management). (ST)

- Taking into account the number of years already spent in science, the researchers has a good track record of scientific achievements. Building upon previous experience of research positions, the researcher will benefit from the proposed action to re-enforce a position of professional maturity and independence. (ST)
- The complementary skills to be developed are clearly presented and will further help the researcher to take the next steps towards the establishment of an independent research career. (ST)
- The career possibilities for the researcher, following the success of the action, were clearly and sufficiently described. The fellowship will reinforce his professional potential, both in academia and in private initiatives. A Career development plan is foreseen and intended to support the researcher to actively plan his future career.
- The proposed research will add further diversity to the career possibilities for the researcher. (ST)
- The proposed activities are complementary to the researcher's past research experiences and will provide a fair addition to professional development towards maturity in research. (ST)
- The researcher has published a good volume of papers demonstrating an already good scientific maturity. The new research experience acquired during the fellowship will provide new opportunities to re-enforce an independent position in research. (ST)
- The researcher already demonstrated a high capacity for independent research, as documented in the very solid list of first-authored publications. (ST)
- The researcher already worked in different environments, most of them are internationally leading laboratories. (ST)
- The researcher demonstrates high potential to reach a position of professional maturity and independence. This capacity is justified through high impact, peer reviewed articles, course prizes, supervision of undergraduates and industrial and international experience. The applicant expresses good motivation to take complementary training and to improve the scientific track record. (ST)
- The fellowship will help the researcher to re-enforce professional maturity, an independent research career and importantly facilitate candidate's scientific networking. (ST)
- The candidate' achievements witness personal initiative, transnational mobility, independent thinking and leadership in a research context. (ST)
- The researcher stands to benefit greatly from this project and, combined with previous experience in supervising MSc students, this will help propel the researcher into a position of professional maturity. (ST)
- The researcher has excellent records of international mobility and scientific publications. In addition, the researcher has already delivered a good number of oral presentations, some of them as invited speaker, at national and international symposia. The researcher has already acquired experience in teaching at the undergraduate level and in the supervision of MSc and PhD students. It is demonstrated that the researcher has already acquired scientific maturity. (ST)
- The young researcher has formulated clear and credible targets to be reached at the end of the action, including professional independence. (ST)
- The researcher can work with a spin off company interested in the actions results and contact other companies. This exposure to the private sector will help the researcher to gain professional maturity. (ST)
- The researcher earned the PhD degree recently and has not had the time to publish many publications, still the researcher's CV reveals good capacity to reach or re-enforce a position of professional maturity in research. The researcher has publications in high impact scientific journals (Angew. Chem. and Chem. Sci.) as first author, and reports some experience in students supervision. (ST)
- The researcher has already experienced mobility and shows the necessary potential for future integration in a new environment and a new team. (ST)
- The proposal carefully addresses the best career possibilities for the researcher. (ST)
- The proposed project will further improve the independence of the researcher, and will support the researcher in obtaining a higher level position. (ST)
- The proposal presents a well-argued path towards maturity and independence of the researcher. (ST)
- The scientific production of the researcher is considered very good. (ST)
- The educational background and the research achievements of the researcher clearly demonstrate the consistency in career path, thus representing a good basis for the re-enforcement of academic and research positions. (ST)
- The researcher clearly demonstrates a strong track record in education, research experience, publications, teaching and mentoring. The proposal presents excellent evidence on the capacity of the researcher to significantly progress in the academic career with a clear statement of a Career development plan for the researcher outlined. (ST)
- The novel research will credibly open up the best career possibilities for the researcher. The researcher will

collaborate with diverse entities with proven expertise in the different areas of expertise within the research field; synergies to be established for the objectives targeted have been well justified. Also, the cooperation strategy with companies is satisfactory designed, as well as the role and the commitment of the key persons selected. (ST)

- The researcher has an adequate level of scientific productivity given their postgraduate experience and proven capacity to carry out independent work. (ST)
- The international experience of the researcher will help to upscale results of the research, and to facilitate their professional position after the project. (ST)
- The ER demonstrates a very good track record or research experience and outputs in the field of study. Additionally, the ER has previous experience in research project management skills. Hence, the ER profile reinforces the capacity to reach a position of professional maturity during the fellowship. (ST)
- The researcher has an outstanding track record from the PhD and first postdoctoral position. The researcher has already demonstrated partial independence as a researcher in the past. The project has a complementary nature and, therefore, the researcher sufficiently demonstrates the capacity to grow fully into an independent researcher. (ST)
- The researcher has gained extensive experience at several research institutes in different countries through short-term and long-term visits and has been productive in terms of publications in all the stages. The researcher has obtained pre- and post-doctoral fellowships, has delivered invited talks at international meetings and has shown independence, having been a corresponding co-author in an article published in a relevant journal. (ST)
- The researcher skillfully describes how the MCSA fellowship will further enhance their independence and research maturity by gaining new skills and further increasing their networking with researchers from other disciplines. In addition, the researcher describes the creation and monitoring of a career development plan which, with the contribution of a steering committee, will support the transition to full independence. (ST)
- Besides acquiring new technical skills and knowledge in the field, the candidate will obtain training necessary to gain leadership (e.g. courses in Grant writing, lab management). The project appears to be designed in a way enabling the candidate to develop own niche to pursue follow-up career. (ST)
- The past experience and track record of the researcher combined with the acquired experimental skills indicate that there is very good potential to reach a position of professional maturity during the fellowship. (ST)
- The ER's supervision of students during the project is appropriate to practice group leading, and hence gain professional independence. (ST)
- The project will significantly boost the researcher's independence and multidisciplinary skills. (ST)
- The researcher has a long list of important papers including some in top journals. (ST)
- The researcher, three years after their PhD, has a high number of first author publications in refereed journal plus a second author publication in Nature, and several co-authored papers. The researcher has already demonstrated the ability to work on very different research topics. The researcher has already gained ample teaching experience. This shows a very good capacity to fully exploit the proposed fellowship in order to reinforce independence. (ST)
- Both supervisors are very qualified to assume their respective roles in this research. The integration in the team and the host's institution will be straightforward through the activities mentioned (weekly seminars, group meetings). The host institution provides a mentor and a tutor to the researcher to help with the development of a career development strategy. (ST)
- It is overall well demonstrated in the proposal that the researcher has the capacity to re-enforce and further develop his career during the proposed project. (ST)
- The proposal describes convincingly how the researcher will acquire new knowledge and useful skills at the host institution. The gained competences fit the needs of the project and will support the development of the researcher. (ST)
- The track record of the researcher displays extensive research experience relevant to the action topic, and leadership skills proved by management of numerous grants on history. The researcher has had several scholarships in European universities. These experiences will support the researcher in conducting the action and enhancing their professional maturity during the proposed fellowship. (ST)
- The researcher's CV clearly shows the capacity of the researcher for independent thinking, through the research activities developed in the past. (ST)
- The proposal satisfactorily demonstrates that the researcher 1) has already a strong track record; 2) is well known in both fields of study (Ancient history and Religious studies); 3) can re-enforce an already strong professional maturity; 4) has good networking skills. (ST)
- The proposal would enable the applicant to devote energy to research and training activities and to author a monograph and peer-reviewed articles, enabling them to make a mark in the field of historiography. (ST)

- Capacity of the researcher to reach a position of professional maturity is shown to be high. The researcher has worked in various projects and positions and has a versatile scientific background, including programming skills.(GF)
- Both the research topic and the planned training during the program could help the researcher to move toward academic independence.(GF)
- The researcher's track record of publications, successful international collaborations, leadership qualities, independent thinking ability and outstanding results demonstrate a remarkable capacity to accomplish a higher level of expertise and professional maturity through this fellowship.(GF)
- The potential of the experienced researcher to reach a position of professional maturity is clearly demonstrated. The applicant's CV provides evidence for a strong research background on topics indirectly related to the proposed research.(GF)
- The researcher's capacity to reach a professional position is convincingly presented. The proposal clearly shows that the researcher is capable of developing an international career.(GF)
- At the researcher's career stage, an exceptional degree of academic success has been demonstrated by publications in prestigious journals, which indicate very high capacity to reach or re-enforce professional maturity and independence, as well as by managing research projects and disseminating academic knowledge (i.e. invited speeches). The proposed research project is coherent with the researcher's previous work.(GF)
- The researcher is involved in several international research collaborations, which indicates the ongoing elaboration of a research network that would be instrumental in gaining professional maturity.(GF)
- The proposed study will contribute to the researcher's professional development, especially by the acquisition of new skills and knowledge in neighboring fields, as well as it could contribute to wider international visibility (GF)
- The researcher has a good research output in terms of publications, authorship and number of citations. Evidence of advanced skills are also provided by their participation at international conferences and their experience in students' supervision. The applicant has led a symposium in an important world congress, which indicates high level of professional maturity and good organisation skills.(GF)
- The capacity of the researcher to significantly progress in their professional development as an independent and mature scholar during the fellowship is provided by the already solid background and previous fieldwork and research experience in the topic of the proposed research. The researcher has a clear plan where to continue their career and a vision of the necessary steps to achieve this goal.(GF)
- There is a very good match between the capabilities already demonstrated by the researcher and the needs of the project, e.g. Aptitude at working within a team, numerical skills.(GF)
- The researcher has a good record for career stage, as evidenced in particular by a number of paper and conference publications, project participation and research supervision, and would be able to re-enforce a position of professional maturity through this proposed project.(GF)
- The researcher would make available previously acquired experience and skills (communication, teaching, research dissemination, research methods) that are likely to contribute in a positive manner to professional development.(GF)
- The researcher will acquire interdisciplinarity knowledge complementary to past personal experience and the combination of both will be excellent to develop a mature and independent researcher in the field of structural studies applied to the development of anti-cancer drugs. The three-year program has great potential to result in a career breakthrough for the researcher.(GF)
- The proposed work fits well within the research interests of the researcher even considering the current position of the researcher at the hosting organisations in Europe.(GF)
- The path for the ER to become a mature researcher is well addressed and the pursuit of independent positions is appropriately described (e.g. Targeting of ERC grants).(GF)
- Considering the few years of experience, the researcher has a good publication record and specific training in communication skills.(GF)
- The researcher will bring back and integrate new skills and knowledge not only for the academic host group, but also to underpin the start-up activities already established by the researcher. (GF)
- The two organisations would offer international networking opportunities to the researcher during the fellowship. They have previously active and extensive international cooperation in the field, beneficial for the researcher. (GF)
- The Capacity of the researcher to significantly and substantially progress with their own academic career is demonstrated by the already strong scientific output, solid background and level of experience acquired so far. (GF)
- The researcher has international experience, and an appropriate publication record for the career stage which indicates a capacity to gain professional maturity and independence and potential to develop into an

independent PI. (GF)

- The publication record of the researcher is good considering the stage of their career, and their achievements indicate emerging independent thinking and a collaborative attitude. The Capacity of the researcher to reach a position of professional maturity is clearly demonstrated. (GF)
- Quality and appropriateness of the training is very well documented. The researcher is to be given access to courses and to the laboratory in order to upgrade their research skills, particularly in the xxx method. Furthermore, training in general skills, paralleled with personal Career development plan, would be achieved. (GF)
- The researcher has taken provisions to attend a number of programs at the institutions to acquire and refine the leadership skills required for independent positions. (GF)
- The researcher's background is relevant and will provide a basis for this new project. It is demonstrated that the researcher is productive, with many articles already to their name, and this contributes to the potential to reach a more mature status. (GF)
- The researcher's resume shows a record of research experience in the topic of the proposal. (CAR)
- The researcher's general background and experience in xxxx and xxx are demonstrated in the CV and provide a good combination of skills needed for the general realisation of the planned research. (CAR)
- The researcher is familiar with xxxx and more generally with the topic, which is a good starting point for the career restart. (CAR)
- The proposal clearly demonstrates how the project research develops from - but would significantly expand and extend - the researcher's previous research. (CAR)
- Prior experience is aligned, and the new training would reinforce the fellow's professional career goals. (CAR)
- The fellowship will allow the applicant to resume their career in Europe, strengthen expertise, and broaden international collaborations network. (CAR)
- The proposal convincingly explains how the researcher's past experience will contribute to their development as a mature researcher during the proposed fellowship; this proposal is in the Career Restart strand and it thoughtfully demonstrates how the opportunity provided by a fellowship would re-establish the researcher within their chosen field of specialism. (CAR)
- The researcher has a very good track-record for career stage, with international publications, high engagement in presentations at international conferences, etc. clearly showing a great capacity to develop further the research skills and past projects. As a continuation of a previously funded project the proposed project of publishing a high-quality book and the integration in a different international academic context will strengthen the academic profile of the researcher considerably. (CAR)
- The researcher has a good track record for this stage in their academic career; since the award of the PhD they have engaged in important scholarship and have produced some good quality articles and essays. In addition, the researcher has accumulated teaching experience and has authored xxxx and xxxx, some of them in peer-reviewed publications. (CAR)
- The contribution of the host institution to the advancement of the researcher's career is sufficiently explained, by demonstrating the step further that could be done in the researcher's career. (CAR)
- The capacity of the researcher to progress is very credible and well supported by their publications record (including publication of high quality articles and a monograph with xxxx Press). (CAR)
- The fellowship has the potential to reintegrate the researcher into academia after a career break, especially through the development of new connections at the host institution. (CAR)
- The stated involvement in projects and joint publications show that the researcher can work in a team setting. (CAR)
- The previous experience and CV indicate that the researcher has all the capacities to reach a position of an independent researcher during the fellowship. (CAR)
- The researcher has a very good academic curriculum in line with the field of the proposal. In fact, the researcher has experience in several projects and was successful in receiving important funding in different phases of their educational and professional career. The researcher is experienced in working in international environments as well. (ST)
- The proposal demonstrates sufficiently how the proposal is the most likely to open up the best career possibilities for the experienced researcher. (ST)
- The researcher has a very good track of publications, and other relevant experience. The researcher's capacity to significantly progress an academic career during the fellowship is provided by that already solid background. (ST)
- The researcher has timely built a consistent academic career, complementing the PhD with postdoctoral positions under the supervision of top academics and resulting in papers published in very good journals. The proposal is a credible corollary for the path pursued so far by the researcher: it develops knowledge previously

obtained and applies it to a new and relevant issue and it uses the benefit of full-time research and of the development of new networks in the academic and policy circles. (ST)

- The researcher's past achievements demonstrate coherence and good fit with the career path, and considerable experiences in academic as well as applied research. Thus the researcher is expected to be able to re-enforce a position of professional independence with the planned project. (CAR)
- The researcher's CV and track record are commensurate with their years of research experience, and the proposal presents a clear road map for returning to a career in research. (CAR)
- The past experience and the CV indicate that the researcher matches the proposed research work, with several publications in high impact scientific journals. In addition, the researcher has experience as PhD and post-doctoral fellow in several important catalysis research groups in different countries, complemented by teaching and supervision skills. Thus, the fellowship under the selected host would contribute to re- enforce the researcher's professional maturity and independence. (ST)
- The proposal convincingly argues that the present research proposal builds on the researcher's past experience and extends it further towards a greater professional maturity. (ST)
- The researcher is a qualified professor in Economics, with a proven publication record and a scientific network and has demonstrated capacity to reach a position of professional maturity and independence. (ST)
- The proposal convincingly describes some aspects of the researcher's capacity to re-enforce a position of professional maturity, as is particularly clear from the researcher's international mobility and ability to secure research funding. (CAR)
- The relevant training, lecturing and research leave no doubt that the researcher will be able to fully capitalize on this experience to re-enforce a position of professional independence. (ST)
- The researcher's curriculum demonstrates research experience in multiple areas relevant to this proposal. (ST)
- Given the level of experience of the researcher, the scientific production is more than adequate. (ST)
- The researcher's publication track record and past personal experience reveal professional maturity. For example, the applicant is the first and also corresponding author of high-quality publications relevant to the proposed study, which demonstrate strong research autonomy and leadership qualities. (RI)
- The researcher has already international reputation in the architecture, but after the fellowship will increase the chances of working in the homeland. (RI)
- The proposed research would provide a plausible opportunity for the researcher to reintegrate in an academic environment and develop their own profile thanks to a new series of important publications. (RI)
- The researcher has good research experience in the building energy domain and a very good publication track record. The proposed research and their contribution to setting up a new centre of excellence in the host institute will help reaching a position of professional maturity. (RI)
- The applicant has a good research background and a suitable publications record. The researcher has the entire necessary prerequisite both in theoretical and empirical sciences with relevance to battery technologies to enforce a prospective career in academia. The research record of the applicant is grounded on a good academic and professional experience. (RI)
- İndependent thinking is well-demonstrated in the proposal through academic experiences (workshops, supervision, grants). (RI)
- The researcher's career development plan includes training on transferable skills and provide excellent opportunity for career development, leading to increased future employment opportunities. This plan will be continuously revisited to ensure that career goals have been met. The skills to be acquired include coordinating and investigating independent research proposals, mentoring, training, and supervising PhDs and postdocs, budgeting, efficient time and project management and administrative aspects related to research. (RI)
- The researcher curriculum shows a strong track-record of peer-reviewed journal publications with a number of publications as first and second-first author, excellent teaching record, mentoring of high school students, supervision of undergraduate and graduate students, grants funding, large network, and public engagement and outreach. (RI)
- The researcher has shown proven capacity of professional maturity, independence and persistence, is well equipped with management and organizational skills, and has a wide network of collaborators; this project will definitely re-enforce the position to successfully become an independent researcher in a specialized field. (RI)
- The researcher counts on experience and high-level qualifications to be able to develop a fully-mature and independent academic life. The researcher's interests, expertise and track-record should become an asset for any given host institution characterised by a similar set of interests. Besides, at present, the host institution houses no tenured members counting on the researcher's unique background and expertise at the crossroads of archaeology and digital heritage. (RI)
- The researcher has a well-structured career with clear conceptual and technical goals during the PhD and post-doctoral training. Previous technical expertise constitutes a strong background to address the proposal's

scientific objectives. (RI)
- The researcher has acquired a good quality portfolio of academic and professional skills including research supervision, conference organisation, fellowships and awards. The potential career progress of the researcher is strengthened by a solid track record with experience in an international environment. (RI)
- The researcher a motivated scientist, has a sound scientific and technical background, and is keen to share their expertise with others. The researcher has opened collaborative opportunities over the course of their career and is recognised in the field as a result of participation at high-level meetings. The possibility to progress towards professional independence during the fellowship is realistic. (RI)
- The researcher's curriculum shows an impressive research experience in the topic of the programme which is demonstrated by the long peer-reviewed publication list in relation to time. The capacity of the researcher to significantly progress in an academic career is very well demonstrated by the already very impressive background including the experience in teaching, fund raising and organization. (RI)
- The researcher demonstrates in the proposal an adequate level of experience in the research field. The proposal clearly describes how the researcher would upgrade their professional knowledge and skills in the course of the fellowship; moreover, the experience is likely to foster professional maturity and independence. (RI)
- The candidate demonstrates a high capacity to progress toward research independence. The researcher has acquired a solid background in neurobiology from 2 consecutives postdoctoral training and has produced 4 main author publications, including one in a top-ranked journal, and one patent. (RI)
- The candidate has demonstrated an ability to obtain one small research grant and has applied to a larger grant to conduct the research program as a PI, which is a positive point to progress toward independence. (RI)
- The researcher has an excellent track-record and has prior experience of publishing in peer-reviewed journals and was already successful in grant writing and project management. The CV together with the proposed research shows the capacity to establish professional independence after MSC fellowship. (RI)
- The researcher has a strong background in the field for their years of experience and would gain new knowledge via a range of research related activities. (RI)
- The researcher's past personal experience and proposed research include educational achievements, demonstrating remarkable maturity and autonomy, and academic appointments with a close collaboration with researchers from a variety of disciplines. During the fellowship, collaboration with the two departments and the innovative research are very likely to significantly give a contribution to the researcher's professional development. (RI)
- While the researcher's publication record is not yet extensive, it shows a well-established direction of research interest on the topic of the proposal and can be considered suitable at this career stage. (RI)
- The proposal points out the researcher's systematically acquired skills, specific scientific interests and the level of international recognition, which the researcher has already proved. (RI)

Weaknesses:

Quality and credibility of the research/innovation action (state-of-the-art, research methodology and approach, research programme, interdisciplinarity aspects of the action etc.)

- The state-of-the-art of the research topic is not sufficiently deeply studied. Precedents of opening of aziridines by thiosulfates have been previously published (S. J. Brois, US patent 3468925, in 1969) including those with chiral substrates. (ST)
- The overall state-of-the-art of the research topic is not fully and comprehensively evaluated. It focusses on the host's previous work, giving merely a limited overview of the work undertaken before by other groups, especially regarding cycloisomerisation. (ST)
- The technical arguments to support the new reactions, or reactivities of multicomponent systems, are not convincingly presented. (ST)
- The claimed interdisciplinarity of the project is not convincingly demonstrated in the proposal. This issue is not clearly addressed as the computational and theoretical aspects are not developed in sufficient depth. (ST)
- The medicinal chemistry related aspects of the research project are only very generically covered. (ST)
- The novelty aspect in relation to potential applications and advantages over existing systems are not sufficiently elaborated. (ST)
- The limited timeframe (12 months) is unbalanced with respect to ambitious scientific objectives and associated activities. (ST)
- The theoretical methodology is not discussed with sufficient details. Also, it is not clearly explained how the proposed methodology will be able to distinguish between different nerve agents, taking into account their

similar chemical profiles. (ST)
- Comparison with alternative state of the art techniques is insufficiently discussed. (ST)
- The originality and innovative aspects of the project are not stressed enough. The proposed research regarding the use of magnetic nanoparticles in combination with electrochemical methods for cancer detection in a point of care device is not particularly convincing in terms of innovative content: similar approaches are already described in the literature. (ST)
- The chosen field is well known, the individual elements of the project are not novel (synthesis of TiO2, doping, GO, photocatalytic assessment and reactor). (ST)
- The proposal does not adequately discuss why graphene and graphene oxide were chosen as the carbon materials. (ST)
- The proposed strategy increases the complexity, without duly considering the practical and financial viability of the proposed method for actual applications: multi-phase titania with excellent photocatalytic potential, doped titania, titania GO composites are already commercially available. (ST)
- The feasibility of certain tasks to be undertaken within the action is not sufficiently demonstrated. For example, it is not clear whether the proof-of-concept reactions elaborated for nucleosides/nucleotides will work at low frequency/concentration of N6-methyladenine in ODNs. (ST)
- The proposed research lacks focus and comprises far too many different aspects. (ST)
- The state-of-the-art is not sufficiently described and the important literature on oxide-oxide interfaces has not been adequately cited. (ST)
- Originality and innovative aspects of the research program are very briefly and unconvincingly described without proper analysis of the current research on the topic. (ST)
- Both the methodology and the approach are missing project-specific details. In particular, the proposal does not describe in sufficient detail how the immobilized enzymes-based sensors will be prepared, characterized and tested. (ST)
- The proposal does not appropriately demonstrate the mentioned proof-of-principle devices. (ST)
- The presented performance is below the state-of-the-art. (ST)
- The technical description how results exactly will be generated is lacking details. (ST)
- Some key features of the proposed sensors are not sufficiently discussed. (ST)
- The proposal lacks clarity in the main objective of the project. For example, although the design of new A-ion batteries is targeted, the state of art summarizes the main issues of the A-metal type of batteries. In addition, as one of the main interesting use of IPC is to prevent the growth of metallic dendrite, the interest of preparing and studying “molten” IPC or Ionic liquids is not clearly addressed. (ST)
- The proposal lacks detail in the state of the art concerning ongoing research on the dynamics of BH4 using NMR or neutron diffraction. Therefore, the advances of this project are not convincingly demonstrated. (ST)
- The novelty of the project is insufficiently demonstrated as the topic is not new and the materials pool is mainly limited to commercial salts. (ST)
- The proposal does not sufficiently demonstrate the feasibility of the synthesis of binary systems based on borohydrides; furthermore, the investigation of the thermal behavior of targeted IPC is insufficiently addressed; therefore the credibility of the approach is limited. (ST)
- No convincing discussion is provided on why the proposed capsules are expected to induce asymmetry in the proposed reactions. (ST)
- The role of the researcher in the development of methods and/or computer codes is insufficiently described. (ST)
- The description how the research will open up career possibilities for the researcher is not specifically addressed. The researcher will be performing similar computational studies to those developed during the PhD. (ST)
- The description of the current state-of-the-art is focusing the experimental results but the previous computational modeling relevant to the project is not presented and discussed. (ST)
- The innovative aspects and originality of the approach are limited since computational approaches with conventional software will be performed on known materials and only the last part of the project nvolves computational design of new structures. (ST)
- Some aspects of the project are insufficiently detailed. For example, the “hierarchical assembly” leading to Class 3 compounds is treated in too general terms. The “surface” for depositing compounds of Class 1 is not defined. Figure 1 mentions surface targeted studies, but this topic is not clearly detailed in the proposal. (ST)
- The innovation character of the project and the potential progress beyond the state-of-the art, are not adequately demonstrated. The proposed methodology is not cutting edge. The main challenges in the field are not sufficiently emphasized. (ST)
- Specific objectives have not been sufficiently identified. The goals of the modelling are not clear and the role of

the modelling in informing or understanding the experimental work is poorly described. (ST)

- The advancements of the proposed research compared to the recent achievements in the field are not discussed in full detail. (ST)
- The proposal lacks focus and prioritization of the several listed objectives, which include preparation and study of several new materials, optimization of already reported ones and building prototypes. (ST)
- The present project provides only a vague description of the methodology to be used and the systems which will be studied. (ST)
- The proposal does not give sufficient description of the state-of-the-art in the field, insufficient bibliographical references are provided, thus undermining the overall credibility of the proposal. (ST)
- It is stated that "The proposed project has no inter or multidisciplinary aspects". It is actually multidisciplinary, encompassing aspects of spectroscopy, electrochemistry, advanced chromatographic techniques and computational studies, however, this has not adequately been addressed in the proposal. (ST)
- The introduction part fails to describe why the newly proposed HTMs will be superior over the existing ones and these materials will be cost efficient, which is one of the major arguments of the proposal. (ST)
- The innovative aspects of the research is limited and based on standard techniques. (ST)
- The research methodology does not address in sufficient detail some technical aspects like the problem of large-scale computational and optimization complexity and algorithm design, non-linearity and non-convexity. (ST)
- The discussion on the proposed research methodology does not provide a sufficient justification for building a new software on top of the already existing one. (ST)
- The novelty of the proposed research is not sufficiently addressed. For example, the progress beyond the state-of-the-art within the field of wireless powered communication networking is not precisely described. (ST)
- The description of the research methodology is incomplete; the experimental part of the project is too briefly described. (ST)
- The methodology relies too much on the use of the proposed materials. The credibility of the approach is not clear; the project is extremely ambitious for the time and people involved, with a real risk that the stated objectives of the research fail to be accomplished in the time frame of the project. (ST)
- A market-tasting phase in the second year is not well addressed. The methodology developed by the research is intended to be used by policymakers and city managers, and to be effective it needs to be proven by end users beforehand. (ST)
- The interdisciplinarity aspects of the project are not satisfactorily demonstrated, given the excessive focus on surveys and literature reviews. (ST)
- The different work packages are not clearly supported by credible research hypotheses. (ST)
- The proposed methodology is not convincing and it is not at all clear that something radically new or innovative, extending the state of the art, will emerge from this proposal. The fact the proposer has a different background may be a plus but the proposal does not demonstrate convincingly how this would give a significant edge. (ST)
- The proposal is so poorly structured that it has little credibility. (ST)
- The research description is insufficiently grounded in current research, and there is limited reference to recent research papers to support the relevance and credibility of the proposal. Preliminary results in order to support the hypothesis and credibility of the research are not readily identifiable. (ST)
- Originality and innovation beyond the state of the art of the research program are not convincingly demonstrated. (ST)
- The novelty of the project has not been sufficiently clearly demonstrated, as the project is building on well established results from the host laboratory. Also, there is some ambiguity of the novelty of repeats in the regulatory elements. (ST)
- The state of the art section is weakly developed with insufficient bibliographic citations on existing work. (ST)
- The novelty of the project is limited since the role of targeted gene was investigated in other plant species. (ST)
- Although a range of techniques will be used in the project, the full extent of the interdisciplinarity is not sufficiently clear. (ST)
- The objectives are presented in a qualitative way; indicators to assess the performances and expected improvements with respect to the state of the art are insufficiently described in the proposal. (ST)
- Claims for target metrics, such as "100 times better sensitivity" are not sufficiently backed up with arguments.
- The possibility of obtaining decisive and unambiguous results with a very limited sample of Martian meteoritic material is not completely demonstrated. (ST)
- The presentation of the state of the art is only partial and several key studies on that field are ignored. To argue its novelty, the proposal states that "the periodic driving of particles in complex fluids remains largely unexplored", while the literature contains papers where beads are oscillated by an external field in complex fluids for more than a decade. Microrheology based on magnetic beads has been used for instance to probe

intracellular materials. Therefore, the proposal fails to convince of its originality. (ST)
- Novelty relies essentially on the technical implementation of published theoretical proposals and existing technology. Some essential scientific publications are missing in the reference list. (ST)
- The proposal does not sufficiently clarify the main object of the research, not explaining whether it would deal with judicial councils or with constitutional courts and whether it would concern only the "countries of the Visegrad group" or all European countries in transition. (ST)
- The proposal does not convincingly justify why looking at the research problem from the point of view of judicial institutions is the best suitable approach. (ST)
- The research methodology of the proposal fails to fully explain how it proposes to analyze the political and social context and discourses. The discourse analysis approach subsection has insufficient references on methodology. (ST)
- Although the proposed methodology is generally relevant, it is not presented in sufficient detail. For example, it remains unclear how many interviews and focus groups would be conducted, how participants in interviews and focus groups would be selected, and how the qualitative data obtained would be analysed. (ST)
- The proposal fails to highlight sufficiently the gender issues that are relevant for the project. (ST)
- The proposal lacks a convincing explanation of how the research concretely would contribute to the specific research field in an original and innovative manner. The potential for innovation is significantly limited and limiting, partly because the proposal is insufficiently clear about the essential scientific training in biosemiotics, required in order to obtain good results from the proposed research. (ST)
- The description of the state-of-the-art is not sufficiently comprehensive in relation to the general objective. For example, there are many different types of executive functions and this aspect is not sufficiently detailed and analyzed. (GF)
- The ability of the ER to successfully implement the advanced statistical methods has not been convincingly documented. (GF)
- There is a strong focus on the effect of imports on the firms of one EU country, effects on other relevant EU members is not sufficiently explored. (GF)
- The methodology lacks in innovation, in particular in respect of more recent digital humanities methods such as automatic text recognition. (GF)
- The state-of-the-art of research on the topic has not been described with sufficient detail; for example, the assumption that there are major similarities between HIV and HCV in terms of treatment cascades is not sufficiently justified. (GF)
- Even though the objectives are clearly stated, the proposal falls short in sufficiently pointing out the explicit research question underlying this research endeavor. (GF)
- Although the proposal addresses an up-to-date research topic, the researcher does not sufficiently demonstrate the knowledge of the state- of-the-art about medical anthropology as on gender and religion issues. Moreover, the state-of-the-arts is not sufficiently developed in terms of theoretical considerations of European minorities, especially European minority groups of women nor whether they are more or less inclined to seek care. (GF)
- The methodology part is briefly addressed specially about clinical ethnography and it is not specified clearly how the bridging of the two very different fields of study will come about. (GF)
- The qualitative study (namely home observation of patients) will be performed exclusively in the third country in which the challenges posed by tele cardiology may differ from European ones. This aspect of study is not comprehensively discussed. (GF)
- It is not sufficiently demonstrated how the final objective will be achieved. (GF)
- While the approach is innovative, the innovation of proposed objectives is limited(GF)
- The novelty of the software to be developed and its advantages in regard to the existing alternatives available are poorly discussed. (GF)
- The research sources are not fully identified, the description of their analysis lacks sufficient detail and insufficient information is provided on the data gathering process and the methodologies to analyse the data to allow a full assessment of their appropriateness in the overall research design. (GF)
- It is not clear if the imaging devices to be developed are modifications of existing systems or if these devices will be built from scratch. (GF)
- The description of animal experiments lacks sufficient details; it is not clear how much time is necessary to develop myopia, the small sample size proposed is not justified, and it is not obvious whether different treatment strategies will be tested using the same sample set. (GF)
- The degree of multidisciplinarity of the action is modest, being mostly software development of interest to the particular exoplanet community, and moreover details about the connections between the currently available codes, including that developed by the researcher, are missing. (GF)
- The researcher has insufficiently reflected on the gender-related aspects of the research, specifically the extent

to which female logistics workers and associated geographies are similar or not to male ones. (GF)

- The proposal is poorly presented with too many hypotheses and too broad focus. (GF)
- Some concepts used in the proposal, such as "negotiator habitus", remain rather vague and make it difficult to understand the precise objectives of the research. (GF)
- The methodology and approaches selected by the researcher are not enough beyond state of the art, as selected methods and materials are known. (GF)
- The chronological border of the investigation are not clearly specified(GF)
- The reference to gender is somewhat superficial and not duly specified. (GF)
- The level of novelty of the proposal is not sufficiently demonstrated. The researcher focuses their attention on gender and racist stereotypes in cinematography - a topic that has already been addressed by a number of other studies. (GF)
- The objectives are in parts too general (e.g. Including any available scientific work on European policies on migration in the comparative analysis) and do not sufficiently demonstrate how the interconnectedness of various disciplines will be achieved. (GF)
- Analyses proposed are very advanced, but they will not provide significant new information about data processed. (GF)
- The state of the art is too generically described. For example, it is limited to a few specific cases in a vast research area; limitations of the present techniques or samples are not elaborated in a quantitative manner. (GF)
- Specific novel aspects of the proposed work have not been clearly identified against the current state of the art. (GF)
- The proposal does not provide enough information on pilot experiments or preliminary data showing that the new animal model is appropriate. There is the potential risk that the entire premise of the project is incorrect. (GF)
- The methods used for preparation of the conductive polymers are not novel and are described in the literature. (GF)
- The proposed research methodology and measures lack the full breadth of description and precision on some specific aspects. For example, not enough information is provided about the rationale for choosing the specific questionnaires for MDD and emotion regulation. (GF)
- Considering the level of a novelty for the researcher that this research area would represent during the outgoing phase, the measures to integrate the researcher in different areas of expertise and disciplines are limited. The described research group is very restricted, and so are international networking opportunities. (GF)
- The methodology concerning the creation and use of audio-visual contents is not described with sufficient accuracy. Moreover, description of the planned fieldwork is not supported with sufficient details. The length of the fieldwork is not justified. (GF)
- In light of the nature of structural disadvantage in the target community, the methods proposed for overcoming this challenge are insufficiently elaborated. (GF)
- Although, the proposal has a strong pre-clinical character (the focus of the experiment is made on using a subcutanous model in a mouse model with a transfected cell-line) and is based on methods which have limited clinical translation potential, the claimed ways it will use the findings for clinically implemented personalised medicine are not clearly described. (GF).
- The proposal does not fully elaborate on how the scales of experiments and up scaling would align with each other when addressing the research questions despite this being central to the project. (GF)
- The research questions are rather generic and not clearly focused on knowledge gaps. The link between specific objectives, (which are mainly focused on data collection and on application of known approaches), and the overall objective (directed to the balance among the involved factors), is not clearly introduced. (GF)
- The links between the generic goals and objectives and the actual proposed research are poorly developed. In particular, it is unclear how the different calculations are combined together to describe the whole process. (GF)
- The overview of related work does not provide sufficient information on the performance of the best state-of-the-art xxxx, which is necessary to show the relevance of the project. (CAR)
- The state-of-the-art analysis does not take sufficiently into account recent studies in the field but is mostly based on a bibliography analysed during the applicant's doctoral years. (CAR)
- The project is the continuation and settlement of another research project. It only consists of a refreshment and confirmation of data and interpretations already produced within the previous project with the objective of finishing and publishing a book. (CAR)
- The basic model to be used has already been researched in the literature and the innovative aspects on the top of it are not convincingly argued. (CAR)

- The proposal does not adequately illustrate its innovative potential. (CAR)
- While the proposed project shows some potential interdisciplinarity, specifically in applying xxxx techniques for xxxx, the claimed interdisciplinarity between theoretical xxxx and xxxx is overstated because the formulated goals fit standard xxxx research. (CAR)
- The concepts for describing and guiding the case study (xxxx, xxxx, xxxx, xxxx etc.) rest very abstract and are used more in metaphorical ways than as meaningful tools of analysis. As a consequence, the research question is formulated very vague and in general terms. (CAR)
- The interdisciplinarity is not sufficiently well-justified as it is presented predominantly as a conceptual study with insufficient detail on which disciplines the proposed methodology will draw upon. (CAR)
- The methodology chosen to achieve the objectives is not explained in sufficient level of detail and it is not sufficiently justified as the best possible choice. (CAR)
- The research methodology does not sufficiently clarify the time frame in which the xxxx will be conducted, which legislation will be examined and, consequently, the relevance of the political context. (CAR)
- İndependent research activities are only partially demonstrated. (CAR)
- The multidisciplinary aspects of the proposed research are not sufficiently addressed; the scientific disciplines related to xxxx and xxxx are not fully specified. (CAR)
- Proposed approaches like xxxx and xxxx for better statistical xxxx on xxxx and xxxx are fairly standard and are not shown to be innovative - they would just be applied to a new type of data. (CAR)
- The proposal does not sufficiently demonstrate that the project involves significant innovative content. Some of the claimed novelties are rather overstated. (ST)
- The literature review is not sufficiently addressed. (ST)
- The outline for evaluation of the data is insufficient. Although the researcher sketches a causal diagram in section 1.1 with predictors, moderators, and control variables; the proposal does not provide sufficient detail as to what training in Statistics will be provided. (ST)
- The proposal insufficiently elaborates hypotheses, analytical elements, specific tasks, and deliverables related to the modelling section of the project. It does not provide enough detail on selected methods and various stages of the research process. (ST)
- The innovative nature of the enquiry is not adequately demonstrated, since it appears that this database has already been used for the writing of a previous thesis. This casts some doubts on the potential novelty of the research. (CAR)
- The suitability of some of the listed databases is insufficiently argued and not convincing for the proposed analysis, as they are of insufficient quality for some EU countries. (ST)
- The research idea is not well formulated. For example, it is not clear why research funding should be promoting research diversity instead of incremental research, when recent research shows that research funding mainly promotes publishing in the same field. (ST)
- The sample size calculation has not been explained with sufficient detail. The current and anticipated rates of surgical site infection in obese patients undergoing orthopedic surgery has not been clearly specified. (CAR)
- The proposal does not show sufficient evidence of critical engagement with some of its concepts, such as 'conservative' and 'modern values', or 'encompassing comparison'. (CAR)
- The state-of-the-art presented is incomplete and does not adequately acknowledge previous work on multiscale modelling based on thermodynamic, mechanistic and kinetic considerations. Besides, the specific research gaps that need to be addressed, including the approach (kinetic fingerprints) that the researcher proposes to investigate, are not clearly discussed. (ST)
- The objectives of the proposal are not particularly clearly set out and convincingly presented. For example, the objective of investigating "the impact of Innovation Labs on firm's innovation performance" is not supported by an adequate design. The research is more about perceived challenges and opportunities, than an articulated impact investigation, based on indicators. (ST)
- Insufficient attention is paid to provide clear identification and justification of how precisely gender issues would be effectively encompassed in the research project. (ST)
- The multidisciplinary nature of the project is limited being only suggested but not further deployed in the proposal. This makes it hard to discern the position of the planned study within the framework of related disciplines. (CAR)
- The proposal does not clearly specify and justify the methodological approach in terms of its conceptual framework, coherence with the identified research objectives, research design and methods. Notably, there is no clear and convincing explanation of how the research would effectively address the identification and analysis of interactions between existing theories about historical roots of European economic inequality and economic development in the long-run. (ST)
- The research methodology, in some aspects, is not sufficiently framed. For example the researcher does not

specify the amount of data to be collected and process and, moreover, how they intend to conduct several randomized control-studies on large population scale. Furthermore, the research methodology is not very innovative, since the digital nudges approach is developed by other researchers and used by other authors as well. (ST)

- The presented methodology is very briefly and generically illustrated. The proposal lacks more detailed information on data gathering, data analysis, data interpretation and integration, etc. Furthermore the use of a conceptual model is neither clearly analysed in the proposal to assess the expected economic theoretical model that would be tested empirically. (ST)
- The proposal is mainly cast in empirical terms and fails to provide sufficient details about the theoretical underpinnings of the project and its implications for policy modelling. Moreover, the econometric methodology is not adequately explained. (ST)
- The methodology is not sufficiently explained. It is not clear what is meant by drafting a translation method, an editorial strategies profile, and never-before-used philological strategy. It is also unclear why precisely these specified novels need to be analyzed; how lengthy they are; and what exactly "analysis" would entail. The analysis of poetry mentioned in the proposal is not explained in sufficient clarity, given the project's focus on the early novel. (CAR)
- The methodological choices proposed lack further details and justification, and do not provide guarantees of an appropriate experimental design; (CAR)
- The proposal fails to describe properly the research methodology, the theoretical background, the potential sources (e.g. primary and secondary) and their location (archives, collections etc.), the data collecting strategy and data accessibility. (CAR)
- The methodological approach of the proposal lacks detail The novelty of the proposal is questionable; the research approach follows recent investigation by other groups in the field. The study tactics considers building and improving the two current designs, which are already reported in scientific literature. (RI)
- The innovative character of the proposal is not sufficiently described against the state of the art. In fact, the innovative character mostly implies refined methodological tools whereby the fellow did not discuss to which degree would the results of this research differ from the stream of previous research in this area. (RI)
- The statement that the project opens new pathways for addressing issues that seriously threaten the stability of the European Union is too ambitious and not sufficiently grounded in this proposal. (RI)
- The interdisciplinarity character of the proposed project is taken as given but it is not adequately addressed. (RI)
- Insufficient information is provided with regard to the selection of case study countries. (RI)
- The researcher's preliminary data do not fully support the original hypothesis. This is going to increase the risk of detecting low to moderate changes after the intervention. (RI)
- The innovation is restricted to investigating the importance of a previously described but poorly understood phenomenon in an alternative model. The biological relevance of the proposed studies and their impact in advancing the knowledge in development are unclear from the provided information. (RI)
- The selected methodology to address molecular mechanisms is predominantly based on the use of drugs. Complementary genetic approaches, which are needed to strengthen the conclusions, are not described with sufficient detail. (RI)
- The proposal claims to be original, but the researcher does not demonstrate it with sufficient clarity. (RI)
- The 3 week period proposed to conduct 60 qualitative interviews is inadequate. (RI)
- Considering the outlined experimental design and the duration of the fellowship, the proposed research is, science-wise, somewhat overambitious in scope. (RI)
- The research methodology lacks details about the way in which knowledge assets will be taken into account, as well as about the integration of ontology models and related reporting applications. (RI)
- There are a few minor shortcomings which relate to the limited explanation of the innovative aspects of the proposed research. (RI)
- The state of the art is insufficiently focused on expatriation as a main objective of the project. Relevant resources on corrupt behavior among expatriates are minimally included. (RI)
- The research methodology is too generally described and lacks focus: it is not sufficiently clear who the stakeholders are, how many interviews would be conducted, what kind of test batteries would be used, how the case studies would be selected, how the representative samples would be designed. (RI)
- The design of the project does not convincingly show that the project would achieve its objectives, which are not well-defined similarly. (RI)
- Whereas there are some multidisciplinary aspects in the proposal, the nano-science aspects of the research project are not sufficiently detailed. (RI)
- The research methodology is not sufficiently detailed; the proposal mostly presents the description on citing

techniques and does not specify the data to be collected and processed, failing to convince on the overall effectiveness of the methodology. (RI)
- It is not clearly stated what is the main goal of the project and the objectives are not explicitly specified in the Excellence 1.1 text, which is too vague. (RI)

Quality and appropriateness of the training and of the two way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host (including secondment)

- The structures of novel heterocyclic structures with interests as agrochemicals which are envisaged in WP2 and also during the secondment, are not clearly described in the proposal. (ST)
- The training opportunities and goals related to very short visits in USA and another research institute in UK are not credible. It is unlikely that a few day visits which include also guest lectures and discussions could also lead to adaptation of new research techniques. (ST)
- The quality of the training and transfer of knowledge from the host to the researcher on computational chemistry is not convincingly demonstrated, because the role of computational methods in the research proposal is not sufficiently detailed. (ST)
- The knowledge transfer from the researcher to the host is insufficiently described. The publication list of the host shows an already existing expertise in deep eutectic solvents as well as in process engineering. (ST)
- The training of the researcher in the characterization of materials and polymer are not well detailed. (ST)
- The proposed training in the area of transferable skills is not very persuasive: activities aimed to develop the training program are not clearly included in the proposal. (ST)
- Since the research experience of the applicant and host are very closely related, a mutual benefit is not evident. The two-way knowledge exchange has not been convincingly described. (ST)
- The proposal does not present in detail the transfer of knowledge from the candidate to the host and the complementarity with the competences already available at the host. (ST)
- The means by which the researcher will be trained in transferable/soft skills are not presented in unambiguous fellowship-specific terms. (ST)
- Part of the expertise and knowledge of the researcher are already available in the host institution. (ST)
- Additional skills to be gained in non- technical scope, like communication and negotiation abilities are insufficiently considered. (ST)
- The proposal lacks a credible link to justify the use of highly toxic Os and the sustainability research. (ST)
- The transfer of scientific knowledge from the host to the applicant is not convincingly addressed as the CV of the applicant indicates already gained skills matching those targeted to be transferred (synthesis, structure characterization even using large facilities). (ST)
- Considering the overlap in expertise, the two way transfer of new knowledge between the candidate and the host will be limited to either party. (ST)
- The researcher doesn't show adequate expertise and independence in chemical synthesis to support the feasibility of the synthetic tasks in due time. (ST)
- Several key research tasks are assigned to internal and external collaborators, limiting training opportunities for the researcher. The lack of strong prior experience by the researcher on the proposed research techniques contributes further to this limitation. (ST)
- Skills training of the researcher focuses excessively on high impact publications instead of transfer of knowledge. (ST)
- International academic networking opportunities proposed in the fellowship have not been sufficiently detailed. (ST)
- The proposal does not sufficiently address possible new collaboration opportunities for the host. (ST)
- The proposal lacks a clear identification of the international networking opportunities that the host could offer. (ST)
- Most of the knowledge described to be transferred from the researcher to the host organization is already available there. (ST)
- The two-way transfer of knowledge/training is limited by the fact that the researcher is already holding a postdoctoral position in the host group. (ST)
- The on-the-job training described covers a range of techniques that the researcher is already familiar with and does not adequately reflect the instrumental capability of the Host. (ST)
- The proposal provides an incomplete description of additional training opportunities offered. (ST)
- The proposal fails to demonstrate a meaningful two-way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host and vice-versa. The proposal briefly mentions training in some research skills in very general terms without providing key aspects of such training. Furthermore, the complementary training skills and

management skills that will be gained by the researcher are not convincingly demonstrated. (ST)

- The researcher has already good experience in teaching at university and supervising students as postdoc which decreases the amount of possible transfer of knowledge in soft skills. (ST)
- The knowledge transfer between the host and the researcher is not sufficiently specified in the proposal which makes not fully evident the quality of the training. (ST)
- According to the target goal of the researcher to become a university professor, specific training and educational aspects of the fellowship are less emphasized in the proposal. For instance, special courses to be attended are not sufficiently identified. (ST)
- It is not evident in the proposal how the knowledge transfer from the researcher to the host will reinforce the host organization. (ST)
- The transfer of the previously acquired knowledge and skills from the researcher to the host organisation is insufficiently substantiated in the proposal. (ST)
- The training strategy is limited only to "training through research". The training topics are not clearly defined, and the training activities are not properly identified in the Gantt Chart. (ST)
- It is not convincingly elaborated what skills, experience and knowledge the researcher would transfer that are unique and not currently present at the host. (ST)
- Transfer of previously acquired knowledge and skills is unidirectional. The knowledge transfer from researcher to host lab (which knowledge and for which target) has not been adequately described. (ST)
- The researcher has minimal experience in most of the research methods. (ST)
- There are insufficient arrangements for the integration of the researcher in the host institutes. Plans for day-to-day collaboration between the researcher and the host groups are inadequately outlined. (ST)
- The researcher is already an assistant professor at the institution targeted by this application, and as such, this proposal does not bring any additional transfer of knowledge than what will take place without it. (ST)
- The transfer of knowledge to the host is poorly assessed, without sufficient information to value how the host will benefit from this project. (ST)
- The transfer of knowledge to the secondment host is described as 'very important and relevant for Europe and the whole world', but no sufficient information supporting this claim can be found in the proposal. (ST)
- The proposal is very closely aligned to activities that are ongoing in the group regardless of the proposed fellowship. There is not sufficient evidence given that the ER will have the necessary independence to personally guide the course of the research in a way that is expected of an MSC fellowship. (ST)
- The transfer of scientific knowledge from the researcher to the host institution is not clear. While the researcher possesses expertise that is not clearly present at the host institution, its relevance to the research activities of the host is not adequately described. (ST)
- The description of the researcher training by the host is barely detailed: training aspects to be provided are not fully defined; the text mainly refers to general statements about the knowledge to be acquired in the relevant research field. (ST)
- The proposal presents a list of courses and training activities organized by the host institution and they can be considered useful for the enhancement of generic skills of the researcher, but specific training activities strictly related to the research project are not described in a satisfactory way. (ST)
- Knowledge transfer from the researcher to the host organization is not clearly presented and generic teaching activities do not completely represent a convincing plan. (ST)
- The proposal would need a close collaboration with specialists in Roman Law. The proposal does not clarify whether such experts are available in the host institution. (ST)
- The concrete actions in which the skills will be acquired are not set out. It is not clear that there would be formal training at the host institution so the researcher will have to rely on an online course. Thus the proposal speaks of "training objectives" but not clear measures to meet them. (ST)
- The proposal fails to explain and justify the role of secondment both in research and training. Also the expertise of the two supervisors at the two institutions that would provide secondments is not presented in sufficient detail. (ST)
- The training program doesn't not properly explain how theoretical and methodological issues would be provided and how complementary competencies would be brought to the researcher's knowledge and skills. (ST)
- The training plan is very ambitious, and insufficient consideration has been given to the time needed for the researcher to acquire the skills envisaged to a sufficiently high level of expertise. (GF)
- The opportunities for new international networking promoted by the outgoing and return hosts are not addressed in sufficient detail. (GF)
- Although the ER will benefit from the new knowledge obtained during the project, there is an excessive focus on the importance of grants/proposal preparation. Although the preparation and training for these applications is

important for the ER it is not the only main thing that will assure their success in the future. (GF)

- The two-way knowledge transfer of the researcher to the non-European institution is not clearly presented. (GF)
- The development of an international teaching experience at the non-European institution is not totally realistic, given the limited duration of the visit. (GF)
- The proposal fails to describe adequately how the knowledge and skills will be transferred from the researcher to the host institution during the outgoing phase. The proposal talks about sharing competencies, but does not adequately explain how this will be done. (GF)
- The quality of training at the incoming institution is only superficially outlined. Nothing is said about training facilities and transfer activities at the host institution in Europe. (GF)
- The nature and mechanisms of the qualitative skills to be acquired by the researcher are not specified in adequate detail. (GF)
- It is not sufficiently shown how the exchange will be done, i.e. under what circumstances (where) and at what points (when) the exchange will be done is not adequately clarified. Only a vague reference to seminars and workshops are made. (GF)
- The proposed training plan is unbalanced as it proposes a large variety of training courses, while the acquisition of some skills relevant for the research is left outside the training plan (e.g. Anthropological skills to conduct the data analysis). (GF)
- The means by which the acquired new skills and experience will be transferred back to Europe is too briefly described. (GF)
- The proposal lacks sufficient information on the training objectives and activities and on their relation with the research objectives both in the host institution and during the outgoing phase to allow a full assessment of their appropriateness. (GF)
- The researcher has no prior experience in animal experiments and no clear indication is given about the supervisors' expertise in this respect; the proposal lacks sufficient details on specific training dedicated to this important issue. (GF)
- The transfer of knowledge is for the most, limited to an exchange between the outgoing host and the incoming host, eased by the researcher, hence not entirely satisfactory. In addition training to improve other general skills are not described in detail. (GF)
- The transfer of knowledge and skills from the researcher to the host during the return phase is not described in sufficient detail. There is a high overlap between the skills of the researcher and both hosts; it is not clear how the experience of the researcher will be complemented by the experience of the hosts. (GF)
- The proposal does not provide sufficient information on the new knowledge gained during the 24 months planned at the partner organisation. (GF)
- The transfer of knowledge to the supervisor and the host group in the return phase and specific measures for training the researcher in scientific skills during this phase are not sufficiently described. (GF)
- Complementary training on transferable skills is not sufficiently considered during the fellowship, neither during the outgoing nor the incoming phase. (GF)
- The two way transfer of knowledge is not sufficiently described, e.g. It is not specified how the researcher would gain managerial, organizational and research skills other than by training -through research, and it is also unclear how the researcher's knowledge would be transferred to the host institution. (GF)
- The exact nature of the training is not sufficiently elaborated on. It is mainly limited to a broad descriptions and day-to-day interaction. (GF)
- The description of the two way transfer of knowledge between researcher and the two hosts does not give sufficient details about the nature and mechanisms through which such transfer(s) will actually take place. For example, the transfer of scientific knowledge from the researcher to the outgoing host mostly relies on the research activity itself rather than on a wider transfer strategy. (GF)
- No relevant transfer of knowledge is foreseen in the future as resulting from this research project. (GF)
- Measures for training in soft skills are poorly articulated. (GF)
- The transfer of knowledge from the researcher to the hosting institution during the Global Fellowship in the outgoing phase is not explained with su fficient clarity. (GF)
- The training plan does not sufficiently cover the management skills (e.g. research management, financial project management) needed to perform independent research work in a position of high responsibility. (GF)
- The training objectives in scientific skills are satisfactorily presented, however, complementary training on transferable skills are not well defined. (GF)
- The transfer of knowledge to the researcher during the return phase is somewhat limited since the researcher has previously occupied a postdoctoral position in the same host group for over one year and in the same research field. (GF)

- The transfer of knowledge from the host of the return phase to the researcher is not described in sufficient detail. (GF)
- The proposal does not convincingly explain how the knowledge from the researcher would be transferred to the host institution in the third country or back in Europe, although the capacity for it is mentioned. (GF)
- The section on knowledge transfer is not convincing as it fails to show how, given the differing expertise, it will be achieved. (GF)
- The transfer of acquired knowledge from the third country to the host institution in Europe is insufficiently described. (GF)
- The activities in the twelve months after the return to the host institution remain unclear. (GF)
- The way the fellow will transfer back knowledge and expertise to the host institution in Europe is not clearly addressed (GF)
- The proposal does not adequately clarify the transfer of the previously acquired knowledge and skills from the researcher to the host organisation. (CAR)
- It is unclear how the host organization could benefit from the past experience of the researcher in professional consultancy in xxxx, and how this is of interest to the host institution. (CAR)
- It is not made sufficiently clear whether apart from the mentioned training-through-the-planned-research activities, the host organisation would actively offer the transferable skill training. (CAR)
- The involvement of the researcher in training activities and administrative tasks is mentioned, but no factual examples are given. (CAR)
- The training on transferable skills is weak. Elements that may equip the researcher with the right combination of research-related transferable competencies are insufficiently described. (ST)
- No proper mention of the specific training that would be made available by the host institution to extend methodological skills in experimental economics is made in the proposal. (ST)
- The training focuses mainly on scientific research skills but lacks details about training in other relevant areas, such as project management, organisational skills, media training or how to deal with the different kind of stakeholders (eg practitioners and policy makers). (CAR)
- The training that the researcher will obtain during the project is not described in sufficient detail. The methods and the opportunities for the knowledge transfer from the host to the researcher are inadequately addressed (e.g. short courses, generic "training-through-research" approach). (ST)
- The proposal fails to provide sufficient and adequate information on the training and of the two way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host. The descriptive part of these sections of the proposal is too vague and not sufficiently focused on providing specific, relevant details. The information provided is too general, so that it is unclear exactly what activities will be undertaken. The proposal does not give sufficient specific detail about potential courses and tutorials. For example, it is unclear how the host would train the researcher in xxx literature, in response to a stated training need. As for training-through-research, the proposal is unclear about the direction of transfer. (CAR)
- The proposal does not provide a sufficiently detailed explanation of the transfer of knowledge from the researcher to the host. It is unclear, how the researcher's know-how will add significant value to the host. (ST)
- An adequate description of how the host institution would benefit from the research stay lacks in quality of details. Specifically, the proposal does not sufficiently discuss how the researcher would transfer previously acquired knowledge and skills to the host. (ST)
- Specific information provided to explain several competencies to be transferred such as the panel data techniques are not precisely defined. (ST)
- The discussion about how would the researcher gain new knowledge from the host organisation is insufficient. In particular, it is not clear if the researcher already possess the methodological knowledge and skills required to implement the project or if they would be transferred (and how) by the host institution. (ST)
- The transfer of knowledge from the host institution to the researcher is not sufficiently justified. Since the researcher is an expert in Internet Law, the proposal insufficiently justifies the researcher's need to learn Internet Law topics (e.g. data privacy, online business models, cloud computing, etc.). Similarly, the need to take course in Academic English Writing is not clear taking into account researcher's previous international academic and professional accomplishments. (CAR)
- The proposal insufficiently identifies practical strategies to transfer existing knowledge from the researcher (qualitative research, interviewing, participant observation and informal conversations) to the host. (CAR)
- The project overly relies on training-through-research as the only mechanism to facilitate a two way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host. Other formal mechanisms especially to ensure the transfer of knowledge from the researcher to the host are not detailed. For example, the possibility of organising a workshop is mentioned however it is not fully explained. (ST)
- The transfer of knowledge from the researcher to the host organization is not precisely specified. For example,

it is not clear which new skills the researcher is bringing as these are strongly overlapping with those of the receiving group. (RI)
- The training in experimental techniques is insufficiently described. (RI)
- The transfer of knowledge in the fields of industrial skills and IP exploitation is not sufficiently addressed. (RI)
- Although the proposal provides evidence that the research team at the host institution has expertise in key areas of the proposal for which the researcher does not have a strong track record of publications (e.g. aging), the transfer of knowledge from the host institution to the researcher is not convincingly presented. (RI)
- The researcher does not provide good evidence for having acquired a significant amount of transversal skills. In that context, training to new transversal skills provided by the host institution is very limited. (RI)
- The areas where the researcher will receive training and the mechanisms for training are not described in sufficient detail. (RI)
- There is a significant overlap between the expertise of the researcher and the host research group in the field of super-resolution imaging and biosensing. The new research skills which will be acquired by the researcher during the fellowship are insufficiently evidenced in the proposal. (RI)
- Insufficient information is provided regarding the specific training necessary to be in a position to conduct the analysis. (RI)
- The training program lacks sufficient clarity and structure and the scientific skills that will be acquired during the fellowship are described in a generic way; for example, the people involved, techniques, timing, and training courses are not sufficiently addressed. Insufficient information is provided for training in complementary skills. (RI)
- There is no clear systematized plan of training and two-way transfer of knowledge, although the activities are many and pluralized. (RI)
- Although the likelihood of bi-directional knowledge transfer is highly likely, the exact knowledge and skills to be acquired by the experienced researcher are not described in sufficient details. (RI)
- The training programme at the host's premises is limited, and does not go behind the standard research collaboration and academic dissemination route. Details are missing, namely regarding any training aiming to enhance a broader range of relevant skills and competences in leadership, project management, organisational skills, media training or how to deal with various stakeholders (e.g. practitioners and policy makers). (RI)
- The training in reserve design and on project management, writing grant winning proposals, outreach and communication is insufficiently explained compared to other trainings and activities. (RI)
- It is not convincingly addressed how the training will contribute to the researcher's professional development. (RI)
- Teaching and mentoring of undergraduate students is mentioned as a way of knowledge transfer from researcher to the host institution, but the proposal does not provide enough detail as to by which means this will be done. (RI)
- In this section, the proposal does not deliver sufficient details on the "big data skills" and "certain econometric skills", which would be provided through hands-on training by the supervisor. Therefore, the proposal does not provide adequate insight on how the researcher would gain new knowledge during the fellowship at the host organization. (RI)
- Although the host institution would create a good environment for the researcher to acquire new knowledge and skills, the proposal fails to sufficiently describe how exactly the host will contribute to researcher's professional development. The same applies to measures planned to gain new knowledge and skills. (RI)
- Although it is clear that the researcher can bring in specific knowledge on operational research, optimization, systems thinking, etc., it is not clear how this will be transferred to the host. (RI)
- It is not evident what kind of expertise the candidate will bring to the hosting lab in light of their research directions. It is not clearly articulated how the hosting laboratory will benefit from a fellow with extensive expertise in parasitology. (RI)
- A specific plan on how the researcher will share their expertise with colleagues at the host institution is not provided. (RI)

Quality of the supervision and of the integration in the team/institution (qualifications and experience of the supervisor(s), hosting arrangements etc.)

- The new skills to be gained from the industrial secondment are described only in very general terms. (ST)
- The proposal lacks a clear strategy how the supervisor will manage IF along with other major research related financial commitments such as EPSRC fellowship and ERC grant. (ST)
- The proposal does not fully demonstrate the extensive experience of both supervisors in mentoring young researchers. (ST)
- The means of integration of the researcher within the host group and institution have not been appropriately

described. (ST)

- The proposal fails to describe properly the measures to be implemented for a successful integration of the researcher into the team and institution. (ST)
- The proposal does not clearly demonstrate the experience in mentoring young scientists and in leading scientific projects even at the laboratory scale. (ST)
- It is not evident how this project will encourage collaborations with various research centers. Such collaborations and their purpose are not sufficiently addressed. (ST)
- The proposal does not sufficiently elaborate on the quality of the research group as a whole. (ST)
- The proposal does not clearly address the international networking opportunities that the host could offer to the researcher. (ST)
- Expertise at the host in medical oncology, which is essential for the proposed research, is not clearly presented among the host competences described in the proposal. (ST)
- The supervisor has limited experience in supervising PhD students and participating in international research programs. (ST)
- The integration of the researcher in the research environment of the host is insufficiently described and the specific measures taken to integrate the researcher in the different areas of expertise and disciplines are not well addressed. (ST)
- Some shortcomings affect the know-how transfer arrangements; e.g. PhD supervision has not been clearly considered as a training element, and the goals in terms of academic and/or industrial researcher positions are not sufficiently addressed. Furthermore, the ways to transfer know-how from the researcher to the host organization are not sufficiently clear. (ST)
- Measures to integrate the researcher in different areas of expertise and disciplines, which are important for the success of the project, are not appropriately planned. (ST)
- The nature and the quality of the research group as a whole is insufficiently described, as is whether the host scientist has sufficient previous experience of hosting postdoctoral fellows. (ST)
- It is unclear whether the host supervisor has experience in mentoring junior researchers to their first independent academic positions. (ST)
- Although the researcher is already working in the host lab, the proposal does not describe further hosting arrangements (besides one-to-one meetings) to show that the smooth overall integration of the researcher has been considered. (ST)
- Some elements are given on the institutional environment, but the direct involvement of the host group as well as the partner group to provide dedicated integration/supervision efforts for the researcher is not clearly described. (ST)
- There are limited details on how the researcher will be involved in the work of the actual team of researchers apart from collaboration with the supervisor and being a part of the wider academic community. (ST)
- There is insufficient information on the plans for involvement with the sociology/social policy department (very relevant to the topic of research) at the host and the research groups there. (ST)
- The integration in the research team/environment is not clearly addressed. There is a good description of the practical aspects, but the academic/research integration is not adequately addressed. (GF)
- The experience of the supervisor at the incoming institution is insufficiently outlined. (GF)
- Taking into account that the researcher is an anthropologist who needs to be integrated in a rather different research area of expertise and discipline, measures of integration that include participation in public health research team, one-on-one supervision, peer-to-peer activities, monthly group meetings are rather vaguely described. (GF)
- No clear evidence is given of in-depth qualifications in interdisciplinarity of the staff at either place. (GF)
- The quality and the nature of the research group is addressed within only one of the host institutions. (GF)
- The personal arrangements regarding the progress monitoring are not going beyond the general commitment of supervision. (GF)
- Insufficient information is provided in the proposal about the integration in the team/institution: the proposal lacks sufficient detail regarding the hosting arrangements and integration of the researcher within the beneficiary and partner organizations. (GF)
- At both of the two hosts, precise procedures for the scientific supervision are missing. (GF)
- The experience of the supervisors in mentoring postdoctoral researchers is not well documented. (GF)
- The international networking opportunities at the host institution are not described in sufficient detailed. (GF)
- Measures for the integration to the researcher into the host groups of the outgoing and incoming phases are not well elaborated. (GF)
- Further hosting arrangements such as services beyond the academic context are not sufficiently addressed by the proposal. (GF)

- The experience of the supervisors in training is not described. (GF)
- While both the researcher and the supervisors are highly competent, their areas of expertise are overlapping rather than complementary. (GF)
- Insufficient information is given about the specific measures to integrate the researcher in Third countries environment, i.e. integration and supervision of the researcher in field teams. (GF)
- The hosting arrangements for the incoming phase are not sufficiently well described, in particular concerning measures to integrate the researcher in different areas of expertise and international networking opportunities. (GF)
- The hosting arrangements for both outgoing and return phases are addressed in a limited way. (GF)
- The track record of the supervisors and host groups' expertise described in the proposal does not fully evidence that the competence in water treatment necessary for the project is available. (GF)
- The description of the personal integration of the researcher during the long intended stay of the candidate at the external partner-institution is not clearly described. (GF)
- The proposal does not sufficiently demonstrate how the supervisor at the beneficiary organisation has a sufficient level of experience and track record on the specific research topic. (GF)
- The experience of the European host is somehow limited with respect to supervision of experienced researchers (post-doctoral level). The envisioned forms of contact between the researcher and the host are not appropriately design for a successful implementation of the project. (GF)
- The measures taken to integrate the researcher within the institutions are not adequately described. Even if individual colleagues are nominated, the nature and the quality of the specific research group(s) in which the researcher will work are not presented in sufficient details. (GF)
- The international networking opportunities offered by the host during the return phase are not described in sufficient detail. (GF)
- The arrangements for the good integration of the applicant are not sufficiently well-presented, apart from participation in discussions fora. Insufficient detail is given about the research group and environment as a whole to assess its quality and potential contribution. (CAR)
- The proposal does not include specific measures that will be taken to integrate the researcher in different research groups. (CAR)
- The concrete measures through which the researcher would be integrated in the research environment and would interact with other experts at the host are not presented in sufficient detail, as only a description of the host is given without precise actions of interactions between researchers. (CAR)
- The proposal does not give adequate detail of any international networking opportunities that the host could offer. (CAR)
- The integration of the researcher in the host institution is not sufficiently addressed; the practical details of how this process will be carried out are not clearly specified. (CAR)
- The international networking opportunities of the researcher at the host are not sufficiently addressed. (CAR)
- The level of research achievement of the supervisor is not evident in the proposal. (ST)
- The proposal is unclear regarding the role of the co-supervisor. (ST)
- The qualifications and experience of the main supervisor do not particularly match the field of research of the proposed project. (ST)
- Although overall qualification and expertise of the supervisor appear pertinent, the supervisor's level of experience and track record with regard to fellowships mentoring have not been satisfactorily demonstrated. (CAR)
- The choice of supervisor is not sufficiently justified. On the one hand, qualifications and experience of the supervisor are only partially presented. On the other hand, the supervisor has expertise in public international law while the project focuses mainly on private international law issues. (CAR)
- Insufficiently clear evidence is provided on the experience of the supervisor in the training of post-doctoral researchers. (CAR)
- The proposal does not clearly explain what measures will be taken to integrate the researcher in the relevant groups/networks. (ST)
- Explicit measures taken to integrate the researcher in different areas of expertise and in a research team at the host institution are not adequately described. (ST)
- It is unclear how the host would integrate the researcher into the different areas of expertise. How the researcher would specifically take advantage of the stated measures to integrate the researcher into the hosting institution is not entirely clear. (CAR)
- There is insufficient information on the hosting arrangements for the integration of the researcher in the team/institution and involvement in new collaborations. (ST)
- There is not enough evidence on the ways how the host would contribute to the advancement of the

researcher's career. (ST)
- The proposal is not explicit about concrete actions to promote the integration of the researcher with the host institution's team. (ST)
- Although the significant experience in research work of the whole host organization is successfully presented, the information provided on the quality of the specific host research group is insufficient and its interest in the researcher's topic is not sufficiently detailed. (ST)
- The proposal does not provide sufficient details on the measures for integrating the researcher into the host institution. (RI)
- The hosting arrangements, the nature and quality of the host organization, and the international networking opportunities are not described with sufficient detail. (RI)
- Whilst the supervisor is a highly qualified and experienced academic, there is insufficient information on his expertise in the building energy sector which qualifies him to perform the appropriate supervision. (RI)
- The researcher does not describe with sufficient clarity how exactly the integration in the host institution would take place, within which precise unit and which team. Instead, the proposal solely mentions that possibilities have been identified and contacts have been made. (RI)
- The strategy and measures for supervision during the qualitative study in several countries is not clearly stated. (RI)
- Insufficient information is provided regarding the specific involvement of the supervisor with the proposed project. (RI)
- There is inadequate evidence of sufficiently experienced research staff within the host team to provide effective supervision and training for the researcher. (RI)
- The effectiveness of the integration is not fully convincing. The project does not provide sufficient information about the specific team of scientists (apart from the supervisor) that would assist the researcher and this project. (RI)
- The researcher makes insufficiently clear how the double supervision is organized. (RI)
- Measures taken to integrate the researcher in the different areas of expertise and disciplines are not addressed in sufficient detail. (RI)
- Since the host supervisor is the citizen of the homeland of researcher, the European dimension of the study may be limited. (RI)
- The proposal insufficiently addresses how the supervisor's fields match the researcher's topic and areas of scientific interest. (RI)
- The proposal does not articulate in detail how the experienced scientist will benefit from the international collaborations established by the host. (RI)
- Measures taken to integrate the ER in the different areas of expertise and disciplines are insufficiently described. (RI)
- Networking opportunities with other institutions available through the host are not described in sufficient detail. (RI)

Capacity of the researcher to reach or re-enforce a position of professional maturity/independence (Career development plan etc.)

- It is insufficiently discussed how the researcher will gain professional independence as a result of the proposed research, because the discussion lacks explicit examples on how this will be achieved. (ST)
- The proposal lacks critical scientific analysis and focus, and consequently does not provide convincing evidence that the project will enhance the capacity of the researcher to reach a position of professional maturity in research. (ST)
- The track record of the researcher is modest in relation to their research experience. (ST)
- The proposal does not fully demonstrate that the researcher can reach a position of professional maturity through this project. (ST)
- The proposal does not clearly specify how the researcher's past personal experience and proposed research contribute to the Professional development as an independent mature researcher during the fellowship. (ST)
- The experienced researcher will be part of a large team and it is not clear how the necessary independence will be acquired during the fellowship. (ST)
- Communication skills (including language), as well as trans-national mobility capabilities of the researcher are not sufficiently demonstrated, as the applicant attended only conferences in the home-country and most of them are with poster participation. (ST)
- The capacity of the researcher to re-enforce a position of professional maturity/independence is not fully justified.The applicant does not have publications of expected quality and authorship for their career stage. No first/corresponding authorship is apparent. (ST)

- There is no convincing information or demonstration that the researcher can reach a position of professional maturity/independence directly after the action. (ST)
- The strategy of the researcher in terms of career development (accumulation of technical skills) is not convincing. (ST)
- The proposal does not explain sufficiently how the proposed research will open up the best career possibilities for the researcher. (ST)
- The papers published by the researcher do not sufficiently show his/her expertise on the specific research objectives in the proposal, hence the capacity to reach a position of maturity as a result of the project is not demonstrated. (ST)
- The capacity of the researcher to reach or re-enforce a position of professional maturity / independence during the fellowship is insufficiently demonstrated by the previous results on the applicant. (ST)
- The exact measures the host will contribute to the advancement of the researcher's career are not adequately described. (ST)
- There is insufficient evidence and demonstration of past activities and outputs, which compromises an objective assessment of the leadership qualities and level of scientific independence of the researcher. (ST)
- It is insufficiently clarified to what extent will the researcher's track record, as well as the proposed research, assist the researcher to reach or re-enforce professional maturity and to develop professional career prospects significantly. (ST)
- The possibility of achieving independence of the researcher has not been given sufficient consideration. (ST)
- The experience of the researcher in writing and publishing scientific results is insufficiently documented. (ST)
- It is not sufficiently described how the researcher plans to form an independent research niche, distinct from the host supervisor. (ST)
- The proposal fails to demonstrate a significant level of independence of the researcher, which is endorsed by a limited number or scientific papers and the high presence of the PhD supervisor as co-author. (ST)
- It has not been sufficiently justified how the proposed project will support the aims of the researcher to build a reputation as a world expert in a field of research that is different from the field of the proposed research. (ST)
- Despite the extent of postdoctoral experience, the researcher is shown to have relatively few and narrowly distributed peer-review publications, and these are not shown to have generated significant visibility. (GF)
- The qualities of autonomy and independent thinking of the researcher are not sufficiently demonstrated, and it is not sufficiently shown in the proposal how they will be re-enforced. (GF)
- The statements on the researcher's capacity are insufficiently supported by specific indicators. (GF)
- The researcher's past experience and developed research are not fully consistent with the degree of difficulty and size of the present research proposal and the proposal does not fully demonstrate the researcher's professional maturity to develop successfully the proposed research plan. (GF)
- Given the early career stage, the number of publications firstly or secondly-authored by the applicant is too modest to assess the degree of professional independence. (GF)
- The researcher's publications to date are nearly all co-authored, mostly with the researcher's supervisor. While the researcher would undoubtedly benefit from single-authored publications, the indication of future co-authored publications – including with the project supervisors would again represent a continuation of dependence on a more senior scholar rather than moving towards research independence. (GF)
- The experience in research and the number of publications of the fellow are limited in relation to level of experience. (GF)
- The CV is somewhat unbalanced regarding the ratio between publishing and translating activities. (GF)
- The researcher does not demonstrate a significant track record on the economic aspects of the proposed research, which would make it difficult for the proposed research to contribute significantly to enhance the researcher's development in this area during the fellowship. (GF)
- The scientific resume provided is insufficiently detailed and previous positions have been held in the same institution. (CAR)
- The researcher has a weak publication record and does not convincingly explain how their past personal experience could concretely contribute to the professional development as an independent researcher. (CAR)
- The number of high impact journal publications, and especially those where the researcher is the first author, is limited. (CAR)
- Despite the researcher's general skills being a good fit for the project. It is not made sufficiently clear whether they have enough experience in xxxx and xxxx. (CAR)
- The proposal does not concretely explain how this kind of research will open up the best career possibilities for the fellow. (CAR)
- Beyond stating the prestige of the host institution, inadequate detail is given to assess how the host will contribute to the advancement of the researcher's career. (CAR)

- Supervision of undergraduate students is not planned thereby undermining management experience. (CAR)
- The career development strategy is insufficiently documented. The proposed action would invest on a new research domain, not part of the initial background of the researcher. The proposal does not sufficiently justify how it would contribute to the professional development of the researcher. (ST)
- The discussion of how the high-quality, novel research would open up the best career possibilities for the researcher is not sufficiently explored in the proposal. (ST)
- While the MSCA fellowship can provide the conditions for a return to a research environment and career, it is not clear that it can support achieving a position of professional independence during this period. (CAR)
- The proposal fails to convincingly address how the researcher's past experience and proposed research will contribute to professional development as an independent researcher during the fellowship, and only does it enumerate past professional achievements instead. (CAR)
- The researcher does not demonstrate a sufficiently solid record of research achievement considering the length of research experience. (ST)
- The robustness of the researcher's project and publication track record is not sufficiently documented. (ST)
- The proposal refers to the existing international network of the researcher, but makes only limited reference to how the access to broader transnational academic networks would be sustained or how it could be broadened by the host, in a way that provides opportunities for the researcher. (ST)
- There is not enough information regarding the researcher's laboratory skills to support their capacity to re-enforce their technical independence. (CAR)
- Aside from career planning and mentoring meetings, measures to integrate the researcher in the different areas of expertise are not sufficiently described. (RI)
- The researcher plans to develop the topic of their PhD thesis rather than conducting research on a new topic, which may be suboptimal for the purpose of reaching professional independence. (RI)
- The approaches proposed to be used during the fellowship are similar with those the candidate has already worked and therefore there is no clear diversification of the skills for the applicant. (RI)
- The capacity of the researcher to reach professional maturity and independence in research is not clearly evidenced. The independent thinking and leadership qualities of the researcher are insufficiently demonstrated in the proposal. The track record related to publications as first or corresponding author is relatively modest. (RI)
- The researcher's publications relate to the results of the PhD period and work carried out during the protracted postdoctoral stay in the host group await formalisation in the scientific literature. (RI)
- The number of first author publications of the candidate is limited for their level of experience. (RI)
- The fit between the proposed research and the researcher's main prior research experience is not convincing. (RI)
- It is not sufficiently clear how the fellowship will contribute to enhancing the researcher's professional maturity beyond their already established independence, given their experience in running their own laboratory or having a role of principal investigator. (RI)
- How the proposal will develop new independent thinking and potential for leadership qualities of the researcher is not appropriately demonstrated. (RI)
- The track record of the researcher in relation to the level of experience shows too few high impact papers published. (RI)
- The researcher insufficiently explains how the previously manifested scientific interests and publications are linked to those mentioned in the proposal. (RI)
- The researcher's academic background is modest, which may have impact on the progress of the academic component of the research. (RI)
- The researcher's publication list is not extensive and mostly concerns the architectural design and urban experience outside the home country. (RI)
- The proposal does not provide sufficient information on career development strategy. (RI)
- The contribution of the researcher's past experiences on the proposed research was not elaborated successfully. (RI)
- The work is highly likely to assist the reintegration of the researcher into the European research scene. (RI)
- How the research will open up career possibilities for the researcher is not sufficiently described. In addition, the international networking opportunities the host could offer have been described only in general terms. (RI)
- Although the researcher's overall track record is very solid and the quality of publications above average, the researcher's contribution as the principal author is not very convincing. (RI)

Criterion 2 – Impact

Strengths:

Enhancing the potential and future career prospects of the researcher (expected impact of the planned research and training, added value of the fellowship, new competences and skills etc.)

- Experience from a world-leading lab in a highly topical area of chemistry would provide a very sound footing for an academic career. (ST)
- The researcher would benefit from the interdisciplinarity training provided and by the host's extensive set of courses, for example in leadership, networking (through a COST action), communication, mentoring, management and business skills, etc., which are all needed to further advance a research career. (ST)
- Working under the supervision of an expert in the synthesis of new small molecule scaffolds together with the secondment opportunity in a world class private company will equip the fellow with a unique set of experiences and competencies that will be crucial for the successful realization of a future leadership career role. (ST)
- The proposal convincingly demonstrates that the researcher will develop knowledge and leadership ability to start new collaborations with both academia and industry. (ST)
- The enhancement of the potential career prospects are promising, because the researcher will acquire the (soft) skills and competencies in specialized pharmaceuticals research fields of synthesis, catalysis and bioisosters. (ST)
- The stimulating environment and the quality of the scientific and professional training will result in important opportunities for the applicant's future career. (ST)
- The project and the training activities will enhance many scientific and complementary skills of the researcher, thus enhancing the potential, maturity and independency of the researcher. (ST)
- During the fellowship, the researcher will acquire new skills in solid-liquid separation processes and in liquid-liquid separation processes. This is complementary to the existing expertise of the researcher in vapor-liquid separation, and will provide clear opportunities to become a promising leading researcher in the field. (ST)
- Chances to pursue a career in the industry after the fellowship will be greatly increased. (ST)
- The researcher will be prepared for an academic position, new grant applications and postdoc grants. The proposal clearly presents the added value of the secondment to his future career. (ST)
- The proposal clearly defines the impact of the fellowship on the researcher's career and independence, which will benefit from the gain of knowledge and development of skills in organic chemistry, chemical biology and bioinformatics, particularly in the field of nucleic acids. (ST)
- The training of the researcher in complementary skills is clearly demonstrated. The researcher will develop skills in project management, paper and grant writing, dissemination of project results and will get access to a wide range of lectures, meetings, workshops, etc. (ST)
- An important asset for the researcher's future career will be the development of leadership and mentorship abilities by guiding undergraduate and graduate students. (ST)
- The researcher will further enhance the already established scientific network, through contacts with the hosting institution's collaborators, beneficial for their future research endeavors. (ST)
- The career goals of the applicant are clearly outlined. The proposed project will contribute to the development of the soft skills of the experienced researcher and will enhance chances for an academic career. The project will also increase the visibility of the fellow in Europe and strengthen scientific networking. (ST)
- The proposal adequately demonstrates how the planned stay will enhance the future carrier prospects of the candidate, e.g. by collaborations with high-tech companies. (ST)
- The researcher has an initial planning to continue his career at selected universities with a clear intention to launch his own independent research group. (ST)
- The international connections of the hosting institute will enhance the visibility of the researcher. (ST)
- The proposal shows that the link between fundamental and applied research planned in the project will benefit the future career prospects of the applicant. (ST)

- The fellow will gain experience and competences in grant writing, communication and leadership. (ST)
- Some added value of the fellowship is demonstrated insofar as the broadened collaboration network will facilitate the setting up of the researcher's own group later. (ST)
- The researcher will acquire through the fellowship a high quality research training and gain relevant scientific knowledge and technical skills that will significantly contribute to enhance the potential and future career prospects of the candidate. The positive impact of the project on the applicant's career is clearly argued, in terms of learning new experimental techniques, exposure to national and international research network and broader academic development. Moreover the suggested collaboration among the different groups will help the researcher to establish a solid network and thus make it easier to land the next career step. (ST)
- The fellowship will enhance the skill base of the researcher. (ST)
- The fellowship will give the candidate a chance to develop own ideas and engage in scientific networking in bioinorganic chemistry. The proposed conference attendance will bring new academic contacts. (ST)
- It is convincingly demonstrated throughout the proposal that the fellowship will provide the researcher with new career prospects. The fellow has a clear long-term academic career plan in mind. (ST)
- Due to the quality of the project, the researcher will not only grow as an independent researcher but also will be more competitive in future funding applications. The researcher will be competitive for future research positions in biochemistry and biotechnology, and will be attractive for the bio-tech industry. (ST)
- Academic activities, such as student supervision, seminar attendance and presentation of own work at international conferences are mentioned. (ST)
- The researcher has a clear professional goal: to obtain an academic position. The proposal makes a convincing point describing four areas where the researcher will gain important new skills. The expected impact on the future career of the researcher is convincgly demonstrated. (ST)
- The proposal convincingly explains that the researcher will reinforce complementary skills to improve their CV.
- The host institution is committed to helping the researcher with future grant applications to launch an independent career. (ST)
- The host institution offers "Marie Curie + 1" initiative, funding support for an additional one year to the researcher to further consolidate the progress achieved from proposed research. (ST)
- The career of the researcher is still in its infancy and the project implementation will contribute substantially to its future development in both, academia or industry. (ST)
- The high quality multidisciplinary environment offered by the host institution and the effectively structured training plan will certainly enhance the potential and future career prospects of the researcher. (ST)
- Some transferable skills in supervision, publication, management, innovation, and collaboration are listed with a good host laboratory. (ST)
- The proposal outlines to a high level of details the scientific and complementary work that will benefit the researcher's career. (ST)
- The possibility of exchanging the researcher's national and international, academic and industry, network of contacts and cooperation, giving new opportunities for the researcher, is properly planned. (ST)
- The researcher will reach new competences through the proposal aimed the researcher in becoming full professor. (ST)
- The set of scientific and strategic objectives are convincingly designed to be beneficial for future career prospects since the scientific. (ST)
- objectives ensure that the interdisciplinarity skill set of the researcher is increased while the experience gained in achieving the strategic objectives (including leadership, management, and business awareness skills) will be necessary skills in future career developments. (ST)
- The proposal will have a high impact on the researcher's future career by extending their technical competences in Electromagnetic. (ST)
- Interference resilient circuit design, as well as fostering new collaborations within Europe. (ST)
- The researcher will develop a complete set of research skills throughout this project, preparing the researcher prominently for a group leader career. (ST)
- The researcher will be exposed to an excellent research environment, switch organism, allowing themselves to develop new ideas/collaborations and become an independent scientist. (ST)

- The successful outcome of the fellowship will increase the researcher´s probability to be granted independent funds to start up their own laboratory. (ST)
- The ER comprehensively describes the benefits granted by the MSCA fellowship, if awarded, for their future career perspectives, describing in detail the possibility to obtain important data to be published in prestigious journals, the possibility to enhance present, and create new, scientific collaborations, and the possibility to learn how to write a successful funding application under the supervision of a skilled mentor. (ST)
- The action constitutes a natural career step for the researcher, i.e., to provide theory for experiments in a high-quality international group. The long-term impact on researcher's career in terms of producing high-level publications, managing grants, extending his network, and supervising students of different levels is well laid out. The host group has a solid track record to train young researchers towards permanent academic positions. (ST)
- At the end of the project, the researcher will be a highly specialized experimentalist able to master a large panel of advanced technical and scientific methods in various experimental systems, resulting in a rare and sought-after profile in the domain of quantum technologies. (ST)
- Competences in management and transferable skills are considered, which will improve the career prospects of the researcher beyond the timeframe of the project. (ST)
- A positive outcome of the proposal would greatly contribute to the researcher's career advancement, in light of its innovative approach, the need to create a broad network encompassing several disciplines and the belonging to a newly developed branch of study. (ST)
- The proposal demonstrates the good potential of the researcher upon completion of the fellowship to reach a position inside or outside the academic world. (ST)
- The project is likely to enhance the potential and future career prospects of the researcher. It would provide the researcher with a broad training in skills needed in future research or commercial applications regarding games and neurocognitive training. (GF)
- The fellowship can provide very good opportunities to enhance the researcher's skills that are crucial for successful career in science, including research skills particularly in chemical ecology and improved use of statistics and Bayesian models and soft skills such as project coordination, management, IP and communication. Additionally, the support in grant preparation will help in securing funding in the future. (GF)
- Both supervisors have international collaborations, which may allow the researcher to establish new international academic contacts.(GF)
- The researcher's competences would be strengthened via the development of the research project and the enhancement of a broad range of relevant skills, including language skills. (GF)
- The host institution and partner organisation would provide perfect conditions to gain new competencies and enhance the potential to reach the much stronger position in the academy. (GF)
- Knowledge and competencies acquired during the fellowship will have a positive impact on the career development and future prospects of the researcher; several career prospects to be achieved are very well explained. (GF)
- The proposed project provides a possibility to enhance the career prospects of the researcher; the acquisition of new competencies and publishing (in English) would be an important advantage in the future career of the researcher. (GF)
- The collaborative network of multidisciplinary experts would provide the researcher with a very good model of interdisciplinarity cutting-edge research and promote the researcher's career development. The environment would provide the researcher with very good opportunities in developing translational and market-oriented research. (GF)
- The researcher will be able to substantially increase the expertise in neurorehabilitation and to complement already existing skills in very meaningful and relevant ways. This will substantially strengthen professional maturity and increase chances to establish an independent research position in the home country. (GF)
- The fellowship would make an important impact on the researcher's career and open up career possibilities for the researcher internationally. It would be possible by the following new achievements and competences: improved track of publications, participations in the international conferences, a tested combination between research and activism, digital competences, gender studies expertise. After the fellowship the researcher would be able to balance the research and academic career by the position of the associate professor in the home country. (GF)
- The methodological, conceptual, managerial advances, the communication, dissemination and teaching skills to be gained, the new language knowledge, the additional technological competences are all very

beneficial for the future career prospects of the researcher. (GF)

- The main aim of the researcher upon completion of the mobility is to compete for a permanent position in Europe or the United States, which will indeed be facilitated by the acquisitions gained during the proposal. (GF)
- As international post-doctoral training is highly valued within the researchers' current organisation (an academic institution), the fellowship has high potential to impact on the advancement of the researcher's future career. (GF)
- The proposal convincingly argues that the fellowship would add value to the researchers' current profile and consolidate the researcher's position as an international scholar, opening up new opportunities for collaboration within Europe. (GF)
- The training in spatial data analysis and visualization, as well as experiences in a non-EU research, training and social environment, will enhance the career prospects of the applicant. (GF)
- The long-term impact of the fellowship on the ER's career is adequately discussed. (GF)
- The expectations of the candidate have been clearly formulated. The training to be received in the outgoing phase will be very valuable for the future career back in Europe. (GF)
- The outgoing phase will very likely increase the publication record of the researcher. (GF)
- The fellowship will reinforce and expand the network of collaborators that the research has worldwide and the contact with highly productive scientists. These collaborations will be very valuable for a future career as an independent researcher. (GF)
- The opportunity to work at excellence centres in Europe and USA has a large potential to enhance the future career prospects of the researcher. The outlined routes to establish a future independent career in academia are appropriate. (GF)
- The proposal describes a clear strategy of the expected impact of the planned research and training on the researcher's career prospects after the fellowship, putting forth viable future career goals, with a focus on applying for an ERC grant as a long-term objective. (GF)
- By establishing a new link with American and European institutions the project would offer a possibility for the researcher to expand their professional independence and establish more diverse research collaborations. (GF)
- The acquisition of the stated new skills, together with the opportunities provided by the fellowship to work with the two highly acclaimed supervisors in their respective institutions, will significantly enhance the researcher's potential and career prospects. (GF)
- The expected impact of the planned research and training on the researcher's career prospects are clearly stated. They are extremely well suited, timely and convincing. (GF)
- The expected impact of the planned research and scientific training on the career prospects of the experienced researcher after the fellowship are very well described and credible. The scientific- and transferable skills acquired during the fellowship are complementary to the previous expertise and will support the researcher in pursuing the desired career as a modern leader in evolutionary biology. (GF)
- Strengthening the publication record and grant writing skills will enable the researcher to apply for funding and start an independent research group in the future. (GF)
- Significant opportunities for new co-operations and future career possibilities will be accessible to the researcher, especially during the time at the outgoing host, and the training in soft skills (including start-up companies) and research education at both hosts is highly relevant, with the latter often being a requirement for permanent positions at universities. (GF)
- The training, choice of case studies and renowned host institutions will definitely advance the career prospects to qualify for the stated aim of a permanent research position. Even though the research is more of empirical value than theoretically innovative, the current scholarly interest in the issues addressed would support the career prospects. (GF)
- The researcher plausibly suggests they will be able to build international collaborations linking Hispanic and Andean researchers and this will contribute to their international network. The researcher convincingly describes the added value gained with the fellowship with respect to improved technical skills . (GF)
- The proposal clearly describes the career plan of the researcher including training, networking, communication and dissemination strategies, is well-tailored and convincing for enhancing the future career prospects of the researcher to reach a level of professional maturity. (GF)
- The proposal lists a number of relevant research and other skills that would be obtained through the fellowship and which would enhance the potential career prospects of the researcher (GF)
- The researcher would acquire new teaching competences, expert knowledge and language skills . The

proposal sufficiently demonstrates that the new knowledge and language skills could later be used by the researcher to access new relevant literature and sources (data etc.). (GF)

- The added value of the proposed action on the researcher's future career is very significant, bringing new knowledge and skill-based competences, important publications and a new research topic. The action would help the researcher to acquire a rich and complex academic profile comprising various research, teaching, and clinical aspects, which would open the possibility to access various academic positions. (GF)
- The researcher would benefit from the new experience in different fields of non-academic sector (such as the participation in legislative activities in the related field of expertise). (GF)
- The fellowship would enable the researcher to resume their xxxx career after a series of career breaks due to family responsibilities. (CAR)
- The proposal credibly formulates the general contribution of the fellowship for the future career of the researcher. (CAR)
- The proposal convincingly explains how the research would impact positively on the career prospects of the experienced researcher, in terms of future applications for large funding awards and permanent academic positions. (CAR)
- The training action would enhance the future career prospects of the researcher, enlarging knowledge on research methodologies and contributing to their professional maturity. (CAR)
- The objectives for enhancing personal career development are well described as broadening skills in different fields. (CAR)
- The researcher would accumulate adequate research expertise and publications in the areas of xxxx, xxxx, xxxx and xxxx to apply for jobs in these fields. Its impact would be transformative and it would also enable the researcher to make competitive applications for future funding. (CAR)
- The applicant has already a significant track record of publications and the project will increase expertise in xxxx and xxxx. The competencies and transferable skills that will be acquired during the fellowship are expected to positively impact the professional development of the researcher. The acquired skills in project management and in writing grant applications and exposure to xxxx will enhance the fellow profile as an independent researcher and lead to a position to exploit opportunities arising from academic and private environments. (CAR)
- A good potential impact on the enhancement of future career prospects of the researcher through the proposed research and training activities is expected. (CAR)
- The xxxx fellowship would significantly re-enforce the researcher's scholarly profile, their professional maturity and independence, and increase the researcher's employment chances in academia and other sectors. (CAR)
- The proposal adequately addresses the career trajectory of the researcher. Moreover, it convincingly demonstrates how the fellowship could increase the researcher's employability by contributing to the realisation of the stated professional objectives of the researcher. (CAR)
- The project would allow the researcher to become more internationally recognised, improve the publication record and, importantly, gain a xxxx position. (CAR)
- The researcher would also benefit from the networking opportunities that exist in the host organisation which would enhance the researcher's future career prospects. In particular, the current project promises to lay a solid groundwork for future projects. (CAR)
- The training will enhance the researcher's skills in teaching and student supervision. (CAR)
- The proposal clearly explains the new skills and competencies that will be acquired during the fellowship, in terms of subject specific expertise, research and methodological skills and general transferable skills. The proposal outlines a suitable personalized training programme, including workshops on research strategy development, public engagement, and preparation for grant applications. (CAR)
- The fellowship would enable the researcher to build expertise on the relationship between xxxx, xxxx and xxxx in past and present xxxx. (CAR)
- The researcher would benefit from the fellowship gaining new experiences and exposure to xxxx networks. (CAR)
- The research results will be communicated to the policy-making community and the researcher plans to use public events to disseminate the information gathered during the project. (CAR)
- The new competences and knowledge to be acquired during the planned research and training will provide high quality competences in animal production systems with relevance to the industrial sector. (CAR)
- The proposal identifies an adequate list of new competences that would be acquired by the researcher,

such as policy-relevant language or data management. (ST)

- The proposed fellowship will enhance the methodological, theoretical and publishing skills of the researcher. (ST)
- The fellowship will provide the researcher with excellent opportunities for future research activity in the field and will facilitate their planning to establish a fuel cell lab in their home university. (CAR)
- The researcher will acquire new competences in terms of research capabilities, as the proposal involves strengthening international connections, publications and research skills. (ST)
- The applicant would gain increased methodological competency, further experience working at the host institution and a broader international network as a result of this fellowship. (ST)
- The researcher will gain valuable new experience and skills in project management and administration, and also research-specific skills through learning two new ancient/rare languages, and editing/designing skills. The skillsset is impressive including both research-specific and transferable skills, thus significantly enhancing future career prospects. (CAR)
- The expected impact of the proposed research and is clearly articulated and beneficial for the researcher's career prospects. The researcher would gain a number of specific skills, all transferable, and in high demand in the science community, including experience in 3D animation, 3D printing and video mapping. The researcher would also receive training in new software skills. (CAR)
- The proposal extensively documents the specific areas of training and know-how which would enhance the researcher's career prospects after the fellowship; the specific and relevant new competences and skills that enhance the researcher's profile and add value to future career opportunities of the researcher are identified; the researcher will definitely benefit in all relevant aspects (subject expertise, research practice, communication, recognition, and networking). (ST)
- The fellowship presents an excellent opportunity for the researcher to not only restart a career in academia, but to also continue growth and transition from a background in political history towards environmental history and environmental studies more broadly. (CAR)
- The proposed research environment at both the host and partner institutions offer very good possibilities for positively influencing the present difficult research-policy dialogue. (CAR)
- There is adequate evidence that the work-environment of the host institution will have a positive impact on the researcher´s career. This will allow the researcher to acquire new competences and skills in order to get a tenured position in the future. (ST)
- The stay at one of the leading laboratories in the field of high pressure will boost the future academic career of the researcher, reinforcing his curriculum with high impact publications. (RI)
- The project will give the researcher the possibility to re-integrate into the European system and establish himself at the host institution, including both research and teaching activities. (RI)
- The researcher will be also trained in leadership, management and financial skills, thereby making him a more mature and independent researcher. (RI)
- The candidate has a good potential to reach an academic position in the future, after training in a new field of photo –chemistry and will have a chance to influence development of new technologies. These benefits of exposure to different working environments on the prospective career development of the applicant are sufficiently pointed out. (RI)
- The research skills to be developed at the host institution are appropriate and relevant to the researcher's needs. (RI)
- The researcher would acquire a portfolio of new competencies and complementary skills, which have not been part of their previous training (e.g., directing an independent research program, reintegrate into European Research Area and expanding European network). (RI)
- The plans and strategies to support future career perspectives of the fellow after the fellowship completion are sufficiently detailed. The career prospects of the researcher will be also improved, in part due to the proposed collaborations with industry as well as by the potential applicability of the project results. (RI)
- The fellowship will enhance the researcher's national and international visibility through exposure to the host's collaborative network and participation in a multicentre team. (RI)
- The MSCA project will be instrumental in order to grant the researcher the possibility of obtaining a position of maturity and full activity after a particularly demanding –and productive post-doctoral phase. The ER will have acquired research skills on a higher level about the application of digital-heritage methods and technology, management of cultural information systems, the use of 3D reconstructions and augmented reality, as well as skills in teaching methodologies in the Digital Heritage Programme. The ER will consolidate an extensive network and the proposal will provide the same researcher with a solid basis from witch to participate in international research collaborations, as

well as to re-integrate within the scientific community in Europe. (RI)
- The proposal will provide the candidate with a pro-active environment and the high involvement in European projects. (RI)
- The action has potential to consolidate the researcher's scientific and technical expertise in the field, to enhance the researcher's professional maturity, and to broaden the local collaborating network. (RI)
- The fellowship will reinforce the future career prospects of the researcher by providing increased recognition, greater network and outreach opportunities in a new country, and improved collaboration with industry. (RI)
- Through the realisation of the proposed research, the researcher would acquire new knowledge of quantitative and qualitative research techniques. (RI)
- The fellowship offers a potential for an added value considering the researcher's profile, because besides developing skills, publishing articles and a monograph, the researcher would also have the opportunity to establish a network, which would be useful with regard to the researcher's future career prospects. (RI)
- The training through the proposed research will provide a very good opportunity for a successful reintegration of the researcher in Europe. The new knowledge and skills acquired during this fellowship has the potential to significantly enhance the researcher´s future career prospects. (RI)
- The proposed project is well aligned with the researcher's long term interests. It complements and expands their previous expertise with additional know-how on cutting-edge molecular tools to study genome organisation and consolidates their overall scientific qualification by means of collaborative interactions within and outside the host institution. This will positively impact on the researcher's future career as a scientist. (RI)
- The host will broaden the researcher's prospect based on its extensive network of contacts in research, education and academia. (RI)
- The project will have a very substantial and positive impact on the re-integration of the researcher in Europe and the enhancement of their career prospects, which is credibly documented by the plans to utilise the project accomplishments to exploit specific post-project opportunities. (RI)
- The proposal justifies how the solid multi-faceted training opportunities in the host institution and other participating organizations, the research accomplishments and their visibility would promote the researcher's reintegration in a tenure track academic position in Europe. (RI)
- A convincing list of planned training, acquired skills, and expected impacts on the Experienced Researcher's career prospects is provided. The application describes very well how the Fellowship will act as a contribution to career development. (RI)
- The proposed research will have a good impact on the scientific development of the researcher by providing skills in phylogenetic and phylogenomic techniques and additional opportunities in museums collections, teaching and supervision. (RI)
- The new interdisciplinarity competencies and inter-sectoral skills to be gained by the researcher during the fellowship, together with the capacity to manage research projects, and the training foreseen in the proposal would enhance the capacities of the researcher to develop the career after the fellowship. (RI)
- The research is supposed to lead to multiple publications that would improve the researcher's standing. (RI)
- The added value of the fellowship on the future career of the researcher is positive as it supports the researcher's goal to get a permanent position and become an associate professor. (RI)
- The non-technical training modules will enhance the career prospects of the researcher in industry. (RI)
- The considerable experience in practising architectural design as associated with business, the proposed project should enhance researcher's horizons by becoming better acquainted with the dynamics of academic research, thus greatly improving career opportunities. (RI)
- With the experience in designing, business operation and the acquired academic standing, the researcher may considerably contribute to the process of socio-economic development in the home country. (RI)
- The researcher explicitly declares, that will take the active role of Marie Skłodowska-Curie Ambassador, promoting the MSC action, which is very valuable. (RI)
- The training to be implemented during the project will further increase the level of professional maturity of the researcher and will provide job opportunities, for example, in colleges, universities and museums. (RI)
- The researcher proposes to act as Marie Curie Ambassador, a commitment already present in the

enclosed CV, as the same researcher is an active member and Chair of the Events and Network Working Group of the Marie Curie Alumni Association. (RI)

Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the action results (including intellectual property rights)

- The proposal describes a clear plan for publications in high-profile journals and a thoughtful plan for conference attendance. (ST)
- The proposal describes a varied plan of outreach activities, including periodic contributions to popular science magazines, as well as direct public engagement activities, which would open up more opportunities to interact with potential industrial partners through this project. (ST)
- The dissemination strategy is clearly described and is appropriate. The proposal convincingly describes that the results of the project are planned to be published in high impact ISI journals and will also be presented at national and international conferences and events. Sufficient time is allocated to dissemination. (ST)
- Outreach activities such as participation to visits and talks to schools and events (Discovery Night, Sheffield Festival of Science and Engineering) geared towards general public will certainly promote science and increase their level of knowledge and are clearly detailed. (ST)
- The intellectual property issues are appropriately considered. (ST)
- The dissemination is carefully planned in detail including proper journals, conferences and invited lectures. (ST)
- An IPR strategy is well described and justified that would positively impact the exploitation of the project results. (ST)
- Exploitation of the results and potential intellectual property aspects are well considered via routines of the host institute. (ST)
- The measures to disseminate the action results to the scientific community, including the organization of a dedicated workshop and participation in international conferences, are of good quality. (ST)
- The proposed dissemination and exploitation plan is well presented and of good quality. Appropriate means of dissemination of research results (publication in peer reviewed journals and conference contributions) are proposed. Expected interactions with the industry are described and IP issues are adequately considered. (ST)
- The proposed measures to disseminate and communicate the project results to both the scientific international community, to the industry sector and to the broad public are very well planned. (ST)
- Measures aimed to protect results with commercial potential are properly foreseen and will be implemented. (ST)
- The exploitation plan is feasible in general and it is included in one of the secondments. (ST)
- The plan for the dissemination of results is adequately presented; it is based on publication of results, participation in international conferences and university meetings. Additional actions, such as internal exchange and networking events, are well outlined and will be implemented to increase the visibility of the project results among other researchers. (ST)
- The knowledge generated during the implementation of the action will be exploited by the researcher in collaboration with the supervisor, who holds extensive expertise in this issue, with an external partner having relevant experience and with the hosting institution's administration. (ST)
- A variety of very good measures is proposed to disseminate the results also outside the academic community.
- Contacts with the industry are mentioned that are highly relevant for valorization of the outcomes of the project. (ST)
- Measures proposed for the exploitation of the results are adequate. An assessment procedure will be implemented to identify any exciting chemistry that might require IP protection in the course of the project. İntellectual property issues are properly considered. (ST)
- The researcher plans to participate to different actions that will reach broader audiences. An effective use of social media is also proposed. (ST)
- The University's IP team can provide the support to exploit the results through IP route. (ST)
- A comprehensive program is described to communicate the research results to a wider audience through a variety of outreach activities e.g. schools, science festivals and local newspaper. (ST)
- A standard plan for dissemination through publications and conferences is provided. (ST)
- The dissemination programme, for the scientific community, is well planned, in terms of high impact publications, e.g. Journal of the American Chemical Society, Angewandte Chemie, Chemistry of Materials, and Advanced Energy Materials, where between 5 to 10 publications are planned to be

submitted during the project. Conference presentations, e.g. the annual meeting of the International Society of Electrochemistry and specific battery forums are considered as well. (ST)

- The exploitation strategy and the IPR aspect are sufficiently reflected and overall appropriate according to the university and H2020 guidance. In addition, immediate implementation of good results will be exploited together with company XXXX, which is part of host's industrial involvements. (ST)
- Considering the proposed work on known chemical scaffold, a rigorous IP plan is not presented, for example strategy on how to warrant IP protection after 12 months is insufficiently addressed. (ST)
- The IPR issues are recognized and participation of the instruments of the host institute in patenting is discussed well. (ST)
- The supervisor has expertise in IP transfer and in start-up companies creation and funding. (ST)
- The plans for social media and multimedia releases to reinforce dissemination are very good. (ST)
- An outstanding variety of channels are expected to be used for the communication of the science to a wide array of audiences including school students and the general public through social media, open days, direct presentations, radio and videos. (ST)
- The plans for the dissemination of the results in scientific journal and at conferences are very clear, ambitious, and feasible. (ST)
- The dissemination plan is realistic regarding presentation of research findings at conferences and to policy makers. (ST)
- A very promising IPR strategy is outlined in the proposal. The host group manages a spin-off company potentially interested in the action´s results. (ST)
- The proposed dissemination measures directed towards the general scientific community are convincing and very good. (ST)
- Dissemination of the results follows a well-developed strategy; top-tier publications are identified as targets and this is feasible according to the previous achievements of the supervisor. (ST)
- A non-technical leaflet will be mailed to target associations and schools to create awareness among general public about the research work. (ST)
- The research programme has a good potential for transferability of results to other market applications, beyond transport. The proposal demonstrates a strong exploitation strategy with very good focus on entrepreneurship and start-up activities. The stakeholders' engagement is also addressed very well with well-considered impacts on business/start-ups, research contracts, and scientific community. (ST)
- There are very good and coherently articulated measures to disseminate results to wide audience such as open days, students presentations, videos and public lectures. (ST)
- The outcomes of this research may have an economic impact and intellectual property rights issues are appropriately considered. (ST)
- The dissemination strategy is well conceived and overall credible. The planning of the dissemination activities is adequately described in the Gantt diagram. Possible exploitation is well considered. (ST)
- The dissemination strategy is included in the Gantt Chart and consists of standard approaches like publications in (undefined) journals and presentations. (ST)
- The dissemination through journals is appropriate to the project's goals and addresses correctly the open access policy. The communication through conferences is sensible and adequate, and well complemented by mobility actions. (ST)
- Valuable yearly lectures in the fellow´s homeland are planned. (GF)
- The proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the action results are well documented and feasible (GF)
- Being trained by the partner organization is likely to result in an optimal academic dissemination of the research outcome. In parallel, commercialization of the outcome will also be considered. (GF)
- Potential partner organizations are identified for commercial exploitation of the action results. (GF)
- Dissemination activities targeting academia and professionals have been described with sufficient detail and include publications in international peer reviewed journals and presentations in international scientific conferences and social media. (GF)
- The dissemination plan targeting the academic community convincingly includes plans on publishing 2 peer reviewed articles, 1 monograph (in English and Italian), setting up a website and giving talks and lectures to undergraduate students and postgraduates and at international conferences and workshops. (GF)
- Both research groups have spin-off companies; this is a significant advantage for commercial exploitation of the action results. (GF)

- The dissemination plan is very credible and lists significant deliverables such as a monograph on the dissolution of the USSR, scientific articles, participation in conferences, improved teaching skills, and more. All these deliverables are planned to be published in outstanding scientific publications and monograph series, which is also an asset of the proposal. (GF)
- Appropriate support from a Technology Transfer Office, linked to the return host institution, will be provided if the action results were to be exploited. (GF)
- The proposal includes an clearly articulated ambitious and fairly innovative, yet viable, range of dissemination measures, corresponding with the research objectives, and including different media channels of the host institutions, academic publications, workshops, a video graphic essay, round-tables. (GF)
- The proposal includes a credible plan for ensuring publication of the project's findings in open access contexts. (GF)
- The dissemination plan includes innovative formats like videos and story telling(GF)
- The dissemination measures are classical and correct. They include articles in peer-reviewed journals, international symposia, open-data repositories, and lectures in both institutions. This is the traditional way of disseminating new knowledge in this field of research. (GF)
- The exploitation plans are commensurate to the needs of the project and appropriate measures to protect results have been elaborated. (GF)
- The different range of proposed dissemination and communication activities is positively designed to reach different types of audiences. In this regard measures designed to disseminate back to the field are notable, such as the seminar in collaboration with Moroccan NGOs. (GF)
- Wide dissemination of the obtained new knowledge is planned via web-based species catalogs and online illustrated identification keys. The communication via the web platform tool is well considered. (GF)
- Adequate information is provided on a number of dissemination activities, including teaching and student supervision, and two workshops. (GF)
- The internet plays important role in the dissemination strategy as the researcher plans launching project blog and will use variety of social media since the early beginning of the project. (GF)
- The dissemination strategy is sound and includes different types of outputs including a monograph, research articles, seminars and participation in international conferences. Specific relevant events, institutions and publications are identified both in Australia and Europe that will benefit dissemination . (GF)
- The proposal adequately mentions the main platforms useful to disseminate the new knowledge generated by the action to a specialised public (mainly through peer-reviewed impact journals with an emphasis on Open access, significant international meetings, a specialized international workshop, web page, research.gate and academia.edu). (GF)
- The general inherent quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the action results is high. They include conferences, journals, and internal communication in the host organizations. (GF)
- The Exploitation plan is very well addressed, properly considers the future use of data, with clearly identified needs and constraints including good consideration of intellectual property rights, as well as online resources. community, including specific details of events or links to websites on which information will be hosted; for example, the Pint of Science event and European Researchers' Night events. well as presentations and a planned bi-lingual web platform. (GF)
- The project has strong potential for the generation of IP rights and Exploitation. This is further strengthened by the valorisation award received by the candidate for this technology and by the interest shown by different investigators in the field. (GF)
- Measures to exploit the action's results are well described, seeking to communicate these results to a wide range of stakeholders. (CAR)
- The exploitation of results is well described; a clear strategy and adequate measures are presented for the transfer of knowledge to industry and for IP issues. (CAR)
- The host institution has large experience of publication and results exploitation thanks to its Technology Transfer Office dealing with the private sector and the creation of spinout companies. The measures for the dissemination of the results are generally good, taking into consideration an open source strategy. Strategic alliances are planned between the host and xxxx companies to maximize the efficiency of academic-industrial collaborations. (CAR)
- Multi-lingual nature of the dissemination strategy, as well as the clear target of the proposed actions, add value to the proposal. (CAR)
- The proposal generally puts forth a clear and coherent dissemination strategy to reach an academic

audience (for instance, workshops offered at host institution, conference papers and participation, co-organization of a xxxx symposium, participation in international seminars, publication of xxxx peer-reviewed journal articles, and work on a book manuscript to be published after the fellowship period).

- Some envisaged dissemination measures, such as a conference and accompanying activities, have a good dissemination potential. (CAR)
- As manifested by the CV and in the described plan, the researcher's commitment to open science is remarkable. There are also plans to make the models easy to use for non-technical users in an on-line portal for xxxx. (CAR)
- The very good plan to present work in progress via a longer talk at the former home university of the researcher would be a good advertisement for the researcher's own work and also the host's resources. (CAR)
- The proposed dissemination measures are well articulated and contain original ideas, such as an innovative approach to dissemination of results through a specific target group of university students who will be involved in the proposal. (ST)
- Dissemination measures in the academic and research audiences are well defined. They include articles in journals, attendance to international congresses and free access of the data set developed in the project. These measures are sufficiently identified in the Gantt Chart. (ST)
- The proposal includes several substantial communication and dissemination measures, which are relevant to reach academics and inform and involve as much as possible policymakers and civil society actors at different levels. (CAR)
- The proposed measures for the dissemination of the results are convincingly exposed, including papers in highly ranked journals, some of which are open access, thus enlarging the potential audience. (CAR)
- Concrete dissemination planning is included in the Gantt Chart. (ST)
- There is a good and realistic scientific publication strategy. (ST)
- The planned dissemination activities are of different types and target different groups within academia. (CAR)
- The project considers an appropriate dissemination strategy and adequate measures for the diffusion of the research outcomes in the scientific community, including a credible publication strategy, presentations in appropriate conferences, workshops and seminars, and web briefings on major research sites. (ST)
- The plan of dissemination addressed to the professional audience is ambitious. It includes one monograph (draft), an article on Gypsy women's agency in peer review journal, one exhibition, conference presentations and organization of international conferences and workshops. (ST)
- A set of workshops, conferences and seminar presentations in academic and policy institutions are planned to disseminate the action results, which can help the researcher to interact with academic scholars and policy-makers in the context of the proposal. (ST)
- The dissemination strategy is clearly described, publication output and conferences presentation are concisely described including the planned topic; realistic plan to present the results at three conference and publish two papers; the measures to exploit the action results are presented in detail and well sequenced. (ST)
- The proposal presents adequate plans for a range of exploitation and dissemination activities among various identified stakeholders and potential users (such as think tanks and universities, government entities, regional governments and high-level international organisations). (ST)
- The researcher's link to the OECD and the planned joint working papers have the potential to greatly enhance the exploitation opportunities. (ST)
- The way the new knowledge generated by the research will be disseminated and exploited is clearly presented. (ST)
- The proposal outlines some different channels for dissemination of the findings, mainly aligned with the instruments already existing at the host institution. (ST)
- The plan for the possible exploitation of the action results is clearly articulated, including future drug screening strategies, vaccine or software development for the relevant industries. (RI)
- Dissemination in the form of scientific papers and conference presentations is well addressed and planned in the Gantt Chart. Dissemination aims at high impact journals and conferences. The experience of host and researcher in that matter proves that this objective will be achieved. (RI)
- The proposed dissemination strategy takes into account also open licenses and repositories. Different tools to exploit and to disseminate the action results are provided and for each one, a short but specific and realistic plan on how to apply it is presented. (RI)
- The researcher shows the capability to get support by the host institution and colleagues and to reach

the planned goals in dissemination. (RI)

- A clear plan of dissemination and exploitation of results is presented. The researcher proposes an effective program to disseminate the results – high-impact scientific papers, repository, oral and poster presentations in scientific conferences, seminar at other EU universities, class excursions to the lab by high school students, code for bioinformatics analyses to be publicly available, freely available databases on sequencing data, plasmids through MTAs, protocols shared through the lab website. (RI)
- The proposal provides a clear and ambitious dissemination plan, including the organisation of workshops, participation in conferences as well as by means of outputs in both article and monograph form. The proposal also includes plans for dissemination via social media and research fora such as the Marie Curie Alumni Association and EuroScience Open Forum. (RI)
- The researcher proposes to produce three substantial academic articles over the project's development, which will be submitted to identified peer-reviewed journals. The articles resulting of the two research workshops proposed as part of the work plan will be published as peerreviewed conference proceedings. (RI)
- The plans for exploitation and dissemination of the results are valid and well presented. The Host institution has the capacity to support and enhance such plans through the Technology Transfer Office. (RI)
- The knowledge generated by the action will be disseminated through standard ways such as publications in peer-reviewed journals, and conference presentations (national and international). The actions are scheduled in the Gantt Chart. (RI)
- The strategy for research dissemination is well established and includes an appropriate number of peer-reviewed contributions, participation in conferences and targeting relevant international scientific audience. (RI)
- The proposal specifies potentially exploitable outcomes and already suggests industry partners for potential exploitation. (RI)
- The past research and creative work of the ER in countries relevant for the proposed project, which has received substantial media and policy attention, will be leveraged on in the current dissemination of project results. (RI)
- The researcher plans to create robust datasets to inform future projects and disseminate the data. (RI)
- Specialist audiences are targeted by detailed and appropriate dissemination measures, such as peer-reviewed publications and presentations at national and international conferences. Effective additional actions, such as personal log or the group's website, are geared towards optimally disseminating the transferable know-how generated during the fellowship. (RI)
- The proposed dissemination measures are convincingly addressed and highly appropriate, including publications in high quality journals and international conferences. The four manuscripts envisaged are compatible with the time-frames and workloads suggested. (RI)
- Dissemination of project results is sufficiently addressed through regular avenues, peer reviewed publications and attendance to international conferences. The use of bioRxiv to disseminate the research finding prior to publication will facilitate the transfer of knowledge to other researchers. Depositing generated reagents into repositories will allow other researchers to access them, enhancing dissemination and will be of great benefit to the research community. (RI)
- The proposed measures for exploiting and disseminating both the action results are very completely and effectively outlined. The dissemination plan convincingly includes communications to international journals, social media platforms, meetings, and databases. (RI)
- The researcher has solid experience in communicating scientific results and demonstrates a good knowledge related to importance of various journals and conferences that form a dissemination target for the proposed project. (RI)
- The proposal identifies appropriate dissemination initiatives, including reputable conferences, seminars and publications in high-rank journals. It also considers adequate policy-oriented dissemination activities, using the connections already established by the researcher with important policy institutions. (RI)
- There are sound plans in place to allow the research data to be potentially exploited for the development of drugs for the treatment of autoimmune conditions and appropriate protection of intellectual property rights are considered. (RI)
- The measures for the open source implementation of the computation code and its dissemination in community-effort platforms are considered and sound. (RI)
- It is valuable that the project would produce an open-access online database with data gathered during the longitudinal research, which would be of use to researchers and students. (RI)

- The research would lead to four articles in top-tier political science journals. (RI)
- Open Science perspectives and school community role are important in this project. (RI)

Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the action activities to different target audiences

- The host laboratory is actively engaged in innovative outreach activities directed to both a specialized and non-specialized audience, and the outreach activities are well-formulated and realistic. (ST)
- The measures for the dissemination of the project results for wider and different target audiences are frequent and of high quality and take into account different target groups. These are also scheduled in the Gantt Chart. (ST)
- Measures for the communication of the action are very well described in the proposal; target groups, activities, channels and means of verification are adequately identified. (ST)
- The knowledge generated during the implementation of the action will be exploited by the researcher in collaboration with the supervisor, who holds extensive expertise in this issue, with an external partner having relevant experience and with the hosting institution's administration. (ST)
- Adequate actions of sufficient quality for communication of the activities to different target audiences, e.g. via social media or visits in schools are included. (ST)
- The proposal contains ambitious outreach activities that include the extensive utilisation of social networks. (ST)
- The communication and public engagement strategy of the action using different communication channels and target groups is appropriate. (ST)
- The researcher intends to present the research project and its results to a number of non-professional audiences, including adults and youngsters. (ST)
- Regarding the communication of the research results to non-specialized audiences, a number of well-described and appropriate activities are proposed, including references to similar activities of the researcher in the past. (ST)
- Communication activities are well balanced between academic communication and the general public one. Outreach activities are clearly articulated ranging from awareness-raising activities for local public (e.g. schools) to dissemination via the internet medium. (ST)
- The use of web-based resources and the use of the researcher's mother tongue as well as English will be beneficial to the outreach of this action. (ST)
- By the end of the fellowship, the wide combination of gained experience will place the researcher in a unique position with an incredibly strong profile in the areas of electrochemistry, corrosion and nanoscience. This will make the researcher an attractive candidate for both academia and industry. Additionally, the researcher will be in contact with the host team network of collaborators which will contribute to increase the researcher visibility and opens new opportunities. (ST)
- The measures proposed to communicate are numerous, including different media and existing platforms at the host institute. They are convincingly described, different target audiences are identified and furthermore the measures are well supported by earlier experiences of the applicant. (ST)
- Expanding the network of influence of the researcher through collaborations has not been taken into account.
- School and university visits as well as exhibitions will be organized, targeting the local communities in the areas of two case studies. (ST)
- The researcher will deliver two public lectures in the home country of the beneficiary host institution addressing a general public. (ST)
- Communication support is available from the host, giving access to local media, the hosts' social media channels, activities at secondary schools, and participation in the European Researcher's Night. (ST)
- The timing and frequency of the communication activities have not been sufficiently described. (ST)
- The proposed communication strategy is plausible and in accordance to the EU guidelines on research communication and European Charter for Researchers. Two-way communication between the researcher and different target audiences is positively enabled by use of appropriate tools, especially by using several multimedia instruments. (ST)
- The proposed measures to communicate the action activities to different target audiences are of very good quality. A mix of channels and tools is envisaged. The communication plan is realistic, and some very interesting and novel methods of communication to a wider audience including young people, women, the general public are provided. (ST)
- Many concrete actions are considered by the researcher to reach a general audience such as BBC

website and Science Net, Facebook. (ST)

- Being part of a strong international mathematics community, the researcher's results will address a large audience. (ST)
- The researcher already has a consolidate experience in the communication of mathematical results to a broader audience, for instance the researcher has experience in writing popular scientific articles. Planning of communication activities is convincingly presented in the Gantt Chart. (ST)
- Concrete planning of scientific communication is clearly explained and included in the Gantt Chart. The proposal gives a clear list of measures for reaching different target audiences like British Science Week, Festival at the host institution, social media, and demonstrations on Youtube. (ST)
- The researcher will use channels existing at the host laboratory and institute to engage the general public in scientific research and communicate results. (ST)
- Although there are clear intentions to disseminate the proposed research to different communities, including clinicians and industry, which journals or forums these have not been discussed in sufficient detail. (ST)
- The previous outreach experience of the researcher and the host institution as well as the proposed training on interacting with the nonscientific press will positively contribute to the success of this task. (ST)
- Appropriate strategies are proposed for communication towards non-specialized audience and scholars. (ST)
- The proposal includes an efficient plan to communicate the proposal's activities towards the general public, and more generally to educate on astrophysics, through the host institution's outreach activities and commendable personal initiatives. Adaptation of the level of outreach will occur depending the capacity of the audience to receive the disseminated information. The outreach activities will cover the time frame of the proposal. (ST)
- The use of a specific webpage for the project is praiseworthy and will target a wider audience. Participation to "The week of Science" is well foreseen, which guarantees the popularization among general public. (ST)
- The communication strategy provides targeted information to multiple audiences and includes relevant media such as the radio and the internet, as well as popular science lectures. (ST)
- The dissemination activities include a workshop in the initial stage and a conference in the final stage of the action. The focus on the network of judges can contribute to a better communication of the project results.(This is a social sciences project.) (ST)
- There is a well-formulated plan to communicate the action to the public through different media in a locally based perspective, i.e. taking part in local initiatives interested in history and commemorations. The proposal also includes outreach activities such as public lectures for broader audience, and the use of social media (e.g. writing for popular blogs). (ST)
- The measures to communicate the action activities to various audiences are good and well-detailed in the proposal. Additionally, these measures are included in the Gantt Chart. (GF)
- The communication strategy is good and includes the increasing of the public awareness of the impacts of global change by communication of findings in the media (radio and webpage in a broadcaster), in social networks (blog, Twitter). (GF)
- Additionally, the outgoing host group has a very good experience in the communication of results to a broad and diverse audience, including lawyers, executives and politicians. The researcher will benefit from this experience by participating on ongoing periodical planned activities. (GF)
- The work with high school students at the incoming phase is concretely exposed. (GF)
- The proposal details a range of measures to communicate the action activities to different target audiences, such as a wide academic community, artists and music schools, and the general public. (GF)
- Outreach activities are novel, attractive and reasonably well-conceived. There is an outreach strategy with a detailed plan on how and where the results will be communicated to very different audiences, with different methods such as informative booklets or radio interviews.
- Marie Curie Ambassador activities are planned. (GF)
- The plans described in the proposal for communication of the outcomes of the research are high quality, detailed, specific and targeted towards appropriate audiences through presentations, reports, teaching, supporting and training research-practice partnerships. (GF)
- The proposal judiciously describes a variety of measures that would be undertaken by the researcher in order to communicate the action to diverse audiences, including use of the internet and media channels of the universities, round-tables, workshops and film screenings, in addition to visiting secondary schools, universities and NGOs and informing them about newly created teaching which is

a key aspect of the project. (GF)
- The researcher's engagement with other European researchers is demonstrated in activities such as the participation at the European Researchers' Night, which is an added value in term of specialist target audiences. (GF)
- The measures to communicate the activities to different target groups are convincing. Both the frequency and the nature of the communication activities are adequately presented. (GF)
- Regarding Exploitation, the researcher specifically proposes to look for advice regarding the protection of intellectual property through the commercially-oriented teams at their institution. (GF)
- A detailed communication plan is provided, including specific means and addressed at different target audiences, such as academic institutions, public, patients and other stakeholders. Active participation in the board of international societies will facilitate communication of the results. (GF)
- A range of communication channels will be used (twitter, broadcasts, game-based learning activities at schools, newspapers and magazines), with emphasis on the general public and high school students. (GF)
- Eight communication actions are described for the incoming phase, including web articles, community talks, a public lecture, school events and a local press article. This shows an appropriate intention to reach diverse institutions. (GF)
- There is an ambitious plan of teaching activities and production of teaching materials to present the project outcomes. (GF)
- The proposal considers several appropriate measures for communication, such as making data available online, publications in newspapers, and a science show at European Researchers' Night. (GF)
- The researcher has also planned to realize a documentary of the results, press releases, organize events and participate in conferences and other happenings. (GF)
- The Experienced Researcher will attend a dedicated workshop offered by the host institution to improve communication skills. The host institution promotes a variety of outreach activities, both in-school and on-campus, including mentoring, tutoring, talks, participation in fairs and demonstrations. The active engagement of the researcher in specific outreach activities directed to a non-specialized audience is convincing. (CAR)
- The proposal has a detailed and effective communication plan. The planning is included in the Gantt Chart. (CAR)
- The institutional framework in which the project will be communicated is well outlined. (CAR)
- The proposal provides details of proposed measures to communicate the action results to non-academic audiences; these include social media usage and outreach events. Concrete planning for these outputs is included in the work plan and Gantt Chart; the information provided is limited but adequate. (CAR)
- Some different target groups are mentioned in the proposal. (CAR)
- The proposal identifies a large audience of non-specialists that would be interested in the results of the proposal (e.g. xxx). (CAR)
- The measures for communication of results to different target audiences are well above average. They are very relevant and very well specified, communicating project results and substantially promoting cultural heritage and hands-on experience for younger people. (CAR)
- The proposal solidly describes a set of measures to communicate the action and its results to academic audiences. (ST)
- The proposal sufficiently provides information on the communication approach to different target audiences. Focus groups and events with public institutions and non-academic stakeholders are planned within the proposal. Moreover, the Marie Curie alumni association is planned to be used. (ST)
- The proposed measures to communicate the action is well described as it targets different type of audiences, using different media/approaches (articles in local newspapers). (ST)
- Besides an academic audience, the proposal convincingly identifies teachers and students of Turkic languages as relevant target audiences. The proposal lists specific and adequate communication measures (training events, workshops, lectures, website). (ST)
- The measures to communicate the project to the Internet community and general public is clear and properly described, following a credible and well-paced plan. The initiative to create a Wikipedia page is particularly adequate. (CAR)
- The communication and public engagement strategy of the project is well designed in terms of the number of communication channels and it is also well described. In particular, several different target groups are addressed and detailed planned activities for communication with them are provided. (ST)
- The proposal presents a realistic public engagement strategy based on communication, outreach and

visibility activities carried out at local (unofficial networking and discussion meetings) and international levels (posts and debates on blog on entrepreneurship etc.). (ST)

- Evidence has been presented that the proposal aims at communicating the outcomes of the project to various non-specialist and non- scientific audiences via book for "grand public" written in a clear and simple style and Memoranda of Understanding detailing the research results for museums and research centres. (CAR)
- The proposal includes a good set of communication activities and meaningful channels that would positively contribute to communicating the action and its results to different audiences. The use of media is promising. The website in different languages as well as the plan to involve NGOs are highly appropriate. (ST)
- The planned communication activities are varied, accessible and target different audiences, since they range from appearances on television to Facebook. For example, a dedicated YouTube channel is an original idea, which could reach a large non-academic audience in a low- threshold way. (CAR)
- The researcher is fully aware of the importance of targeting grassroots organizations and local stakeholders not only for research but for also for consultancy and policy purposes. (CAR)
- The researcher offers the ground-breaking proposition of relying on their previous formation in scientific journalism and documentary film production to elaborate visual production connected to the fieldwork in order to reach decision-makers and a wider audience. (CAR)
- The communication of the results is designed in an excellent manner, target audiences and communication objective is included. The proposal combines audiences relevant to the entrepreneurship field with general public, both in Europe and China. (ST)
- The positive interaction with different stakeholders beyond Europe will be open through the global networking hub. (CAR)
- Measures for the communication of scientific results to multiple target audiences via various media, press releases, open events and teaching of undergraduates, are fully appropriate. (RI)
- Specific actions for outreach activities are very well addressed and precise definition of the type of activities is given and included in the Gantt Chart. The activities are oriented towards specialized as well as to the general public. The researcher plan to use modern tools, like video streaming and blogging, to communicate the results to the general public. (RI)
- The wider communication strategy targets the general audience via foreseen publications on a designated web page and mainstream media. Particularly promising is the envisaged use of innovative types of science to public events, such as at the European Researchers' Night and at the Doors Open Day at the Faculty of Social Studies at the host institution. (RI)
- The communication plan is convincingly argued and is feasible, while exploitation strategies are convincingly presented, revealing appropriate commercial plans and synergies with the creativity industry: It involves social media, public meetings and teaching activities including outreach events such as various MSCA open days and researchers' nights, as well as a contribution to an archaeological film festival. (RI)
- The proposal includes specific and targeted communication activities, clearly identifying each target groups, while communication measurements are timely distributed during the proposal's lifecycle, indicating a concrete planning approach. (RI)
- Excellent actions for public engagement are presented. The Host institution has excellent and well established infrastructure to support all those actions. (RI)
- The involvement of press, media, newspapers, magazines, websites, etc., to communicate the action activities to different target audiences is very well-presented. (RI)
- Promotion and communication measures toward multiple audiences are well balanced and described in sufficient detail, including information to stakeholder, raise of awareness on the themes for the general public and sensibilization of policy makers. (RI)
- A sound plan is provided to inform the public about important results of the programme, including social media platforms. A very wide community will be addressed (scientists, governmental, students, school children, general public). (RI)
- The proposed communication measures are highly innovative. Very different channels and tools will be used (brochures, talks, special developed toolkit, comic strip movie, press releases, etc.). (RI)
- Planned measures for communicating to different target audiences are appropriately described. (RI)
- The plans and measures for communication of the project's accomplishments are of a high quality and address both academic and nonspecialist audiences through a variety of mechanisms including social media, engagement with major NGOs and working in primary and high schools. (RI)
- The researcher shows high ambition to communicate the research activities to the general public. The

researcher will act as a Marie Skłodowska-Curie ambassador and will engage with high schools to communicate their findings to the younger generation. (RI)
- The proposed measured to share the results on web, social media and open public seminar series are well planned. (RI)
- The proposal adequately details the communication strategy. Outreach activities and events targeted at audiences beyond the research community would use social media, blog posts and explanatory videos. It is oriented towards practitioners in relevant fields and general public, planning concrete knowledge transmission events as well as the use of Internet, social media and micro-blogging. (RI)
- A sound plan is provided to inform the public about important results of the programme, including social media platforms, online demos, public talks and educational seminars at schools. (RI)
- The proposed measures to communicate the results of the project to a variety of target groups are coherent, very well documented and wellsupported by the existing structures of the host institution. (RI)
- The researcher underlines the necessity of communicating the information to broader, diverse audiences, finding appropriate paths and channels to do this. (RI)

Weaknesses:

Enhancing the potential and future career prospects of the researcher (expected impact of the planned research and training, added value of the fellowship, new competences and skills etc.)

- The career perspectives envisaged by the researcher are not sufficiently analyzed/described in the proposal. (ST)
- The academic research approaches that the candidate will use in the project are practically the same as used during the PhD and the first post-doc period, an area where the applicant is already an expert. (ST)
- Several opportunities to enhance the researcher's potential are listed, such as industrial collaboration or scientific writing, yet are not given in sufficient detail. (ST)
- The added value of the fellowship for the future career prospects is unclear, as the researcher is already affiliated to the host institute and the duration of the project is only 12 months. (ST)
- It is insufficiently discussed how activities associated with collaboration and interaction with other scientists would enhance the potential and future career prospects of the researcher. (ST)
- Career goals of the researcher are not clearly formulated. (ST)
- The concrete planning session for the dissemination and exploitation strategy is not well reported in the Gantt Chart. (ST)
- The innovative nature of the project is too limited to set the fellow at the forefront of a new topic. (ST)
- No post-fellowship strategy to reinforce career prospects regarding a possible return phase or alternative action have been discussed. (ST)
- Since the applicant is already a recognised expert in chemistry, the planned research and training will unlikely bring any major improvement to the researcher's profile and hence future career prospects. (ST)
- The programme aims at positioning the researcher to hold an independent academic post, yet the researcher is already a research professor in a third country teaching courses and co-supervising PhD students. The purpose of the training is thus not fully convincing. (ST)
- The proposal seeks to position the researcher as a member of the bioinorganic chemistry community but the host laboratory is not well established within that research field; rather the host group's recognition is for proteins and organic chemical biology as seen in the awards they highlight. (ST)
- A future aim of the researcher is to lead a research group. However, the proposal is not mentioning the sufficient involvement of the researcher in mentoring activities at the host. (ST)
- The proposal gives few details about the future applications of the candidate to extra EU grants, to several EU postdoctoral positions and in launching a start up. (ST)
- Based on the presented training program including mainly synthesis, some standard characterization techniques and determination of conductance properties, it is quite overambitious to expect that the candidate will become a "specialist in the field of molecular electronics".(ST)
- The proposal fails to concretely point out the career opportunities of the researcher after the fellowship. (ST)
- It is not fully credible that the researcher will become an excellent scientist in both academic and

industry. (ST)

- The researcher already has significant expertise in the proposed research field; the proposal fails to demonstrate the development of additional relevant skills and competencies. (ST)
- It remains unclear how exactly the project will enhance the transferable skills of the researcher. The respective paragraphs in the proposal lack detailed information in this regard. (ST)
- The researcher does not explain sufficiently how the generated knowledge, visibility and training soft skills (e.g. writing of publications, grants, building industry connections) will advance the career and what the career plan is. (ST)
- The involvement of the researcher in seminars, teaching and supervision of students is described mostly in a generic way, without sufficient specific plans and details. The future career prospects of the researcher after the program are not clearly described. (ST)
- The proposed measures to promote the researcher's career are not sufficiently convincing. The fellowship may not result in enough publishable results, to allow the researcher to compete successfully for a position of professional independence. (ST)
- Since the researcher already has an academic post, it is not clear how the proposed fellowship will benefit the career apart from offering the opportunity for an extended sabbatical away from teaching duties. (ST)
- There is not enough detail about the opportunities for the researcher to supervise PhD students. (ST)
- The claim that the researcher will be ready to become a research group leader after the fellowship is not sufficiently justified. (ST)
- The researcher expects to widen their scientific expertise to different research fields. This is limited, however, by returning to a previous host institution rather than going to a new one. (ST)
- The proposal names diverse skills (lecturing, management, leadership), which the researcher would develop thanks to the proposal, but is vague as to how this would happen. (ST)
- The added value of the fellowship is not sufficiently shown in relation to the researcher's future career in Europe. Even if the researcher would broaden the career opportunities, very little evidence is given that the researcher would have a prosperous future career at the return institution. This is firstly due to the researcher starting a new track in the career, secondly to the fact that not sufficient evidence is given of the cross cultural feed-back of the research. (GF)
- Insufficient information is provided on how the activities described in the proposal might facilitate the career in a non-academic position. (GF)
- The proposal insufficiently describes the future career prospects of the researcher. For instance, the expected impact of the planned research is described in too generic terms and is unconvincingly argued. (GF)
- Considering the actual position and the research presented, the proposal inadequately justifies how the proposed research could contribute to the next logical step in the career development of the researcher. (GF)
- The researcher is already a postdoc in the incoming host lab. It is not clearly described in the proposal how receiving this grant would enhance the potential and future career prospects of the researcher. The impact of this fellowship is likely to be minimized since it will only be a marginal addition to the researcher's multi-institutional profile. (GF)
- The added value in terms of future career prospects is not adequately addressed. The main focus is on the future research agenda, while the proposal does not sufficiently address the new opportunities of the researcher after the fellowship. (GF)
- The impact of the proposal on enhancing the researcher's career prospect is addressed in general terms. The proposal does not sufficiently well describe how the acquired expertise would contribute to the researcher's prospects of an independent research position. For instance, the impact of establishing professional research networks or collaborations is not adequately elaborated. (GF)
- The opportunities created for the researcher are limited. Overall, this action is not sufficiently focused on the researcher. He is and will actually be embedded in an ongoing collaboration without having a clear leading role. (GF)
- The project has limited potential to provide new scientific and technical skills to the researcher. Opportunities to consolidate the researcher's position in a new institution and establishing an independent research line are not clearly described. (GF)
- The proposal does not provide sufficient information on how the lack in key training measures will be compensated in the future. (GF)
- It is insufficiently described how the proposed research will develop a specific, outstanding and innovative scientific skill set to the researcher to help in the future career . (GF)

- The expected impact of the planned research and training on the experienced researcher's career prospects after the fellowship is not well substantiated. (GF)
- The proposal fails to explain sufficiently how the researcher's theoretical and methodological skills will be developed. (GF)
- Given the intense competition in the field, the foreseen career impact of the project is not sufficiently justified. (GF)
- The proposal does not sufficiently elaborate on the possible impact of new additional skills, including, for example, teaching and managing projects as well as respective responsibilities, which enhance the potential and future career prospects of the researcher. (GF)
- The description of the return phase has a number of significant weaknesses, including lack of detail on the level of student supervision, or how the fellow will be trained and exposed to the transferable skills included in the proposal. (GF)
- Given some deficiencies in the methodological design, the proposed research would not lead to publications in highly ranked journals, which would limit the impact of the project on the researcher's career prospects at other institutions. (GF)
- The potential of the fellowship to reenforce future career prospects of the researcher is limited due to the fact that the researcher already holds a consolidated position in the research sector. (GF)
- A weak point of the proposal is the fact that the action just supports the continuation of a series of exchanges between the fellow and the host. The researcher is already now commuting between the outgoing and incoming host, which is to be seen as a factor limiting the impact of this action. (GF)
- New competences to be acquired and the expected enhancement of current competences are not thoroughly described. (GF)
- The benefits of mobility and the advantages of expertise exchange are vague. (GF)
- The proposal does not sufficiently address the concrete opportunities of the researcher. (CAR)
- The details of how competences gained will impact the researcher's career after the fellowship are unsatisfactorily outlined. (CAR)
- It is not clear how the proposed work will strengthen the comparative dimension of the research given that the case studies are the same as those used in the PhD research. (CAR)
- It is not clear what kind of skills will be added in the field of xxxx compared with the previous expertise. Secondly, as the researcher is aware, the xxxx research may not be possible, consequently diminishing the anticipated competency gains. (CAR)
- It has not been identified clearly what specific skills in leadership and coordination would be acquired by the researcher. (CAR)
- The proposal lacks clear identification of new competences, skills, and opportunities which could be gained by the researcher to restart the researcher's academic career. Such activities and skills as the development of audio-visual teaching, school visits and others are insufficiently detailed. (CAR)
- New competences and skills to be acquired during the proposed action are insufficiently described, and the added value of the proposal is not convincingly specified. The expected impact of the planned research and training to push the career of the researcher forward is not satisfactorily explained. The development of long-term collaborations after the proposed action is not clearly presented. (ST)
- The acquisition through the proposal of the full set of competences to achieve the career goal of a future professorship is narrowly and not adequately presented. In particular, the proposal insufficiently explains how the managerial, organisational, as well as networking competences and skills will be acquired. (ST)
- Given the applicant's level of experience (publications, projects, supervision), plus familiarity with the host institution, the added value of the programme is limited; the researcher would see most professional skills consolidated and extended, but a genuine development of new skills would be limited to the methodological arena. (ST)
- It is not sufficiently justified what specific new career opportunities the successful completion of this project would bring for the researcher. (CAR)
- As described in the proposal, the future career is to be strongly based on the one-year extension provided by the host and on the long-term research agenda of the information diffusion on social networks. These positive predictions are described as the pillars of the progress in the researcher's career, but their credibility is not sufficiently justified. (ST)
- The proposal does not demonstrate convincingly that the fellowship would enhance researcher's employability and career prospects, as the information provided in the relevant section of the proposal is too general. It is not clearly explained how the researcher plans to further their career outside of the MSCA. The proposal does not provide sufficient evidence about the nature and length of tenure-track

position that the host institution would offer at the end of the MSCA fellowship and/or whether it is likely to lead to longer-term employment at the host institution. (CAR)
- The positive impact of this proposal on the establishment of future contact networks, arising from the existing collaborations of the host group, is not fully demonstrated. (ST)
- The professional development of the researcher over the last years has not been well explained in the proposal. (CAR)
- Even though the project will enable the researcher to evolve as a professional in different areas such as academic research and teaching, clinical care and clinical research, etc., the applicant does not clearly describe a specific career path and does not sufficiently explore added value in an industrial context. (CAR)
- The description of the added value of the fellowship to the career prospects of the researcher is not convincingly described. (RI)
- The proposal doesn't sufficiently detail how the project achievements will open up the best career possibilities for the researcher. The new competences and skills which will be acquired by the researcher during the project are not clearly defined except novel HPLC based technologies. (RI)
- Although the proposed research would expand the researcher's portfolio of expertise, the researcher's career development strategy is not sufficiently described(RI)
- Routes for career progression are mainly generic. A concrete and detailed vision on next career steps is not well provided. (RI)
- Opportunities to become independent from the supervisor are not convincingly described. The researcher's scientific perspectives are not expected to be significantly broadened during the post-doctoral research training. (RI)
- Measures taken by the supervisor and host institution to reach the training objectives are not described with sufficient detail. (RI)
- The researcher is already working at the host institution. The additional training, which could improve the career prospects, is insufficiently outlined. (RI)
- Measures for developing leadership and complementary skills are not described in adequate detail and alternative options besides an academic career are not well defined. (RI)
- Career employment perspectives and the development of collaborations lack some specifics, such as prospects for further grant applications or other means of advancement after the fellowship. (RI)
- The career plans as well as teaching activities are too generically described.(RI)
- The proposal does not sufficiently explain the expected impact of the research on the fellow´s career after the fellowship. For instance, it is not clear from the project how the candidate will establish an independent research team. (RI)
- Concrete newly acquired competences and how they will be beneficial to enhance career prospects of the researcher are not adequately formulated. (RI)
- The contribution of the scientific skill training proposed to the enhancement of the researcher's future career prospects is well demonstrated only in relation to next generation sequencing skills. (RI)
- The measures through which the host would contribute to the advancement of the researcher's career are not sufficiently detailed. (RI)
- An exact career path is insufficiently tailored in the proposal. (RI)
- The positive impact of working with two organisations is not clearly described in terms of contribution to the future career perspective of the researcher. (RI)
- How the project will enhance the researcher's potential for future academic career options beyond those already acquired is not sufficiently demonstrated. (RI)
- The evidence for long-term career prospects leading to a permanent position in Europe is not presented adequately. (RI)

Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the action results (including intellectual property rights)

- The proposal does not sufficiently promote the results by writing on social media sites, by publishing in EU Newsletters magazines and creating a web page. (ST)
- The number of planned communication and dissemination activities is too high for a one year project. (ST)
- It is insufficiently discussed which research outputs would have most impact on the scientific community and how they would be exploited. (ST)
- The description of the strategy to assess the potential applications of the new polymers, to results in

possible generation of new intellectual right content, is not convincingly discussed. (ST)

- The proposed measures to exploit and to disseminate the action results are minimal and have no significant impact. No specific target journals or relevant scientific meetings are listed. (ST)
- The proposed measures to disseminate the action results toward different non-professional audiences are very weak. No specific activities aiming to reach a general public are listed. Additionally, the description of the use of online tools is very generic and not sound enough.(ST)
- The dissemination plan is not fully coherent. It is missing more detailed planning and concrete indicators.
- The description of the intellectual property issues is not convincing. (ST)
- The need for additional funding and an unpredictable secondment regarding the exploitation is unclear (e.g. "in the case of the necessity of an unpredictable secondment in another European country, additional funding can be obtained by JECS Trust applications").(ST)
- The journals in which the dissemination activity is planned are not sufficiently well identified. (ST)
- The publication plan in highly ranked journals is not credible. (ST)
- The lack of indications about subject categories of the journals or conferences where results can be presented, limits to evaluate the scientific impact of the results dissemination. (ST)
- The proposal does not sufficiently explain the career development strategy intended for the researcher. (ST)
- The plans for the presentation and exploitation of the project's results through the targeting of specified end-users are not fully developed. (ST)
- The dissemination and communication actions are missing important details about frequency and content (also in the Gantt Chart). (ST)
- The dissemination plan in terms of hight level conference presentations is not totally convincing. (ST)
- The proposal does not properly describe how activities related to exploitation and dissemination of results (intellectual property rights, startup policy) will be integrated into the research stay that is planned for a different location than the official administrative host institute. (ST)
- Only two dissemination actions are shown in the Gantt Chart, considering the unprecedented character of the research and its novelty it is expected more actions in this matter. (ST)
- The scientific dissemination through conferences and seminars is very generic and vague. (ST)
- Exploitation is very generically mentioned, and no realistic exploitation plan or action is adequately detailed. (ST)
- The proposal does not properly identify the journals and the conferences where the research outcomes will be presented. The dissemination of the research in conferences and meetings with the various groups is not clearly indicated in the Gantt Chart. (ST)
- The strategic plan for exploitation and dissemination of the project is unclear, only a very general description is presented in the proposal. The number of articles and patents expected has not been appropriately estimated. (ST)
- The dissemination strategy is not clearly outlined. For example, there is no clear reference to specific target journals, their quality or conference types and organisers. (ST)
- The management of intellectual property issues with the help of the Technology Transfer Unit of the host institution is described but target/possible exploitable results are not identified. (ST)
- The exploitation plan is too vague and not fully convincing; it is poorly elaborated without mentioning which of the project results is expected to be subject of IPR protection. (ST)
- IPR issues are not discussed in an appropriate form, which is relevant as this project could generate results requiring such protection. Essentially, only the existence of a TTO at the hosting university is mentioned. (ST)
- The dissemination plan is not presented in sufficient detail and does not include sufficient specifics regarding precise audiences and strategies. The researcher did not shown sufficient effort to exploit and disseminate the action results with a listing of appropriate target journals and workshops/conferences. (ST)
- The project claim that no results will be susceptible to protection is contradicted by the patent planning described in the proposal. (ST)
- The dissemination plan lacks the necessary quantitative targets. (ST)
- The proposed measures to disseminate scientific results do not properly include the organisation of international symposia and workshops, which are important according to the proposal scope. (ST)
- The strategy for exploitation of results is not sufficiently specified and unclear in relation to open source codes that will be transferred to European software companies and the envisaged commercialization routes. (ST)

- The proposed communication measures refer mainly to only one target audience whilst those for wider public audiences are insufficiently considered. (ST)
- It is minor shortcoming of the exploitation plan that the researcher has not set forward any ideas on potential commercially viable project outcomes. (ST)
- The methods of dissemination are standard (preprints which will be followed up by journal publications, conferences and seminars) and lack details about their effectivness. (ST)
- The exploitation of the work is not sufficiently considered, as the proposal is lacking solid planning on which aspects of the project are prone to result in an intellectual property. What is expected to result in patent is not satisfactorily explained. How the society will benefit from the research is also not sufficiently described. (ST)
- The dissemination plan is not sufficiently detailed on the type of workshops and conferences where the results will be presented or which conferences will be attended in addition to the very general American Physical Society annual meeting. (ST)
- The use of the host resources for dissemination, through the university research & information services, is not sufficiently described. (ST)
- Moreover, there is little information provided on the use of web-based repositories for dissemination purposes.
- The dissemination plan is not clearly organized as a part of the research project itself and is generically described (e.g. in the project a lot of space is devoted to the translations of the sources, which is a huge task, but this deliverable is not considered as a medium of dissemination). (ST)
- It is not fully convincing that Webinars will be an efficient way attracting greater numbers and disseminating the research results to the representatives of civil society organizations. (ST)
- The proposal does not adequately address its strategy for balance between scientific dissemination and the commercial exploitation of research results, which may require some results to remain confidential because of their commercial sensitivity. (GF)
- Practical arrangements for data exploitation in both the outgoing and return phases are not sufficiently described. (GF)
- Protection of intellectual property is not sufficiently considered. (GF)
- The publication strategy is clearly unbalanced towards traditional academic output such as journal articles and conference papers; it lacks focus on non-academic manuscripts for non-academic audiences. (GF)
- The dissemination phase formally is scheduled only for the last month. It is a too short period of time to achieve all goals concerning the wider circulation of the project's results (even taking into consideration that the researcher would take part in conferences and seminars earlier). (GF)
- The scale of the proposed dissemination measures is relatively unambitious when compared with the aims of the project. (GF)
- International exploitation options are not clearly explained. (GF)
- The numerous planned conference presentations are not shown in the proposal to be the most effective way to achieve the stated impact objectives. (GF)
- The proposed dissemination of research findings to the academic community is only narrowly described. No strategy for academic publications is provided. (GF)
- No seminars or lectures with students during the returning phase are proposed. This strongly limits the dissemination of acquired knowledge. (GF)
- The proposed dissemination plan is too ambitious to be feasibly executed during the project implementation. (GF)
- The description of the dissemination activities lacks appropriate quantitative elements (number, frequency) and is generic regarding online dissemination tools which disables a proper appraisal of the actions envisaged. (GF)
- The conferences targeted lack diversity, which will limit the impact of the dissemination measures and the ambitious of the outreach measures. (GF)
- The researcher does not clarify how many publications would be potentially provided with the implementation of the proposed project. (GF)
- The measures by which the project would be disseminated and exploited within the academic community are not sufficiently addressed. For example, there is insufficient planning targeted for research students and for the implementation of a webpage. (GF)
- There is not convincing description of how the dissemination plan will materialize. In particular, exploitation of results and intellectual property is mentioned but insufficiently addressed. The publication plan is overly ambitious and not convincingly supported by the description provided in the

proposal. (GF)
- The number of publications and of conferences the researcher has to attend is unrealistic for the duration of the project. The stated possible wider use of the research results is not convincingly explained. (GF)
- Dissemination of knowledge at third country is not properly planned. (GF)
- The dissemination strategy (papers, conferences) is generic and not fully convincing if one considers the role industry plays in this research area. (GF)
- Alternative dissemination strategies are narrowly restricted to publications relying mainly on internet. (GF)
- Some of the targeted journals may be too ambitious given the mainly theoretical nature of the proposed research and the number of articles intended for publication in these journals is not sufficiently realistic for the lifetime of the proposed action. (GF)
- Measures for the exploitation of the research results are described vaguely. An effective IPR strategy is not clearly laid out, also considering the involvement of two host organisations (outgoing and incoming). (GF)
- Active participation to conferences lacks details. Even if these events are marked in the Gantt Chart, a clear plan and strategy for participation is not described. (GF)
- The Exploitation plan is not adequate; terms are very general and non-specific measures are presented for the present project. (GF)
- The dissemination plan does not fully elaborate on the specifics of journals targeted for specific research output. (GF)
- The plans concerning the Exploitation are insufficiently detailed, e.g. it is not clear how highly specific scientific findings can be communicated to a non-academic audience, despite this being a primary target. (GF)
- It is not clear how results will be communicated to biotech companies who would be interested in the newly developed research tools. (GF)
- The dissemination of the research briefs and policy notes since the start of the project is not sufficiently explained, it not well clarified, what results would be disseminated in the earlier periods of the project. (GF)
- The proposed measures to communicate the project activities to the media (publication of one press article in a popular newspaper during the final year of the fellowship) are not sufficiently credible, failing in delivering a comprehensive communication strategy over the whole project duration. (GF)
- Dissemination of results is not described in sufficient detail, nor is their Exploitation. (GF)
- It is unsufficiently described how the radio speeches and national campaigns will be performed to reach the target audience and there are no clear plans to communicate with patient associations who might profit from the proposed research. Besides, the description of measures to validate and quantify the effects of the outreach activities is insufficient. (GF)
- The dissemination strategy lacks a clear timeline. (GF)
- The dissemination strategy does not cover all the relevant areas. E.g. policy implications are not adequately stressed in the dissemination strategy. (GF)
- The Gantt Chart fails to give sufficient detail to assess how the dissemination strategy will be achieved. (CAR)
- At a general level, the dissemination and exploitation activities are poorly and briefly described, without clear parameters of outreach and scope. (CAR)
- The proposed measures to disseminate the research results are not convincingly addressed; the target scientific journals are not specified, expected quantitative targets are not given and planned presentations at international conferences are not sufficiently described. (CAR)
- The proposal includes different actions that will be taken to disseminate the action results, but a more detailed and structured dissemination strategy is necessary, as the dissemination strategy is not clearly developed and only described in general terms. (CAR)
- The overall outreach strategy is not fully elaborated but consists of isolated initiatives. While relevant in scope and scale, they are not realising the full potential of creating broad awareness of the research work among the general public. (CAR)
- The quality of the dissemination strategy is reduced since it does not demonstrate that many top tiers journals and conferences would be targeted. (CAR)
- While the dissemination strategy includes a rationale for the targeting of conferences and details of the topics for presentations, it does not adequately explain which journal outlets would be targeted for the articles. (CAR)

- Insufficient detail is given about the academic dissemination actions to assess whether they will maximise the dissemination of the proposal results, e.g. no suggested publishers, journal titles, or even language of publication are listed. (CAR)
- Potential users are mentioned, but no clear description of how audiences would be targeted is in place. (CAR)
- The project objectives are rather under-ambitious in terms of written output. Insufficient detail is provided on how much of the monograph will be written during the fellowship and, by extension, the time-frame for its publication. (CAR)
- The proposal does not clarify how the virtual workshop – proposed to disseminate the project results – could be able to add new insights to the project itself if this will be organized only in xxxx. (CAR)
- Overall dissemination activities are not sufficiently detailed. It is unclear how the researcher would be able to handle these dissemination activities during the timespan of the action. The proposal does not sufficiently show which results would be exploited for reaching the scientific communities or the general public. (ST)
- The dissemination strategy for academic audiences does not include concrete detail regarding plans for submitting manuscripts to journals for possible publication; the academic dissemination is limited largely to conferences and working papers; frequencies and modalities are not sufficiently clarified. (ST)
- The proposal does not provide sufficient information about the journals that will be targeted for dissemination, in order to appreciate the quality of the plan. (ST)
- The proposal does not explain in sufficient clarity which specific journals or books the researcher would publish in, and this significantly undermines the dissemination strategy. The proposal lacks specific plans for publicizing or launching the dedicated website. It is also not clearly specified how users would find the website. It is not clearly explained what the added value of the Wikipedia page is, or what audience it serves or what it would link to. (CAR)
- The exploitation plan is not appropriately explored, especially regarding the high commercial potential of lead free materials with unknown and likely very high manufacturing costs (based on their processing method of choice). (CAR)
- Despite some classical dissemination measures the overall dissemination strategy is not sufficiently ambitious: the references to electronic dissemination channels, such as webcasts, professional networking sites and other scientific or relevant blogs are inadequately presented. In addition, the aspects regarding the exploitation of results are not fully addressed (e.g. the project does not sufficiency differentiate the strategies for dissemination and exploitation). (ST)
- Even though the proposal considers a range of suitable activities in order to disseminate the results of the research, the overall dissemination strategy is insufficiently developed. Specifically, the classical tools outlined as workshops and seminars are not explained at a sufficient level of detail to show their effectiveness. The main international conferences to be addressed have not been specifically mentioned. (ST)
- Activities targeting the general public and populations at risk have not been sufficiently developed. Details on timelines and specific content of dissemination activities as well as different possible modes and means of communication have not been described with sufficient detail. The proposal presents a list of journals and events but fails to develop a clear dissemination strategy for the action results. (CAR)
- The proposal highlights why EU residents and policymakers, in general terms, would find the expected results to be of interest, but offers comparatively less detail on how the actions would be actioned, other than a mention of a personal website and one online magazine. (ST)
- Direct interaction with stakeholders, although reported in the Gantt Chart, lacks suitable details. Moreover, not enough information is provided about the proposed interaction with policymakers at national and sub-national level. (ST)
- The overall strategy for the dissemination of the action results to practitioners is not sufficiently developed. It is not clear how the dissemination among MEPs would take place, or how would the researcher ensure the proposed presentation of key findings at the DG Communications (RI)
- Although it is mentioned in the proposal that the results obtained will be considered for patenting prior to public dissemination and presented to potential commercial partners based on confidentiality agreements, a clear strategy and timeline are not provided. (RI)
- Although information regarding the compounds to be tested as photosensitizers are identified in the proposal, specific details of how any intellectual property arising from the results of the project will be exploited are not properly addressed. Moreover, specific measures to exploit the results to specific

agricultural companies are not meanigfully dealt with. (RI)

- The strategies to disseminate the findings to a wider audience are not sufficiently described. In particular, the proposal fails to identify and target relevant stakeholders for the dissemination strategy, such as practitioners and carers. (RI)
- While the proposal provides the name of selected peer-reviewed international journals which may publish the articles resulting from the project, insufficient information on the planned monograph and on academic editorial companies which might wish to publish it eventually is provided. (RI)
- The frequency and number of the dissemination actions are not sufficiently described in section 2.2 of the proposal (even though they appear in the Gantt-chart). (RI)
- The proposal does not sufficiently clearly refer to the electronic dissemination channels, such as webcasts, professional networking sites, blogs, or the open availability of project results for download. (RI)
- The proposal does not set out a clear dissemination strategy: A list of activities is not sufficient to assess the proper strategy adopted for an effective dissemination of the project's results and, therefore, the relevance of the specific dissemination activities within the research project is not adequately discussed. (RI)
- Although the host institution possesses a clear strategy to disseminate the findings to a wider audience, the researcher's contribution in these activities is not clearly described, but only supposed, given their previous experiences with public engagement. (RI)
- The quality and impact of outreach and dissemination activities to non-academic audiences and organizations (e.g., the United Nations) is not addressed with enough details. (RI)
- The details of the exploitation are mostly limited to traditional academic channels. The interaction with various beneficiaries and potential users, including policymakers and practitioners are not well specified. (RI)
- There is inadequate commitment to publication in peer-reviewed journals. (RI)
- While the outcome of the action is stated to serve as decision support for public authorities, the dissemination plan insufficiently addresses this target audience. (RI)
- Concrete measures to exploit the action results are not clearly presented in the proposal. (RI)
- The researcher insufficiently describes how the project main ideas will be presented to the particular audience; while certain initiatives are mentioned, the description of overall dissemination strategy remains vague and underdeveloped. (RI)

Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the action activities to different target audiences

- The modality of interaction between the researcher and the industrial partner responsible for the biological evaluation, are not evident. (ST)
- The sourcing of potential manufacturers is overly ambitious, because the technology would still be at an early stage at the end of the fellowship. (ST)
- Standard measures to communicate the action activities to different target audiences are described without sufficient specific details. (ST)
- The communication strategy does not provide many details on the target groups apart from academics. (ST)
- The frequency and nature of the communication activities are not adequately presented. (ST)
- The communication activities schedule is too heavy considering the time length of the fellowship. (ST)
- The proposed measures to communicate the action activities to different target audiences are insufficiently described and there is no concrete planning of the communication of the research to different target audiences discussed or indicated in the Gantt Chart. (ST)
- Although the communication measures are considered with participation of the researcher, the actions of the applicant as MSCA ambassador are too generically projected and the strategy for outreach with broader audience is not sufficiently structured. (ST)
- The public engagement and open audience communication activities are poorly developed. A proper plan for communication of the action and its results is missing, although it is referred to in the Gantt Chart. (ST)
- The proposal is describing in very general terms the measures to communicate the activities to different target audiences. The specific actions and concrete planning for the dissemination are not provided. (ST)
- The outreach program for the general public lacks the necessary details. (ST)
- The proposed strategy to communicate the action activities aims mainly at the promotion of the MSCA

programme and does not sufficiently address a communication of research outcomes. (ST)

- A description of the planned measures towards outreach to a broader, non-specialised audience has not been discussed in sufficient detail. For example, two public engagement events are planned in the Gantt Chart, but details of the activities are not specified. Also, a website is mentioned, but details suggesting how it will be structured or how it will be publicized are unclear. (ST)
- Although plans for some outreach activities are mentioned, insufficient details are provided. (ST)
- The proposal has not a clear communication plan to reach different audiences. The proposed plan is vague and based only on isolated events with scholars or similar ones, without giving evidences of a transversal vision and a convenient set of actions for a wider public outreach. (ST)
- In spite of the significance of the project to industry, insufficient details are provided for the communication to this sector. (ST)
- The specific, potential commercial outcomes originating from the project and their exploitation strategy have not been addressed in the proposal. (ST)
- The proposal does not sufficiently address the exploitation of results on the basis of the large potential for cross-disciplinary use. (ST)
- The number of papers to be published and the target journals are insufficiently described. (ST)
- The communication actions towards principal stakeholders and managers directly involved in the study in some of the countries are limited. (ST)
- The frequency and nature of the outreach and communication activities towards different target groups remains unclear. (ST)
- Public engagement strategy is only very briefly described through the institution's past science promotions in various media. (ST)
- Given the broad relevance of the project to the general public, the communication strategy and especially the outreach activities remain generic, e.g. the spectrum of the targeted audiences is too narrow, and the inclusion of youths and school children is not sufficiently described. (ST)
- The framework of public engagement is insufficiently developed. It is not fully convincing that the project´s results will be communicated efficiently and widely to the general public, especially at the broader international level. (ST)
- The communications strategy is poorly developed and there is insufficient time allocation for activities related to the strategy. Measures to communicate to different target audiences are not well defined. (ST)
- There is insufficient information in the proposal about exploitation and technology transfer attempts, given the applied nature of some parts of the planned research. (ST)
- Not enough emphasis is given to use social media and the internet to reach out to the general public. (ST)
- Activities for communication to different target audiences are not adequately planned in time according to the Gantt Chart. (ST)
- There is no explanation about an adequate exploitation plan to make the tools freely available online for the research community. (ST)
- The number and quality of the measures to communicate the action to different target audiences is not impressive. The ER will repeatedly take advantage of already existing materials for the website and for presentations but does not describe convincingly their originality. Visits to schools lack sufficient explanations about how (number of students/classes involved, organization of lessons, possibility to visit a real laboratory) and how long each meeting will last. (ST)
- The actions and audiences are so numerous that it is questionable if all these goals will be reached during the project. For example, it is proposed to disseminate the project to stakeholders, industry, regulatory authorities, NGOs, medical professionals, schools and lifelong learners and to participate to several outreach events. (ST)
- Although the proposed measures for communicating results to multiple target audiences are largely suitable, these are limited to local audiences and lack sufficient international scope. (ST)
- Public engagement is foreseen only for the second year of the program. (ST)
- The frequency of communication activities is not outlined in the proposal and in the Gantt Chart only the blog posts are indicated. (GF)
- The foreseen frequency and nature of communication activities is not totally clear. The nature, venue and the individual/specific stakeholders involved in outreach activities are not adequately provided. (GF)
- The level of public engagement is not clearly planned throughout the duration of the project and lacks detail. (GF)

- The candidate does not provide enough information on the frequency of planned communication activities. (GF)
- The way the fellowship will use mass media (newspapers, television programs or Internet) to communicate is not convincingly explained, especially the mentioned pre-existing media contacts are not demonstrated. (GF)
- Participation in outreach activities at the outgoing institute are sketchily presented and the researcher's involvement is more in a following than in a leading role. (GF)
- The proposal overlaps between dissemination and communication activities. The proposal lists a number of measures to communicate the action, without providing details on the frequency of such activities (for example, how many press releases, where the articles will be submitted, which kind of events presentation, etc.). (GF)
- The plans for communication are included in the Gantt Chart in a very generic way (they lack sufficient specific information). (GF)
- The communication strategy focuses on limited audiences. The proposal addresses mostly to young people and students leaving out many other audiences. (GF)
- Plan makes use of existing outreach activities but does not present new avenues, such as websites or use of social media to disseminate information. (GF)
- Even though the dissemination and communication strategy cover a range of suitable measures, the proposal does not sufficiently consider online outlets such as social media and websites as channels to reach target audiences. (GF)
- The measures of communication activity among various target audiences are not satisfactorily presented. The envisioned online archive for the wider public is insufficiently described in terms of its implementation, content and objectives. The proposed blog, mini-Skype sessions, and workshop activities are insufficiently developed in relation to the wealth of knowledge that the researcher could potentially disseminate. (GF)
- The different target audiences that will be reached by the project are not identified with adequate detail. Insufficient information is provided about the arrangements or content in relation to lectures to be given to secondary school students. (GF)
- While identifying well the different institutions to be involved in communication, the definition of target audiences and concrete actions of communication are unclear. Therefore, the frequency and nature of communication activities are limited. (GF)
- The strategy to communicate the action activities to multiple audiences, including the media and the public, is not described in sufficient detail and appropriate target audiences are not adequately identified. (GF)
- Communication of the action's activities to different target audiences is poorly addressed, since plans are proposed only for academic and scientific target audiences. (GF)
- The new knowledge generated would be disseminated essentially through papers and presentations, whose planning in the Gantt Chart is confusing: papers come up in the planning as either milestone (milestone 3, incoming phase), deliverables (D2) or elements in "dissemination and Exploitation 1" heading (both phases). Target audiences are insufficiently addressed. (GF)
- The listed measures of communicating results to the general public and the activities proposed are too general and minimal. The relation to the specific project and specific activities of the fellow are insufficiently described. (GF)
- The concrete number of publications to be elaborated is not disclosed. The topics of the planned publications are not indicated. (GF)
- The foreseen scientific journals as the outlets for the research results are modestly ranked, which would limit the visibility and the impact of the research in academic circles. (GF)
- The book, which is to represent a major outcome of the project, would be edited by the home institution of the author, which would decrease the impact and outreach of the project. (GF)
- The number of scientific publications foreseen is too ambitious for the study period and the lack of reference to specific publishing revues prevents fully assessing their potential quality. (GF)
- The proposal insufficiently clearly presents the exact strategy concerning the promotion of the project and its results. (GF)
- The information provided about engagement with NGOs and policy-makers lacks specificity; concrete planning for this aspect is not adequately incorporated into the Gantt Chart. (GF)
- Creative plans to include non-academic audiences, especially people directly related with the field of research are not sufficiently addressed. (GF)
- The proposed measures to communicate the action activities to the general public are not sufficiently

described; content, number and target audience of the events are missing. (CAR)
- Some of the events and measures of the communication strategy towards the non-academic stakeholders are not fully specific. (CAR)
- The proposal refers to some communication tools (press, online media, and events) but does not provide adequate details on the frequency of the communication actions. (CAR)
- The proposal does not relate sufficiently to the issue of the communication of the action activities to different target audiences. In particular the proposal gives inadequate detail of how the identified target audiences will be reached and engaged with public and to policymakers. (CAR)
- The proposal does not include a clearly structured strategy to communicate the action to different target audiences; the frequency of the communication activities is not addressed. (CAR)
- The impact in terms of publications is mainly focused on one book. (CAR)
- The proposed communication strategy does not adequately address non-specialists. The link between the results of the proposed action and the communication activity to a non-academic audience is not clearly established in the proposal. Proposed web-based communication measures are not presented in a comprehensive manner. (ST)
- The description of the proposed communication measures for the general public and the public engagement mechanisms are not sufficiently specific. The objectives and expected results of the communication actions of this type are not convincingly demonstrated and justified. (ST)
- Communication measures beyond scientific publications have not been satisfactorily described. (CAR)
- Although an approach is outlined, limited information is provided on the specific communication measures; these are not convincingly explained in terms of their effectiveness, as well as use social media and other mass communication measures. Moreover, they are mainly related to the presentation of the results to the sample of organizations selected for the research. (ST)
- The communication actions addressed to society at large are limited, and it is not clearly demonstrated that the planned actions would be understood by non-specialists. (ST)
- The communication strategy lacks a clearly identified timetable with regard to the planned activities, which hinders an evaluation of the appropriateness of their duration and frequency. (ST)
- Despite the presented communication activities, the communication strategy to non-academics lacks ambition. The proposal fails to include a formal and well defined communication plan including the explicit involvement of the non-academic stakeholders at both national and international levels. (ST)
- Despite that the project mentions targeting multiple audiences, insufficient attention has been paid to the communication of the results to other audiences that could be interested in the outcomes of the project so as to improve the perception of citizens for "real" benefits and costs of migration such as NGO's, trade unions etc. (ST)
- The proposal fails to address the media in a convincing and precise way, providing insufficient details about possible publication in newspapers or disclosure online. (ST)
- Despite the action to present results to schools and university students, the outreach plan to reach a wider public is not sufficiently detailed. The impact of the outreach activities is not convincingly demonstrated. (RI)
- Although press releases and participation in some educational events are planned, the proposal does not sufficiently describe effective measures and outreach activities to communicate the outputs and the science to the general public; for example, through social media or website. (RI)
- The proposal does not sufficiently discuss the measures that will be taken to communicate the action results to a younger audience(RI)
- Given some translational potential of the research towards the understanding of the genetic/molecular basis of adaptive phenotypes, possible dedicated communication actions targeting stakeholders in applied sectors, e.g. aquaculture, agriculture, human health, are not well outlined. (RI)
- The Gantt Chart does not adequately indicate outreach events other than the European Researcher's Night and the EC events, which instead are mentioned in the proposal as other "potential possible events". (RI)
- The description of the communication activities is marginal, too briefly described and not credible. Furthermore, the digital communications and the related publics are left out and the communication frequency is not convincing. (RI)
- The proposal does not sufficiently address the communication activities targeted to broad audiences. This leads to a limited presentation of a convincing communication strategy and specific measures for the outreach to the general public. (RI)

Criterion 3 – Implementation

Strengths:

Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan (Gantt Chart, Work packages titles, deliverables, milestones, secondments etc.)

- The work plan is coherent and credible, including well-defined tasks, milestones, deliverables, training events, and dissemination and communication plans. (ST)
- A secondment to an industrial partner is correctly set out in the work plan. (ST)
- The Gantt Chart helps to assess the progress of the project, including the planned outputs. (ST)
- Adequate milestones are established to control the work progress at critical moments. (ST)
- The duration, deliverables and milestones are sufficiently clear. (ST)
- The additional work as: conferences, workshop, seminar, dissemination, engage public. secondments has been listed in detail and as a part of WPs, and are well organized and well matched. (ST)
- The work plan is well-structured and contains a reasonable number of work packages, in line with the scientific objectives. (ST)
- The work programme is clearly divided into logical work packages, effectively supporting the progression of the project's goals. (ST)
- Deliverables and milestones are very well planned and realistic; resources and number of person month are appropriately identified. (ST)
- The secondment is well planned, both in terms of content and of timing. (ST)
- The host and secondment groups are very relevant for the specified research and well qualified for the provision of associated training activities. (ST)
- The work plan is extensively detailed and convincing. A logical step-by-step methodology is proposed to address the three main goals of the proposal. (ST)
- The secondment is appropriate. (ST)
- The proposal clearly shows the work plan of the proposed research in the form of Gantt Chart, which includes six WPs, dissemination milestones and training. (ST)
- The deliverables are well placed in the Gantt Chart. (ST)
- A relevant secondment is mentioned. (ST)
- The work plan is very well formulated in the initial section of the proposal and graphically summarized in a concise Gantt Chart. The work plan is coherent with stated research objectives. (ST)
- The workplan structure corresponds well to the research topics. (ST)
- The work-plan is coherent and effective, being properly structured in four well interconnected work-packages that will enable the achievement of the proposed objectives: develop new numerical tools, analyze cardiac heart damage and evaluate them and connect to clinical context.(ST)
- The Gant chart is appropriately designed, well balanced with well-defined and realistic milestones and deliverables throughout the duration of the fellowships. (ST)
- The work plan reflects well the research methodology. Individual work packages are precisely specified and scheduled, ensuring the desired impact. A list of major deliverables and milestones is included. For each, the right amount of time has been planned and will allow the efficient monitoring of the work progress. The short visits to other research groups, with related research, are quite positive as they may contribute to the research training, a better research productivity and to the establishment of strategic networking for the researcher. (ST)
- The project is important since its success will contribute to major energy savings not only at EU level, but also in general. The proposal is a clear continuation on the previous development work done by the researcher. Being pending to be patented, the project has strong potential of industrial application. (ST)
- There are clear linkages between research activities within the work packages and the science needed, especially with respect with new research skills and interdisciplinarity. (ST)
- The overall research plan has been explained. It appears well structured delineating specified milestones and deliverables assigned to distinct time-points. (ST)
- Key methods and approaches designed in the WP are established in the host lab. (ST)

- The work plan is straightforward and overall realistic. Key methods and approaches designed in the work plan are well established in the host laboratory. (ST)
- Deliverables and Milestones are well presented and allow monitoring the progress of the project. (ST)
- A fully coherent work plan linking structural and functional data with computational models is presented; effectiveness is ensured based on previous results of the host, therefore successful completion of the project within the time frame of the action can be expected. (ST)
- The work plan is well-suited to achieve the desired impact and is complemented by appropriately specific, measurable, credible and timebound milestones. (ST)
- The work plan is mostly neatly described and appears logical and credible, with very reasonable deliverables and milestones. (ST)
- The usefulness of the database is planned through a correct strategy. Making the database available in relatively short time is an efficient strategy to gain visibility and consequently facilitate an efficient use. (ST)
- The project is very ambitious and the work plan is full of tasks, but at the same time it is prepared in a feasible way. (ST)
- Timing is very clearly explained in the Gantt Chart, and it shows an ongoing and coherent way of organizing the research. All work packages, well-defined and well-articulated, would reach their objectives. (ST)
- The secondments are very well planned and justified, enhancing the reliability of the research. (ST)
- The Gantt Chart is carefully developed and perfectly coherent with the description of the work plan, which is clearly outlined, feasible, taking into account the actions, time, and capacities of the ER. (ST)
- The work plan demonstrates the methodological and interdisciplinarity approach of the action with international and interdisciplinarity cooperation inherent to the success of the research project. (ST)
- Different work packages and their tasks and deliverables are clearly distinguished from each other and they form a comprehensive whole. (ST)
- The work plan is well designed, comprehensible, with a very clear and logical allocation of research, training and dissemination tasks in both outgoing and return phases. The planned work packages, major deliverables and milestones are well described in the proposal and included in the Gantt Chart. (GF)
- Time distribution is adequate to the proposed activities and to the expected results. (GF)
- The proposal is designed in a way to achieve the desired impact. The Gantt Chart includes: 3 WPS, 6 Deliverables, and 4 Milestones. The WPs are substantially described. The program is detailed and manageable. The WPs are practically related to time periods / outgoing / return phase (GF)
- A detailed plan with clear thematic sections is provided, the work flow is presented in a narrative manner. On the whole, the tasks and milestones are well described. (GF)
- The work plan shows a marked interest in pursuing a quality research with sound and solid outcomes. (GF)
- The work plan has been designed in an excellent structure that takes into account the outgoing and incoming phases of the fellowship and the two research objectives while accommodating the cyclical nature of the research methodology, and having a dedicated work package for building the consortium of European knowledge building communities. (GF)
- The proposal contains a detailed Gantt Chart and work plan with sufficient information to enable effective monitoring of progress in both the outgoing and the incoming phases, e.g. Work packages, milestones, deliverables, short visits, and training, dissemination and communication activities. (GF)
- There is a clear link between the project planning and the research work. The deliverables are clearly explained. (GF)
- The main deliverables and milestones are adequately presented in the Gantt Chart. The proposed milestones are well-placed to facilitate the external monitoring of the progress achieved in the project. (GF)
- Management, Dissemination and Training are contemplated in three different work packages, which provides the project implementation with credibility as these components all have their own timing and deliverables. (GF)
- The extension of the stay at both host institutions and the tasks to be carried out at each university are viable and coherently planned. (GF)
- The working plan is well developed, realistic and reasonably effective. (GF)
- The work plan is coherent, logical and thoroughly presented. The proposal is convincingly designed in such a way to achieve maximum desired impact. (GF)
- A list of concrete work packages as well as a set of minor and major deliverables are well presented in

the context of the Gantt Chart. (GF)

- The work package titles, deliverables, and secondment are included in the Gantt Chart, giving the research a transparent and the milestones, deliverables and public engagement outputs are coherently scheduled in the Gantt Chart according to the project. (GF)
- The work plan is geared towards the achievement of main goals of the project. (GF)
- The specification of milestones and deliverables is adequate. (GF)
- Milestones and deliverables are clearly identified within the work-packages and the time-line of the project. The overall design of the workplan is realistic and convincing. (GF)
- The work is coherently planned and properly designed. Its work packages are clearly defined and even the dissemination efforts are included in a proper work package. (GF)
- Sub-tasks with their own timing are defined for all the work packages in a convincing manner. (GF)
- Management, Dissemination and Training are contemplated in three different work packages, which provide the project implementation with credibility as these components all have their own timing and deliverables. (GF)
- The project is systematically planned in 9 work packages corresponding to key areas of fieldwork, library research and writing. Detailed content overviews of each four month package are provided. This plan is suitably co-ordinated with supervisory input and evaluation. phases and work packages. (GF)
- The work plan is fairly structured to attain the objectives of the two work packages on research and training. (CAR)
- The work plan is rational, systematic and logical, and has been carefully designed to ensure that the desired impacts will be achieved. (CAR)
- The sequence of the work packages is judicious: activities, training courses, xxx and xxx will take place in the first 12 months, while xxx and xxx follow in the second year. (CAR)
- The proposal includes a Gantt Chart and associated work plan which identifies and describes a number of sequential work packages; it also identifies suitable milestones and deliverables. (CAR)
- The proposal presents a well detailed and relevant list of deliverables and milestones, such as articles, xxxx or reviews. (CAR)
- Periodic assessment of xxxx in collaboration will represent a recurring milestone during the project. (CAR)
- Particularly good aspects are the training, and the strategy for elaborating the career development plan, the later to be established jointly by the supervisor and the researcher and defined as a project deliverable. (CAR)
- The work planning provides a comprehensive and detailed statement making clear how the research objectives would be carried out throughout the specified work packages. For each of these, the number of person-months is appropriately described. Given the experience of the applicant, it is plausible that the experiments detailed in WPs 2 and 3 can run concurrently. (ST)
- The overall work plan is logically structured and adequately detailed. Coherent work packages and deliverables are identified. The division of tasks is convincing as an effective way of achieving the project goals with the necessary components. An adequately designed Gantt Chart is included. (CAR)
- The work plan is well conceived, coherently structured, and feasible, and all the four work-packages are well-described and organised. (ST)
- The work plan and the Gantt Chart are clear and good (from the data management plan to scientific meetings and scientific articles). (CAR)
- The discussion about how the work plan would ensure that the research and training objectives would be reached is sufficient. (ST)
- The work plan is ambitious but feasible, considering the existing skill set and the researcher's experience. (ST)
- A list of concrete work packages as well as a set of deliverables are well presented in the Gantt Chart. It is clearly demonstrated how the work plan will ensure that the research and training objectives will be reached. (ST)
- Seminars, obtaining research output, and presenting the work in conferences are convincingly considered in the Work plan. (ST)
- The workplan is complete in terms of scheduled tasks and timings, represented in a Gantt Chart, where the main activities (6 Work packages) are separately and credibly described. The proposal is clearly structured in phases that together provide evidence for the research objectives. (ST)
- Overall project schedule and planning of resources are based on the researcher's past experience and

are clearly presented in the proposal for each deliverable. (CAR)
- The work plan is coherent and effective and likely to ensure the achievement of the project's objectives within the time frame of the action. The work plan is organized around four specific work packages, which are clearly laid out and include expected milestones and deliverables. (RI)
- The work plan and the Gantt Chart gives a detailed description of various tasks. Also the dissemination and training parts of the project are planned and incorporated into the whole project including an appropriate allocation of resources. (RI)
- Necessary actions to make sure that the research and training targets are achieved are well-described in the work plan. (RI)
- A comprehensive work plan is provided, including tasks, milestones and deliverables. The time management of the individual work package is adequately adjusted. A clear Gantt Chart is provided with a correct planning of tasks, deliverables and milestones. The work packages, each with several tasks, leading to deliverables and milestones are aligned with the goals of the project. (RI)
- The division of the workload into three work packages is appropriate. (RI)
- The coherence and effectiveness of the work plan is very well presented while the Gantt Chart is presented in details. A detailed work plan has been included which comprises work packages and milestones which are appropriate and realistic. (RI)
- The number of deliverables and milestones is adequate, are appropriately positioned in terms of time, and are measurable. (RI)
- Work packages, key tasks and objectives are clearly listed and their timing/sequential organization is meaningful, convincing and fully in line with the research approach. (RI)
- The work plan is overall clearly described and properly includes a work package for project management. (RI)
- Deliverables and milestones are properly placed throughout the programs duration ensuring continuous output and dissemination. (RI)
- The somewhat simplified, but appropriate Gantt Chart and additional table are presented, which include 3 Work packages, the major deliverables and some other tasks. (RI)

Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources

- Allocation of time and other practical and administrative arrangements (management, independent mentoring, progress meeting, etc.) to support the researcher are foreseen and are of high quality. (ST)
- The allocation of tasks and financial resources is appropriate, and ensures the achievement of the project objectives. (ST)
- The allocation of resources for each planned task has been adequately addressed. (ST)
- The proposed allocation of person-months is reasonable and appropriate to complete the planned activities.
- The effort allocated for the successful implementation of the different tasks is realistic. (ST)
- If the implementation of the action requires financial support (consumables, small equipment), it will be provided by the supervisor's current funding. (ST)
- The mobilised resources are commensurate with the objectives of the proposal. The target activities are pragmatically assessed with due consideration of the project length-limited number of person months. (ST)
- The content of each individual work-package is adequately described. (ST)
- The allocation of tasks and resources is clear and coherent. (ST)
- Adequate progress monitoring measures are planned in the form of frequent communication between the supervisor and the researcher. (ST)
- Tasks are linked to objectives and the corresponding work packages are adequate. (ST)
- Person-month allocations seem reasonable and based on experience. (ST)
- The proposal describes precisely the number of person-months per work package, but the allocation of the researcher's person-months is not clearly presented and described. (ST)
- Participants of the project (researcher, supervisor, research team) have appropriately specified their workloads on planned scientific results. The overall proposed workload is sufficient to cover planned activities and workload on particular project phases is well-elaborated. Inclusion of supporting staff at the host is expected that is beneficial for the timely project implementation. (ST)
- The amount of person-months is in line with the proposed activities and the time to complete the main objective is thoughtful. The presentation of the allocation of funding is very detailed in the proposal. (ST)
- In addition to the resources available at the host institute, a set of external collaborators have

committed to provide support. (ST)
- The proposal includes a convincing description of the contribution of other experienced laboratory members and collaborators to the research activity and the researcher´s development. (ST)
- The researcher provides appropriate details of who will train them on the required technologies, which is commendable. (ST)
- The resource allocation presented partly makes up for the lack of subdivisions in the research work package. The time line is based on previous experience in simulations-oriented projects of researcher and supervisor. (ST)
- The resources that are going to be mobilized in order to achieve the research and training objectives are adequately discussed, as is the financial support given to the researcher by the host and the supervisor. (ST)
- The resources that are going to be mobilized in order to achieve the research and communication objectives are adequately discussed through the logical and realistic timeline proposed. Both the tasks and the resources are well integrated with the activities to be employed during the mobility. (ST)
- The distribution of tasks pertaining to different work packages is comprehensive, allowing the researcher to carry out the research and its major steps without delays and bottlenecks. (ST)
- The sequence of activities outlined is coherent in that each element builds upon the results of the previous work package. (GF)
- The allocation of tasks and resources is well documented and feasible, each participating organization and phase of research being well justified. (GF)
- The tasks are well adapted to the outgoing and return phases matching the competencies of both institutions. (GF)
- The provision of appropriate resources at both the outgoing and return host organizations is excellent. (GF)
- Work planning and the resources mobilized ensure that the research objectives would be reached. A number of person-months is appropriate in relation to the proposed activities as presented in Gantt Chart. (GF)
- Details on human resources are provided in terms of allocation of person-months. (GF)
- The allocation of tasks is appropriate with regard to the procedural and experimental scope of the research, covering the consecutive stages of the plan. (GF)
- The work planning and the resources to be mobilized would ensure that the research and training objectives are achieved. The time aspect is convincingly addressed, which makes the implementation feasible. Sufficient time has been given to tasks, research and training as shown by carefully planned WPs, striking a good balance between Careers planning, research methodology and output, among other things. (GF)
- The justification of the use of resources and tasks within the proposal is highly convincing and appropriate for achieving the two research objectives.
- Allocation of resources in the working plan is fully appropriate to achieve the goals of the proposal. In particular, the plans for mobilizing resources to support the research at the Third Country have been very well presented. (GF)
- Allocation of tasks and resources aligns well with the aims of the research and is appropriate (incoming phase). Methodologies are already established at the host lab (incoming phase) or will be provided by dedicated collaborators. Essential material is either already available or is expected to be available at the start of the project (incoming phase). Technical support by lab personnel during the incoming phase is available. (GF)
- The timing of the proposal (24 months outgoing and 12 in the EU host organisation) is articulated in a balanced and feasible way so that the work planning and the resources mobilized would ensure the achievement of research and training objectives. (GF)
- The description of task allocation is concise, informative and appropriate to reach the project goals. (GF)
- The main tasks and commitments of the host institution in Europe are sufficiently presented. (GF)
- The main tasks and commitments of the host institution abroad are adequate. (GF)
- The division of tasks between the host institutions is properly planned. (GF)
- The tasks are relevant and oriented towards the achievement of the main research and training goals. (GF)
- The active contribution of the host institution and the partner organization in terms of tasks and commitments to the research and training activities during the outgoing and return phases is adequately explained. The commitment of the partner organization, that ensures its real and active

participation in the proposed action, is convincing. (GF)
- The main tasks and commitments of the beneficiary and partners are clearly identified. (GF)
- The allocation of tasks and resources is well planned. The researcher will make a central contribution to the planned research. (GF)
- The main tasks and commitments of the host institutions are well described for both phases. (GF)
- Tasks are well allocated and have been carefully timed. The good chronological arrangement of the tasks provides a clear overview of the project. The required resources have been identified and allocated to the project. (GF)
- The work packages are convincingly presented, correspondent to the research and training objectives and divided into concrete tasks and phases, so that the fellowship would achieve the desired final goals. (GF)
- The amount of person-months is appropriate in relation to the activities proposed. (GF)
- Existing human (field assistant) and other resources (equipment and vehicles) will contribute to meet work packages' objectives. (GF)
- It is convincingly demonstrated that the allocation of financial resources for a successful completion of the project has been thoroughly considered. (GF)
- The time plan is logically developed. (CAR)
- Although ambitious, the project timescale is rather credible and the resources are appropriated. (CAR)
- The timing in the Gantt Chart is very well planned and would contribute to the progress of the project. (CAR)
- The proposal persuasively explains how the work planning and resources mobilised will ensure that the research and training objectives will be reached; there is a logical fit between the work packages and the research and training objectives. (CAR)
- Cost estimates and budget management are realistic and they are transparently presented. (CAR)
- The Gantt Chart generally reflects well the work plan, which distributes balanced attention and resources to xxx, trainings, dissemination and communication activities. (CAR)
- It is justified to start with the teaching activities in the 2nd year when the project should be already running. (CAR)
- The key tasks and the relevant commitments of the host institution in the context of the proposed research project are adequately discussed. (ST)
- The main tasks and commitments of the host are properly identified. The researcher is aware of the available resources of the host and adequately makes use of them for the research. (ST)
- The section on the appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources, while short, is adequate and logical. The resources are well specified. (CAR)
- The allocation of tasks and resources are not ambitious and deadlines are likely to be readily achievable; the allocation is coherent, realistic and efficient (in terms of amount of persons per WP). (ST)
- The allocation of person-months is coherent with the objective of the project and established in a convincing manner. (ST)
- The amount of person-months in WP2, WP3, WP4 and WP5 is appropriately allocated to core project activities and appropriate share of financial resources to dissemination activities. (CAR)
- Instead of person-month, there is provided sufficient information on the budgetary expenses (percentage) in relation to each of the research segments. (CAR)
- Clear evidence has been provided that the researcher, the supervisor, and the host institution's project team, have the necessary experience and skill to assure that the research objectives would be reached timely. (CAR)
- The resources allocated are appropriate in order to ensure that all research objectives are met. (RI)
- The project's proposed timeline is appropriate. (RI)
- The proposal clearly shows that there are sufficient institutional resources already in place, including specific library resources. (RI)
- The allocation of tasks and resources is well planned. Despite the ambitious nature of the project a credible timeline has been demonstrated. (RI)
- The proposal adequately presents the appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and their respective resources, regarding training, communication and dissemination activities. Work packages are well structured and are aligned with the corresponding deliverables. (RI)
- Costs have been identified, explained and accounted for in detail and the number of person-month is appropriate for the planned tasks. (RI)
- The planned technical resources are adequate for the research objectives. (RI)

- The allocation of time and resources to different tasks is adequate and clearly specified. It is good that there is an additional special table attached specifying the allocation of tasks and resources in the action. (RI)
- The collaborative structure and experience in cooperative work among the researcher, the host institution and department and the supervising would allow realistic resource allocation to various tasks and on-going necessary adjustments. (RI)

Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures, including risk management (organisation and management structure, research and/or administrative risks, progress monitoring mechanisms put in place etc.)

- The management structures and procedures are appropriate. All technical and research management issues will be addressed in a timely manner by the supervisor and the host specialized services. (ST)
- The project management structure and procedures are aligned with the project. (ST)
- Competent departments of the host institution will manage the financial and administrative aspects of the fellowship. (ST)
- The described management structure is adequate to the correct implementation of the project. (ST)
- The management structure is very good, including interdisciplinarity team of experts with complementary skills, and clearly supports the progress and monitoring of the project. (ST)
- The management structure and progress-monitoring mechanisms (different types of meetings are listed) are appropriate to reach the objectives of the action. (ST)
- The management of the action is credible and involves the researcher, the supervisor and the hosting institution's administrative offices. (ST)
- The monitoring processes for the action are credible and based on compulsory written quarterly reports by the researcher, weekly group meetings with the participation of the supervisor and quarterly specialized project meetings. Moreover, two external mentors will oversee the research progress of the action and will aid in the supervision of the researcher. (ST)
- The proposed regular meetings, periodic written progress and appraisal reports, and the well-defined milestones constitute high quality measures to ensure progress monitoring of the action. (ST)
- The fellowship organisation, management structure and progress-monitoring mechanisms are all clearly defined and appropriately designed to ensure the attainment of the project objectives. (ST)
- The time-frame proposed for most tasks is appropriate: the potential impact of possible delays or problems has been taken into account. (ST)
- The commitment of both supervisor and co-supervisor in terms of man-month effort is quantified. (ST)
- The research that might threaten achievement of the objectives are foreseen, the contingency plans to be put in place should such risks occur are proposed. (ST)
- The institution has an appropriated management system in place to steer the research program. (ST)
- The management structure and procedures are clearly described both at the scientific and administrative levels. (ST)
- The beneficiary's active contribution to the research and training activities is sufficiently described in terms of training, supervision, scientific networking as well as providing the necessary administrative support and office space to the researcher. (ST)
- The financial management structure is adequately considered. (ST)
- An agreement has been reached with external organizations for the measurements on the large-scale facilities. Suitable persons that will assist the researcher during such experiments are also clearly identified. (ST)
- The impact of the risks on the overall success of the action is well specified and a thoughtful contingency plan is provided. (ST)
- The administrative and the financial management of the action is guaranteed by the organizational back-bone of the host organization. (ST)
- The management structures and procedures are sufficiently discussed. Among others, the scientific progress will be reported on the regular basis. Training packages are also considered and shown in the work plan. (ST)
- Management activity to monitor progress of the project and its status is clearly presented in the proposal. Responsibility of all players involved in the management structure is clearly identified. Additionally, the host institution support services will adequately participate in the management of the project according to its needs. (ST)
- Measures for project management are very well identified. Financial aspects are foreseen to be handled

by specialized staff and progress monitoring for the projects is appropriate. (ST)
- The demonstrated commitment of the supervisor is good. (ST)
- The proposal only identifies the technical risks related to the work in the laboratory, and not those of the entire project. (ST)
- The host university has established related managerial procedures for EU grants. (ST)
- The central management of the host university will help the researcher with the financial management. (ST)
- The host clearly offers all the necessary qualified human resources to help the researcher to successfully run the project: technicians, staff employed specifically for rearing the study species, experienced administrative and financial services. (ST)
- Research risks are clearly identified. Realistic remedies for each are provided. (ST)
- Research management for the proposal includes regular direct interactions with the supervisor to monitor the proceedings. (ST)
- The risk plan is in accordance with the main goals of the project, and the contingency plans are credible with both theoretical and numerical procedures. (ST)
- A realistic list of possible risks is provided. (ST)
- The proposal describes clearly the monitoring and management of the project which is shown to be very appropriate. It is especially valuable that, in addition to regular meetings with the supervisor, other academic staff from the host institution and from other research centers would also be involved. (ST)
- The solid experience in project management of the host institution is an asset for the administrative implementation of the project. (GF)
- The potential risks, in particular concerning uncertainties in the returned data from field studies, are well addressed and credible contingency measures are presented. (GF)
- The organisation and management structure during both the outgoing and return phases are satisfactory and offer good opportunities for flexibility if required. (GF)
- The proposal provides a comprehensive account of the infrastructure and facilities offered by the outgoing host organization, which are sufficient for the completion of the research objectives. (GF)
- The management structure is appropriate, ensuring that the project will be carried out in accordance with EU guidelines. (GF)
- Scientific and non-scientific risks are appropriately identified and the mitigation plans are outlined in detail and are convincing. (GF)
- Organization and management structure is adequate. There are sufficient monitoring measures in place. (GF)
- A tight monitoring of the completion of each work packages is planned over the entire project duration, based on regular and frequent meetings between the researcher and the two supervisors. (GF)
- The beneficiary organisation has extensive experience in administering collaborative national and international projects and in hosting international researchers. (GF)
- Both the outgoing and the incoming host labs have project managers who will handle all the administrative, financial and contractual issues of the proposal. (GF)
- Progress monitoring and support is clearly accounted for in regular meetings and other contacts between supervisors and the researcher. The researcher's activities will be secured by regular feedback from the supervisors, experts and the host's research offices support. The management structures and processes are well designed and perfectly capable of driving the proposal towards an efficient, high quality and successful end. (GF)
- The description within the proposal of the management structure and procedures is excellent as it includes details of financial, legal and management support available as well as progress monitoring procedures and the frequency of meetings between the researcher and the supervisory team. (GF)
- The addition of a steering group is well considered. (GF)
- The supervision proposed by all the supervisors is appropriate for a semi-independent researcher. (GF)
- A very detailed table with identified risks and adoptable mitigation is presented, covering all principal risks related to the project. It looks thoroughly planned, convincing and appropriate. (GF)
- Risks involved in recruiting, examining and imaging a large group of patients are clearly identified. (GF)
- The proposal is specific enough about the structures for financial management of the project as well as measures to assure the project implementation. The researcher would benefit from solid support services of the Research Office of the EU host institution, with extensive experience in managing EU grants, thus ensuring appropriate financial and administrative management structures. (GF)

- The monitoring plan is convincingly explained in the proposal, with regular meetings both with supervisors and administrative staff. As the proposal convincingly argues, the researcher is an experienced scholar who does not require monthly supervision meetings; the mechanisms envisioned assure that the researcher would conduct independent research while consulting the progress and risks with the supervisors on a regular basis. (GF)
- The proposal identifies relevant risks pertaining to the outgoing phase fieldwork and addresses well the mitigation measures. (GF)
- The management structures and procedures, to which both the host and partner institutions will contribute, are very well described and appropriate. (GF)
- The management structure is highly effective and will monitor the advancement of the project and the use of allocated resources through meetings, milestone and deliverables. Managing objectives and tools are very well defined in the proposal. (GF)
- The host will provide suitable support to the management of the project. A clear internal management structure is described for the incoming phase, for which the host institution has a good level of experience in managing H2020 projects and demonstrates a solid structure of support processes. (GF)
- Different types of risks that might endanger the implementation of the project are properly identified, also, possible and feasible risk mitigation measures are suggested. (GF)
- The measures for the project overview are effective, well-planned through a credible project flow and management structure, and will provide a balanced review of the project management progress; for example, biweekly meetings with the supervisor and regular presentations at group meetings. (GF)
- Some indication of copyright and intellectual property handling (regarding, for example, photos and interviews) is given in Part B (annex). (CAR)
- The active contribution of the beneficiary to the project activities is valuable. (CAR)
- The management is well thought so as to ensure that objectives are reached with meetings and evaluation of the work progress. (CAR)
- The management structure is simple and effective for the size of the proposed project. (CAR)
- The proposal satisfactorily explains the organisation and management structure as well as the monitoring mechanisms that will be put in place for the fellowship. (CAR)
- The description of management structure underlines the main responsibility of the researcher for monitoring the project, supported by regular meetings with the supervisor. This fits perfectly with the experience and capacities of the researcher. (CAR)
- Hosts institution is well experienced in the management of such projects, in collaborative programmes of research with other departments, Universities and the private sector. Full administrative, financial and operative support will be guaranteed by the experienced staff of the Faculty Research Services and the EU Team of the Research Office. (CAR)
- Suitably, the monitoring of the proposal is organized through periodical meetings with the project's supervisor to support progress. (CAR)
- The supervisor will provide the necessary support to manage the project through regular meetings. Risks that could compromise the success of the project will be mitigated by the expertise of supervisor and the collaboration with bioactivity experts. Multiple approaches and multiple xxxx evaluations are planned which limits the risk of not obtaining xxxx. (CAR)
- The proposal is well aware of the risks associated with research, which are well identified with related contingency measures. (CAR)
- Research plan realistically acknowledges possible delays in fieldwork research due to difficulties on the ground. (CAR)
- The proposed planning provides a good basis for a successful realisation of training objectives. In particular, the planning includes a package "Project management" envisaged as a continuous activity with the appropriate features stated. Stated planning would ensure that suitable results are ready in time for dissemination and communication activities. (CAR)
- Project management arrangements have been conceived excellently and presented in the most sufficient manner. The host institution offers excellent management structures, with a dedicated research management and administration team to assist at every stage of the project. Frequent meetings with the supervisors and the research support staff at the host institution are planned. Progress monitoring mechanisms are planned to ensure that the objectives that are reached are very carefully prepared. (CAR)
- The management structures and procedures are described in sufficient detail, with regular progress reporting and meetings with the supervisor. The proposal also convincingly describes how results will be monitored through the establishment of a scientific committee and the list of experts for Expert

Meetings. (CAR)
- The organisation and management structure are well described. Constant guidance and support from the supervisor during the whole implementation period are well assumed. (ST)
- A description of the management structure and procedures is provided. Access to sources of quality management is persuasively demonstrated. There is evidence that an appropriate Career Management Plan would be constructed. (CAR)
- The proposal presents adequate monitoring mechanisms to ensure that objectives are reached, by periodical meetings and checkings with the supervisor and other researchers on specific aspects and by stressing management monitoring. The presentation includes detailed information about the scientific management of the action, overseen by the supervisor and by other members of the host institution academic personnel, and about the management structure of this action, related to the host institutions assistance for specific administrative tasks. (CAR)
- The management structure and procedures in host institution, among others the bodies involved in the control system of the fellowship, are appropriately described. (CAR)
- The proposal contains sufficient evidence for due consideration of project-specific management support provided by the host organisation through dedicated administrative structures for supporting the management of EU projects. Due attention is also paid to intellectual property (copyright) for database data. Sufficient administrative structures are in place to ensure that most risks are dealt with through the implementation of appropriate risk mitigation strategies. (CAR)
- The risk management plan and monitoring of the progress against each work packages and deliverables is appropriate. Risk and mitigation analysis is thoroughly discussed. The outcome of each WP is defined via measurable metrics making it relatively easy to monitor progress and to manage risk. (ST)
- The risk management plan is very solid. Risks (e.g. accessibility of archival sources and other risks) are examined and effective potential solutions are presented. (CAR)
- Possible scenarios putting into risk some aspects of the project development are comprehensively discussed, and properly addressed by articulating detailed alternative mitigation actions should any risks occur. (CAR)
- The progress would be monitored through submission of deliverables, including first conference papers and exhibition, and then seminars, a book proposal and journal article. (CAR)
- The proposal contains sufficient evidence of the capacity of the host institution to administer this fellowship in an efficient manner, given its excellent record of experience with large scale EU-funded projects. (ST)
- Both the proposed host and secondment sites represent high-standard research-intensive institutions as reflected by the kind of guidance, support, and checks for submission that the proposal went through along the preparation stages. The research is situated in the right places for successful achievements. (CAR)
- Potential research and administrative risks are well identified and clear contingency measures are described; for example contingency plans are given in case of low resolution structures and in the absence of structures. (RI)
- Progress-monitoring with the supervisor by means of weekly discussions are appropriately planned. (RI)
- The researcher would be supported by different departments, offices, and services in such a way that needs and aspirations related to the action would be fulfilled. The internal network is presented in an adequate way by the involved names and instances. (RI)
- The proposed agile/scrum methodology is appropriate for the technical management of the action, which involves software development. (RI)
- The researcher shows an adequate understanding on the management of the project, including the necessary resources at scientific, financial and administrative level. (RI)
- The management structure is well planned and sufficiently described. The researcher will have all the support including technical, financial, administrative, and human resources needed for the good implementation of the project. (RI)
- The proposal highlights regular meetings of the researcher and the host/research group as an appropriate measure to monitor progress, deal with risks and to solve problems. (RI)
- The overall management structure is appropriate for the project's development, including administrative and financial management, as well as constant research and quality monitoring. (RI)
- Risks are presented in detail, while their respective contingency plans convincingly indicate the actions that should be taken into account in case of each eventual risk. (RI)

- The management structure and monitoring mechanisms in place to supervise the progress and development of the research are described. Specifically, regular meetings with the supervisor are planned. (RI)
- The research division of the host institution is experienced in administering projects, which represents an advantage. (RI)
- The scientific and administrative management of the project is very good. (RI)
- A clear presentation of the institutional commitment for supporting the administrative needs of the applicant is provided. (RI)
- Host institutions have dedicated scientific support managers who will liaise with relevant stakeholders and further facilitate implementation of the proposed research in both relevant countries. (RI)
- Relevant management aspects are in place within the host group and further support comes from the proven management organisation of the host institution, thus ensuring the effective development of the research. (RI)
- The measures for progress monitoring and quality assessment provided by the host institution are very suitable. The progress is monitored by biweekly meetings of supervisor and host and monthly meetings to assess quality aspects of research and management. (RI)
- The project management and monitoring of the progress against each work packages is appropriate and credibly discussed. It includes weekly/biweekly meetings with the supervisor and Biannual research panel of senior members to discuss the scientific progress of the project. (RI)
- The measures for progress monitoring and quality assessment provided by the host institution are very suitable. (RI)
- The management plan and procedures of the implementation are feasible and well presented. Management procedures are outlined for monitoring and evaluating the progress of the project. (RI)
- The supervisor and the researcher will be responsible for the management of the project; they will prepare Career development plan and Project Management Plan. (RI)
- The administration of the host institution will provide the researcher with all facilities and consumables needed for a smooth implementation of the action. (RI)
- The risk assessment and measures foreseen are realistic and sufficient. In this context the researcher is right to introduce the issue of intellectual property rights. (RI)
- Robust progress monitoring mechanisms are in place including meetings with the supervisor, the hosting laboratory's members and the department. (RI)

Appropriateness of the institutional environment (infrastructure, logistics, facilities for GF role of partner organisations etc.)

- The quality of the infrastructure at the host institute is very well described and appropriate to successfully carry out the proposed research plan. (ST)
- The host institution is highly committed to the objectives of the action. (ST)
- The host institute has significant experience in managing European research projects and its laboratories are fully equipped with state of the art research facilities necessary for synthetic work and analytical investigations. The host offers outstanding teaching and learning experience. (ST)
- The partner institution for the secondment, as convincingly described in the proposal, has the necessary infrastructure to develop the proposed activities. (ST)
- The top-level infrastructure fully corresponds to the needs set out for the successful execution of the project.
- The commitment of the beneficiary to the programme is clear and convincing. (ST)
- The infrastructure (e.g. analytical facilities and specific equipment) available at the host institution has been described in detail and is appropriate for the proposed objectives. (ST)
- The researcher will be granted access to the necessary cutting-edge research equipment, logistic and facilities available at the host institution. (ST)
- The institutional environment and active participation of the beneficiary in the action are very well described and will facilitate the progress of project. (ST)
- The host research group offers the right infrastructure and knowledge for the development of the planned sensing device. (ST)
- The beneficiary's active contribution to the research and training activities is appropriately elaborated. (ST)
- It is clearly outlined that day-to-day research support will be provided by senior researchers of the hosting laboratory and of the collaborating units. (ST)

- The hosting institution has all the necessary infrastructure in place in order to support the research and training activities of the researcher. (ST)
- The institutional host environment is fully appropriate to reach project objectives. The host university is internationally recognized and is very well equipped to perform chemical synthesis in aerobic conditions. (ST)
- The institutional environment is sufficiently described and of high quality. The host institution declares a proper infrastructure to commit tasks and actions defined in the project proposal. (ST)
- İnfrastructure and facilities available at the host institution are of high-level. The equipment available to the action is consistent with the research plan and state-of-the-art. (ST)
- The researcher will benefit from nearly located departments with synergism that will contribute with available technology and knowledge. (ST)
- The host institution has relevant experience in European projects. (ST)
- The host institution has a substantial, well-documented capability to provide excellent technical and administrative assistance and support to the researcher. (ST)
- The host institution has a well developed analytical and laboratory infrastructure to achieve the tasks included in the proposal and the host is willing to utilise other laboratories and experts of the institution to make the project a success (e.g. additional instrumental techniques, electrochemistry, biological screening). (ST)
- The host group and institute have good expertise, equipment and infrastructure, and will constitute a suitable environment for the applicant's research work. (ST)
- The host institution has a substantial well-documented capability to provide excellent technical and administrative assistance and support to the researcher. (ST)
- The description of the beneficiary infrastructure reveals a large number of equipment and facilities available to the group and to the researcher for execution of the project . Some external facilities (synchrotron) available for the project are also mentioned. (ST)
- The contribution of the beneficiary is high and precisely specified. The host will provide all the necessary infrastructure/facilities for the implementation of the research proposal. The logistic aspects are very well thought out, covering a vast number of possible needs of the researcher. (ST)
- The proposal mentions convincingly a number of active contributions by the host to support the fellowship. Thereby the commitments of the host are clearly identified and are important and well suited for the fellowship.
- The institutional environment/s are highly appropriate for the research and training activities. Both host and secondment are well-equipped for supporting visitors and training researchers. (ST)
- The logistics and facilities offered are of very high quality and will guarantee the good implementation of the action. (ST)
- The projected research is well integrated into the supervisor's research program and the host group and institute provide an appropriate environment to perform the proposed project. (ST)
- The host provides a very good institutional environment with administrative support, as well as excellent research infrastructure that demonstrates a commitment to closely supervise and manage the project. (ST)
- The host group and collaborators are equipped with state-of-the-art technology to support the specialized techniques that the project requires, including preclinical assays, advanced imaging and cell migration systems.
- The available lab space, apparatus, and logistical support for the implementation of the action are appropriate.
- The host group has a very good reputation and is at the forefront of research in this field. (ST)
- The suitability of the institutional laboratory facilities to deal with problems as they arise (specifically those relating to the difficulties in working with degraded food residues in archaeological samples) is insufficiently represented in the proposal. (ST)
- The infrastructure and facilities offered by the host proves that it has extensive possibilities to conduct research. What is particularly important to proper project realization is the access to over hundred and twenty international databases as well as to a well-equipped library with documents needed for project realization.
- The proposal describes convincingly how the infrastructures of the host and the secondments' institutions contributes to the research and training activities of the researcher. (ST)
- The proposal offers compelling evidence that the host will provide an excellent infrastructure for the researcher to carry out his project, including research resources, technical support and expertise advice on research data management, research ethics and public outreach. (ST)

- The institutional environment and institutional culture at the host institution are ideal for the pursuit of this proposal, making clear how they will be totally coherent with the ER needs and how they will contribute to create a very good work environment. (ST)
- The institutional environments of each involved organization are shown to be of top quality, and they are optimal for the proposed research. (GF)
- The infrastructure, logistics and facilities at both outgoing and return host institutions are more than adequate to carry out the proposed research. (GF)
- Practical arrangements including administrative procedures that ensure the quality of life at the hosting institution for the visiting researchers are good and described in sufficient detail.
- In both institutions the ER will have access to a very good set of infrastructures from office space to specific and adequate facilities to the project completion, which are clearly defined in the proposal. (GF)
- The host institution outside EU is a very good centre of research, where the supervisor is a renowned scientist in the area of research impacting on the project. (GF)
- The host institution in the returning phase is a new planned centre starting in Jan 2018. This will host key personnel from the previous institution from where it derived, this way assuring the scientific knowledge and quality of the newly created centre where the ER will be integrated. (GF)
- Both host institutions have substantial experience in hosting international fellows. (GF)
- The institutional environment is appropriate, demonstrating the active contribution of the beneficiary to the research and training activities. (GF)
- Both the home institute and the host institute are leading centres in the field of the project and they have promised to offer to the experienced researcher all facilities, infrastructure and administrative help necessary for carrying out the proposed research. (GF)
- Experience of the hosting institution (incoming phase) with EU funded research projects has been demonstrated. Based on their scientific background and international networks both the hosting institutions for the outgoing and for the return phase provide a very good environment for the planned training and research activities. Relevant competencies and the infrastructure and logistics support available at the hosting institutions have been satisfactorily described. (GF)
- The host institution (outgoing phase) offers an ideal infrastructure for successful implementation of the project, in technical terms (testing facilities available), in terms of human resources available (for assisting with experiments), for ensuring chimpanzee and human participants, and in terms of the overall research excellence across the disciplines dealt with by the project. (GF)
- The institutional environments of both host and outgoing institutions are excellent and will provide the best conditions for the action to be successful. (GF)
- The practical arrangements such as the researcher's VISA application and the fulfillment of the Health Insurance requirements would be supported by the host institution. (GF)
- The hosts' and secondment institutional environments are appropriate in that they have the required infrastructure for research of this nature office space, computer, software and access to data and documentation. (GF)
- The three institutional environments will provide access to different networks and physical proximity to the proposed case studies. (GF)
- The infrastructures (laboratories, libraries, scientific facilities) at both the Host institution and the Partner Organization are good, and the researcher will have fully access to them. (GF)
- The institutional environments in both outgoing and return phase hosts are well described and appropriate, containing the necessary infrastructure to support the project. The laboratory of the outgoing institution will support the first two WPs with analytical facilities to fully characterize material structure and morphology while the incoming institution will support the third WP. (GF)
- The commitment of the hosts is convincing. The hosts are willing to continue and to reinforce their collaboration also in non-scientific domains, for example in the development of the educational programme. (GF)
- The active contribution of the beneficiary and the partner organization in terms of tasks and commitments to the research and training activities is adequately explained. An up-to-date letter of commitment from the partner organisations, that ensures its real and active participation in the proposed action, is included. (GF)
- The proposal comprehensively explains the support offered by the beneficiary organisation and the partner organisation to achieving the research objectives e.g. Through institutional support, training, supervised research, mentoring and access to research-practice partnerships with schools. (GF)
- The infrastructures of the outgoing partner organisation and the incoming institution are entirely

appropriate for carrying out the research as they provides the necessary resources and environment for ensuring successful implementation, e.g. access to library, IT support and facilities for data management and analysis, connections with schools. (GF)

- A clearly designed commitment letter of the host partner organisation (for the outgoing phase) is included, specifying the partner tasks such as the full availability for the researcher of infrastructure workplace, equipment and product as well as the scientific and administrative support in the implementation of the training and research activities throughout the secondment. (GF)
- The commitment of the partner organization in the third country is clearly stated in the corresponding letter. (GF)
- The institutional environment is very good, the beneficiary is well equipped with necessary software, workstations, libraries, and other resources useful and adequate to t he practical execution of the proposed project. The software licensing policy is included and well explained. (GF)
- Both the partner and the host institution will provide training and give access to courses, and seminars, which are essential for the development of the activities under this project and for the career development of the researcher. (GF)
- The support of the partner organisation is in general convincingly laid out. It is persuasively shown that the institutional environment of both Outgoing and Incoming hosts is well-prepared to host this researcher and facilitate the successful completion of the project. (GF)
- The application has provided convincing evidence for the appropriateness of the institutional environment of both institutions. (GF)
- The infrastructures and facilities of the partner organization in the third country are also sufficiently presented. (GF)
- The infrastructure, logistics and facilities offered, as far they are necessary for the good implementation of the action, at both hosts are very good and in place. Both institutions have access to a high performance computer facilities necessary for facilitating the project. (GF)
- The proposal has foreseen the details of the necessary infrastructure to be provided by both host institutions such as a desk space, computer facilities, and library access, in addition to logistical arrangements. (GF)
- The infrastructure at the host institutions is advanced and highly instrumental to achieve the research objectives, including a specific support team at the host to allow the proper management of the project. (GF)
- The available infrastructures of host institutions and the level conditions of work, supervision, learning, library etc. are described clearly and well detailed. (GF)
- The infrastructure, logistics and facilities offered by the host institutions are appropriate. Comprehensive library, database and audio-visual facilities are in place, including major specialist holdings, along with access to training opportunities and career planning support. (GF)
- The proposal offers compelling evidence that the host institute will provide an excellent infrastructure for the researcher to carry out his project. Both the host in the outgoing phase and the host in the returning phase offer full support for the development of the project, i.e. full access to the library and electronic resources, courses, strong administrative support. (GF)
- The infrastructure, logistics and facilities at both host institutions are adequate and would contribute to the successful implementation of the action. The researcher would have direct access to all necessary research and training facilities at both organizations. (GF)
- İnfrastructure, logistics and facilities are offered at both hosting institutions. The geographic location of the host university fits the project well. (GF)
- The infrastructure provided to the project is fully adequate. Both hosts make explicit commitments to support the fellow. Excellent computing infrastructure is provided during the outgoing phase. (GF)
- The researcher demonstrates the support of the host institution outside the EU in key aspects such as terms of residence permit, access to archives and support in providing Arabic courses. (GF)
- The host institution in outgoing phase will provide very good administrative and managerial support. (GF)
- Outstanding qualities of the outgoing and return host institutions are convincingly demonstrated. Both have significant experience in supporting R&D projects and in hosting of foreign researchers. (GF)
- The international research and management offices at the host institution will support the researcher (GF)
- The host institution for the outgoing phase demonstrates large scale experience of research project management, with dedicated grants management and central service offices available to support project. The outgoing host institution has achieved the highest possible national rating for its research

performance. (GF)
- The expected contributions and commitments of the host institutions and the host groups to the fellowship are fully credible. The letter of commitment of the host institution during the outgoing phase displays a high degree of commitment to the project. (GF)
- Both institutions have the necessary infra-structure (e.g. desk space, access to internet, electronic library resources) for the development of the activities planned under this project. (GF)
- The wider infrastructure and support mechanisms at the host institution are outlined and adequate. (CAR)
- The infrastructure of the host is very well described and fully relevant for the proposed project. (CAR)
- The institutional environment and infrastructure is appropriate for the project and adequate monitoring mechanisms are in place. (CAR)
- Academic and technical support necessary to perform the research at the host organizations is considered, and some management procedures (including career plan and progress reports) are also in place. (CAR)
- The proposal shows commitment from the part of the host institution to provide an adequate infrastructure for the action, including the necessary administrative, logistical and scientific support also during the secondment. (CAR)
- The proposal clearly explains the infrastructure, logistics and facilities that will be offered at the host institution; these are excellent and suitable for the successful implementation of the action. (CAR)
- The infrastructure and specific equipment offered by the host institution is excellent with state-of-the-art laboratories. (CAR)
- The host institution has a record of excellent experience with large scale projects which contributes to confidence that it will be administering this fellowship in an efficient manner. (ST)
- The institutional environment at the host is appropriate, with the host having abundant experience with providing training on research, teaching, and language skills to researchers at all career levels. (ST)
- A high-quality institutional environment is offered to the researcher demonstrating the active contribution of the host to the research and training activities. (ST)
- The host institution provides a dynamic intellectual environment specialized in the areas covered by the project. In addition, the networking opportunities can be rated as very good. (ST)
- The host institution provides excellent infrastructure and research environment for the implementation of the project. The project clearly describes a high quality of supervision and mentoring, a large and highly skilled research staff – in which the researcher will be integrated as ordinary staff –, a profusion of specialized research centers – some in fields relevant for the project –, an active workshop series and several important networks. (ST)
- The institutional environment of the host institution (infrastructure, logistics, and facilities) are convincingly discussed. The host institution holds a significant collection of relevant primary source materials. (CAR)
- The proposal includes a very detailed presentation of the high-level institutional environment and the inclusion of the postdoctoral fellows, including specific infrastructure and facilities that will ensure the excellent implementation of this action. (CAR)
- The proposal gives sufficient evidence that the host has extensive experience in managing research projects (in FP7 and Horizon 2020) and well established infrastructure for the successful completion of the project. (CAR)
- The general conditions of the institutional infrastructure are adequately described as appropriate, including relevant aspects of mobility, access to relevant literature and expertise, as well as research management. (CAR)
- The proposal provides a detailed description of the infrastructure in the host institution and this is an important point taking into account the computational requirements of the research. There will be access to computing power in the High Performance Computing Laboratory that will be of great benefit for the proposed project.(ST)
- The infrastructures and facilities of the institutions represent a clear strength of this proposal. (RI)
- The main tasks and commitments of the beneficiaries are clearly laid-out in the research proposal. (RI)
- The host institution has good infrastructure that will be accessible by the ER to support well the tasks of the proposal. (RI)
- The host institution has very good computing and experimental capabilities to accomplish the calculations and experiments required in the project. (RI)
- The institutional environment and infrastructure are outstanding. The infrastructure and laboratory

facilities are well positioned for the successful implementation of the proposal's action, including administrative, financial, and human resources support. The host is fully committed to hosting the fellow and providing all necessary training and support throughout the life of the project. The fellow will have access to cutting-edge equipment from the beginning of the project. (RI)

- The infrastructural integration model at the proposed host-institution seems optimal: The researcher will count on a work station equipped with individual desk; full access to libraries facilitating the project's development; free access to various courses; personal e-mail, a web profile on the institutional website, personalised services accessible online and access to PC stations and online scientific journals. (RI)
- The host institution is an excellent environment and one of the best around the world in this particular field. The host offers all the infrastructure, logistics and facilities suited for the effective implementation of the action. (RI)
- The infrastructure, logistics and facilities offered by the host institution are adequate to ensure the good implementation of the action. It provides an appropriate and very good institutional environment to contribute to the researcher's academic and training activities. (RI)
- The commitment of the participants to the project is convincingly demonstrated. A highly qualified and supportive scientific environment is available at the host institution and the extensive infrastructure provided fully supports the execution of all aspect of the project, including fish breeding and demanding computing tasks. (RI)
- There is strong evidence that the host and the seconding institution provide a modern infrastructure, technical equipment and training, whereas various partners of the host's existing collaborations network will provide support of related knowledge. Direct access to very specific data repositories in the secondment and host institution is given. (RI)
- The host institution has a number of research centers that would be helpful for the researcher's research. (RI)
- The host institution has a large faculty size that provides ample opportunities to network. (RI)
- High quality infrastructure and facilities necessary for the good implementation of the core actions are offered by the host. (RI)
- The detailed information on the host included in the table "Capacity of the Participating Organisation" on the institutional environment and on the role of supervisor are essential and very promising for a good and effective implementation of the action. (RI)
- The researcher will have the opportunity to participate in lectures, seminars and training sessions, special programmes, etc. offered by the beneficiary in Architecture. (RI)

Weaknesses:

Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan (Gantt Chart, Work packages titles, deliverables, milestones, secondments etc.)

- Although the allocation of MSc or PhD students under the supervision of the researcher is planned, these roles are not clearly reflected in the work plan. (ST)
- The proposal fails in specifying and clearly describing the relevant milestones. (ST)
- Dissemination through publications is not taken into consideration in the Gantt Chart, consequently their quantification cannot be assessed. (ST)
- Involvement of the fellow in the project management is not sufficiently detailed. (ST)
- The allocation of person-months for the challenging WP2 is overambitious. It is a very challenging work plan to be finalised within the timeframe of the project. Moreover, the simultaneous working on two work packages, complemented by contemporaneous training and conference attendance, is hardly achievable in an effective way. (ST)
- The synthetic workload of the individual work-packages and their superposition are too ambitious for a 24 months fellowship. (ST)
- The time allocation of scientific, dissemination and outreach activity tasks is only briefly and vaguely discussed, and is therefore not convincing. Also, the allocated resources for the characterisation of surfaces over the duration of the project are insufficiently discussed. (ST)
- The time allocation of training activities is not appropriate to reach the goals of the proposal, because these activities are concentrated in the first three months of the project. (ST)
- The work-plan lacks a clear description and breakdown of activities associated with the work packages 1-4. (ST)

- The secondment's activities, even though are mentioned in the work-plan, are not timely planned. (ST)
- Even if in general, the coherence and effectiveness of the work plan is adequately described, with well elaborated deliverables, with the expected results from each work package clearly presented, and milestones and secondments included in the Gantt Chart, the ambitious dissemination and communication plans are however not coherent with the Gantt Chart as the dissemination in the Gantt Chart only consists of the setup of the website as a deliverable. (ST)
- Certain milestones are foreseen at the end of the fellowship, which cannot serve as a quality check for the successful implementation of the action. (ST)
- The work plan is not detailed enough with respect to synthesis, samples and catalysis, for example. (ST)
- The feedback loop between the different work packages, e.g. between catalysis and synthesis, or catalysis and characterization, has not been properly described. (ST)
- Several aspects, such as the stay in another organization, have not been included in the planning, which is critical as the planning is already much overloaded. (ST)
- Only three milestones is a very small number for a two year project to support the monitoring of the project.
- The time engagement of the researcher in each activity is not sufficiently described. The Gantt Chart does not clearly indicate the allocation of person-months for each WP. It is unclear whether the allocated time is sufficient to fulfil all activities proposed. (ST)
- The technical content of the work packages is not discussed in adequate project-specific detail. (ST)
- The time-frame is not entirely adequate. In particular, the time needed to understand the bond-forming reactions and perform detailed mechanistic investigations is underestimated. (ST)
- Deliverables and milestones are presented without sufficient quantitative indicators. (ST)
- The extent of materials' synthesis resources that will be allocated to the project is disclosed insufficiently. (ST)
- The Gantt Chart is not detailed enough and lacks of clarity. (ST)
- The WPs are not defined in a sufficient detail, no subtasks to clarify a technical flow of the proposed work have been provided. (ST)
- The proposal does not adequately demonstrate the credibility of the proposed timeline for the work plan. (ST)
- The linear plan and inadequate prioritisation of tasks limit the scope for improvements to the proposed methodologies. (ST)
- The overall planning is vague and not focused on achieving high-impact objectives. (ST)
- The training activities and the corresponding deliverables are not sufficiently detailed in the proposal. (ST)
- The work packages describe the steps and flow of the research very poorly. Computational challenges are insufficiently described and the titles of work packages are not clearly defined in the proposal. (ST)
- The feasibility of the project to achieve the research and training objectives within the available timeframe is not demonstrated convincingly. (ST)
- The milestones are poorly described and they do not fully correspond to the key decision points of the project. (ST)
- The work plan is not addressing well-expected outcomes. The interactions between the three independent work-packages is not sufficiently highlighted. In addition, the deliverables are not outlined to serve as performance indicators for project progress assessment. Besides, the milestones are not discussed in some depth and are not visibly integrated into the research plan. The distribution of work is not sound and relevant, this is applicable also for trainings. (ST)
- The proposed project is not directed to any specific target, i.e. number of cycles, capacity or rate capability to be achieved especially in the part of benchmarking of new materials to battery cells. (ST)
- The WP1, WP2 and WP3 tasks are strongly related and the feedback among the research steps is not properly shown in the Gantt Chart. (ST)
- A communication of the experimental results of the project at an international conference is planned 3 months after the starting date which is too early and not justified. (ST)
- In WP2, the time allocated for the assays is too short to be effective. (ST)
- In WP3, the time allocated for the NMR studies is underestimated. (ST)
- Meetings with the people involved in the secondment are not planned. (ST)
- The last technical activity (screening and reaction optimization) is not appropriately included in any work package. (ST)
- The time allocated to develop some of the deliverables is unrealistic (e.g. for Task 1 only 4 months are planned for the composite photocatalysts development and characterization). (ST)

- The WPs are designed as sequential processes of design-synthesis-kinetic studies which is inappropriate for the particular research objectives since continuous feedback among the steps is a vital part of the methodology. (ST)
- The planning of training activities is not clear in the work plan. (ST)
- The Gantt Chart does not contain specific details. (ST)
- The scientific work carried out in the framework of each work package is not presented in sufficient detail. The description of the work packages is rather poor and not complemented by the methodology description in section 1. (ST)
- The workplan is designed in a linear fashion, and it is unclear how effective it will be in delivering the specific outcomes in case the planned milestones and deliverables are not met. (ST)
- The work packages dealing for examples with the characterization of the synthesized products and the evaluation of the caloric effects are described in a very generic way. Details on the demonstrator are missing and it has not been convincingly shown that the demonstrator can be successfully developed. (ST)
- The Gantt Chart does not depict a sufficient breakdown of detail to provide a convincing argument that the work plan is credible, nor that it will be effective. The distribution of the activities throughout the relevant calendar is unclear (e.g. the WPs are not continuous), therefore their feasibility is not fully convincing and the timelines are vague. (ST)
- A Gantt Chart is provided that highlights key activities to be undertaken, but the associated discussion lacks detail and integration into a comprehensive program of research. Additionally, the Gantt Chart lacks legends and notes.
- Milestones do not correspond to the key decision points of the project; therefore, they do not facilitate taking corrective action if problems arise. (ST)
- The duration and time schedule of the secondment reported in the proposal are not appropriately described.
- Some training activities are planned quite late in the project (month 20) raising the concern about the training objectives will not be reached. (ST)
- There is some overlap between tasks from different work packages (e.g. some tasks in WP1 overlap with tasks in WP2) which is not convincingly justified. The training plan is not properly included in the work plan. (ST)
- The technical content of the tasks is not presented in sufficient detail. The electromagnetic interference-aware parameter models are insufficiently addressed. The proposal insufficiently elaborates on the rationale for the use of the different enumerated languages (e.g Modelica, Matlab, Verilog or verification languages). (ST)
- The rationale behind the 3 month duration of the two secondments is not clear. In particular, it is not specified how this time is split across the two organizations. (ST)
- The infrastructure available during the secondment phase is not sufficiently presented in the proposal. (ST)
- Considering the relevant experimental and numerical activities, deliverables and milestones are not sufficiently detailed. (ST)
- The non-academic deliverables of the project are not sufficiently covered. (ST)
- The planned activities specified in some of the WPs are not convincingly justified. For example, it is misses an optimisation phase after fabrication and WP3 is too short for the objectives described. Moreover, in the WPs there is no reference to the equipments that must be used for tests and performance characterisations. Information about which decision to take when different configurations to be chosen are possible is not clearly described. (ST)
- Many tasks are undertaken at the same time, which makes the credibility of efficient working lower. (ST)
- The actual timing of when the milestones are reached is insufficiently explained and deliverables are insufficiently addressed. (ST)
- Dissemination and communication activities such as writing publications are not sufficiently detailed in the work-plan. (ST)
- The time allocated for the preparation of some deliverables, such as laboratory analysis and conference presentations, is too tight. (ST)
- Three out of four research work packages are concentrated during nine months of the last year and largely overlap each other's. This raises some potential problems to conduct them in parallel. (ST)
- The transfer of knowledge and its coordination with other activities of the action is not clearly addressed in the work plan and the Gantt Chart. (ST)

- Allocation of tasks and recourses is described in a rather general way and difficult to assess. The researcher does not clearly explain how the planning and resource stated will ensure that research and training will be properly achieved. (ST)
- The time-line for the experiments is insufficiently justified. (ST)
- Deliverables are inadequately identified or timetabled. For example, scientific publication is not sufficiently prioritized to be achieved during the fellowship. (ST)
- The scientific milestones in WP 1-3 are sufficiently justified, but some WP4 milestones are imprecise or poorly timetabled. (ST)
- The Gantt Chart is hard to read (no details are given in the chart e.g. the WPs are not clearly presented). (ST)
- The project is over-ambitious, and it is unlikely that most of the experiments can be performed in two years. (ST)
- The work plan contains a number of critical steps where experiments might not work. As an example, the researcher is confident that GM strains will be generated and analyzed within the last two months of year one of this fellowship. However, the proposal fails to provide any indications (e.g. preliminary data) that the system is workable. (ST)
- Only two planned papers in two years is not sufficiently ambitious for a top level fellowship such as the MSCF. (ST)
- The proposal does not adequately discuss how the proposed tasks for the different WPs are connected, and how the results generated of each WP influence the progress of the others. (ST)
- The names of listed deliverables are unspecific and do not enable estimation of their appropriateness. (ST)
- The milestones are vaguely described, which will make it difficult to monitor the progress of the project. (ST)
- The proposal does not provide sufficient information about quality checks on the data to be inserted in the public database. (ST)
- The time-interdependencies are not clearly shown in the work plan, making it difficult to assess the real impact of particular activities. (ST)
- The proposal does not provide sufficient information on secondments in each of the four countries, specifically on concrete activities to be undertaken and their relevance to the results of the research. (ST)
- The list of description of deliverables and milestones is presented in the chart in a way that makes it difficult to follow. The dissemination and communication plans included in the Gantt Chart are not presented at an appropriate level of details. (ST)
- The time planned for data acquisition and analysis is relatively short when compared to their demands. (GF)
- The described management structure and procedures do not include a progress-monitoring mechanism to ensure that the objectives of the project are reached. (GF)
- Practical administrative arrangements between the return host and the outgoing host governing the implementation of the fellowship in the outgoing phase are not described in sufficient detail. (GF)
- The project plan appears overly ambitious, with several tasks being underestimated in the time required to be completed, e.g. all WP2 subtasks (2.1; 2.2; 2.3). Additionally, some of these sub-tasks overlap between them and also with WP3, intensifying this problem. Altogether, this may result in a serious drawback for the project completion since WP3 is dependent on WP2. (GF)
- The mix of career development and public engagement activities are not clearly timetabled. (GF)
- The testing of the website is left too late. (GF)
- Too many of the measures to disseminate the results of the project have been placed in the return phase. (GF)
- The effectiveness of the work plan has not been convincingly demonstrated considering the time for training needed in relevant methods and the fact that no formal research activities are planned during the 12 months return phase. (GF)
- Given the fact that the work plan is very ambitious (qualitative study, policies analysis, development of final assessment, complex training program and numerous communication and dissemination activities) as well as the number of tasks to be done during the last three months of the project: drafting guidelines and recommendations (Deliverables 6 and 7), conducting all outreach strategy, drafting a book (Deliverable 9), and organizing final workshop (Deliverable 10) the feasibility of the work plan has been not convincingly demonstrated even taking into consideration the assistance provided. (GF)
- There are a number of activities in the work plan for which insufficient time has been allocated to

ensure that they are successfully carried out, such as fieldwork and the international conferences. (GF)

- Given the complexity of the optical imaging devices to be built for the first and fourth work packages, the time allocated to these two work packages is too short. (GF)
- There are some incongruences in the work plan (for example, some of the time during the outgoing phase is not related to any work package or other task or holidays; a paper to disseminate the results of work package1 (physiological demands of flight) is planned for month 12 (deliverable1), while work package1 will last also in the second year. The allocation of time to some deliverables (e.g. 1, and specially 4 and 5) is underestimated, while the periods dedicated only to training or conference attendance are overestimated. (GF)
- The content of deliverable 3.1 (training-through-research activities) is not sufficiently clear. (GF)
- The first journal article is not scheduled for completion until the 32nd month, making it unlikely that any subsequent journal articles will be produced during the fellowship. (GF)
- The content of some work packages is not discussed in detail and their duration is not clear from the Gantt Chart. The relationship between tasks and work packages does not contribute to make work plan fully understandable. (GF)
- The small number of milestones in relation to large number of WPs is not suitable. (GF)
- Dissemination and public engagement are planned to start the first month, without having reached research results. (GF)
- It's very difficult to determine from the Gantt Chart where every task will be developed, if in the Host institution, in the Partner Organisation or in other laboratories. (GF)
- The work plan only contains a methodical schedule and is confusing. (GF)
- The balance between a high number of deliverables for each work package and a low number of milestones to gauge progress is not sufficiently considered. (GF)
- The milestones and deliverables lack clarification on the linkage between the stated objectives and the information in the Gantt Chart. (GF)
- The dissemination measures and progress monitoring are insufficiently detailed in the Gantt Chart. (GF)
- The work plan is not fully designed to achieve the project objectives and impacts. The work plan is not sufficiently clearly linked to the methodology and to the dissemination and communication plans. (GF)
- The proposal contains inconsistencies in the allocation of time and resources. For example, the discussion on the time required and parallel work is not clearly addressed in the Gantt Chart. (GF)
- The work plan is not fully appropriate. One work package is too large and contains too many different empirical tasks, which are thus not sufficiently structured. Given the short time periods provided, the overlap of some work packages is not well justified. Deliverables and their relation to milestones are not fully adequately planned. (GF)
- The three-year work plan appears overly ambitious, considering the enormous amount of material to be studied. (GF)
- The researcher's active contribution to the research and teaching actiivities in the host and secondment institutions is not accurately addressed. (GF)
- The outgoing phase is planned, but it is described as a secondment. It is planned for only 12 months which is not sufficiently justified. (GF)
- Planned deliverables are limited to scientific articles and conference contributions, and milestones are not properly included in the Gantt Chart. (GF)
- The set of milestones is not convincing to be useful to monitor the progress of the research and the proposal is not approriately designed in a way to achieve the desired outcome. (GF)
- All deliverables and milestones are collected at the end of the respective WPs and are not explained at the appropriate level of detail. This strategy is unlikely to enable a fluent work-flow throughout the fellowship. (GF)
- While the work plan contains all the necessary phases, the information is insufficiently detailed to allow for a coherent analysis (e.g. the duration and the time period of the fieldwork are insufficiently specified; descriptions of WP2 and Deliverable 1 are very generic). (GF)
- Control of the project is planned to occur based on the deliverables, but the deliverables in the WPs are not measurable, impairing an appropriate assessment of progress. (GF)
- It is not clear when WP2 begins as there seems to be some inconsistency between the Gantt Chart and the main text. (GF)
- The duration of the training periods planned is inadequately short given the current level of experience of the researcher stated in the proposal. (GF)
- The implementation plan is not fully clear as it only includes xxxx milestones and dissemination activities are included within the xxxx part. (CAR)

- The presentation of the work plan is confusing and does not help to understand and evaluate the relationship between the different phases of the research. (CAR)
- The work plan lacks some effectiveness, with two work packages overlapping and creating a tight schedule for tasks. (CAR)
- The work package xxxx has no relation to the objectives of this action. (CAR)
- No specific data regarding the training are included, only intentions. (CAR)
- Training elements are not sufficiently incorporated into the Gantt Chart and work plan. (CAR)
- The suggestion to xxxx, in case the necessary experiments or evaluation of the investigated method cannot be completed, is insufficiently explained, especially since the relevant work package (WPx) includes dissemination of the results. It is also not made sufficiently clear how extending the experiments to additional features, other xxxx and different parameter settings - suggested as a mitigation strategy in case of negative results - should be understood in this context. (CAR)
- The report proposed for the xxxx month is due to contain the overall objectives of the action. That these are not highlighted in the proposal and clearly outlined prior to the project's start undermines the credibility of the overall project implementation. (CAR)
- The proposal does not mark specific points along the project timeline to verify the progress of the xxxx work packages and assure the effectiveness of the planned work. Only xxxx milestones are settled on the completion of xxxx and one on the completion of deliverables, with no clear indication on the Gantt Chart. (CAR)
- The milestones refer only to reports on activities. (CAR)
- There is a lack of intermediary points that can measure progress in research activities and in training, and in the production of the main outcomes. (CAR)
- The details on the nature of the deliverables is not always sufficiently explained (e.g., are they technical reports, articles, xxxx, etc.). (CAR)
- The basis for choice between a milestone and a deliverable is not always made clear. (CAR)
- The proposal does not explain with sufficient clarity the relationship between work packages and deliverables (deliverables xxx and xxx are not clearly identified). (CAR)
- A milestone settled at the end of a work package does not allow determining whether the project is on schedule. (CAR)
- Monitoring is mentioned but not well-elaborated on. (CAR)
- The progress monitoring mechanisms for such a complex, comparative research project are not convincingly addressed. (CAR)
- The progress monitoring process is not sufficiently addressed in the work plan; the practical steps that will be taken to ensure that the objectives are achieved within the timeline of the project are not specified. (CAR)
- The training activities in transferable skills are not scheduled in the work plan. (CAR)
- Training and dissemination activities are not yet determined, and the plan for xxxx is described as preliminary. (CAR)
- Insufficient detail is given about the xxxx 'short stay' secondments; it is unclear as to why and in what ways these would benefit the researcher. (CAR)
- The coherence of the work plan is not sufficiently documented, as clear and sufficiently detailed work package titles are not provided. In addition, it is not well justified that the period planned for each work package is rather short. (ST)
- The effectiveness of the work plan is lacking in designing of WP. The time periods are tightly scheduled and insufficiently explained. Moreover, the proposal does not provide enough details on milestones for the deliverables, such as reports, educational cases and journal articles. (ST)
- The work plan fails to adequately foresee the task of literature and previous research review, as well as indicators and data gathering for quantitative part of this proposed research. (ST)
- The work plan is incomplete. For example, it does not include sufficient detail about the researcher's participation in and organisation of lessons and seminars mentioned elsewhere in the proposal. (CAR)
- Although the work plan is organised into six work packages that follow a logical sequence this is done in a very simplified way. For instance, the work on publications is planned only in the latter stage of the research and the number of outputs derived from the project is not clearly identified. In addition, the proposal does not provide enough details on the milestones and the different deliverables derived from the project and how the they fit with the described objectives. (ST)
- The feasibility of the work plan is at risk as the timeframe for particular work packages is inadequately justified. (CAR)
- The work plan is based on 3 WPs, but these do not fully cover the whole period of the research, as

apparently no work would be done in Months 1, 6 and 8. (CAR)

- Training actions are indicated as being continuous throughout the proposal: This is too vague and is not very sensible to be included in this manner in the work plan. (ST)
- The provided Gantt Chart is not sufficiently concrete and does not adequately present all the relevant activities related to tutoring, training, and mentoring in the context of the proposal. (ST)
- The Gantt Chart lacks detail as to when the applicant would take annual leave. (ST)
- The concrete planning in the Gantt Chart does not properly reflect what it is stated in other parts. For example, subtasks are not clearly elaborated, and it is unclear whether D1.1. and D7.1 are the same or different deliverables. Other measures like social media contributions and Wikipedia entry are not specifically included in the Gantt. (CAR)
- Although the work-plan includes both scientific and transversal actions, the milestones and deliverables have not been sufficiently described and linked with the research concept and methodological approach. The Gantt Chart is difficult to read and only very limited specific information or explanation is given. (CAR)
- Project administration is not included as a work package that lasts the lifetime of the project. (ST)
- The work packages and deliverables are not clearly defined. The order of the work packages is not clear. For example, the formulation of the conference agenda and writing of papers predate much of the research, and it is not explained why or how this can be done. It is unclear why bibliographic research on academic journals has been cut into four short intervals, and the proposal gives inadequate consideration to deliverables at the end of each interval. The dissemination outlined in WP6 does not match the plans for dissemination included in the Impact section of the proposal. Some plans are formulated too tentatively e.g. a critical edition of a significant single short novel, or too opaquely to be fully credible. (CAR)
- The proposed project duration (18 rather than 24 months) is too limited, which presents critical risks for the coherent and effective execution of the proposal. (ST)
- The aim to produce three academic publications during the time span of the project is not convincingly argued. Taking into account the track record of the researcher more information is necessary so this objective to be realistic. (ST)
- The single and short visit of one week to the "xxxx" in month 9 is hard to understand. If there will be cooperation with a colleague from the "xxxx" in WP3, that would point to longer or more frequent visits. (ST)
- The discussion about how the resources mobilised ensure that the research and training objectives would be reached is insufficient. Moreover, there is no sufficient discussion of the involvement of other persons besides the researcher. (ST)
- The work plan contains work sub-packages not well correlated with the tasks mentioned in the research plan. Deliverables are confusing or mixed with work sub-packages.(RI)
- It is not sufficiently elaborated how the work plan and the resources mobilized would ensure that the research and training objectives will be reached. (RI)
- The proposal does not sufficiently detail plans to mitigate delays in WP2 and WP3. (RI)
- The deliverables and milestones are not properly defined for each work package (i.e. the deliverables are related mainly to dissemination of results). (RI)
- Abbreviations used in WP descriptions and in the Gantt Chart are not all entirely understandable. Throughout WP descriptions, it is not clear what the abbreviation 'T' stands for, or 'F' in the Gantt Chart. (RI)
- No appropriate schedule for concrete tasks and activities which will be followed in the frame of each work package is provided. The time period foreseen for the building of the microscopy setup and creation of the analysis software is considered insufficient. (RI)
- The coherence among the work packages is not demonstrated with sufficient clarity. In particular, almost all work packages present similar, overlapping duration periods, which undermines the effectiveness and feasibility of the project. (RI)
- According to work package 3, the fieldwork would last almost during the entire duration of the project and would take place in various locations. Consequently, the time reserved for the analysis will not be sufficient to conduct it carefully. It is over-ambitious. (RI)
- Some parts of the work plan lack sufficient justification. (RI)
- The deliverables are vaguely defined and can be only concluded from the work package description. (RI)
- How and whether the work planning and the resources mobilized would ensure that the research and training objectives would be reached is not analyzed in detail. (RI)
- The secondment in the associated country is presented without a convincing explanation of the specific

scientific role of the partner organization, except for networking activities. Its selection and its timing are neither clearly justified in terms of coherence nor scientifically sound: It is not clear whether or why this would help to achieve the desired results. The plan of deliverables related to analysis of variance strategy, feedback to results, and preparation of a draft result to be submitted to several journals is too ambitious and not credible. (RI)

- Some elements of the work plan are not appropriately presented/justified. For instance, WP1 and WP2 have partially overlapping aims, deliverable 4.4 is inconsistently presented (mentioned twice), and the feasibility of deadline for deliverable 3.2 (publication in high impact journal) is not fully demonstrated. (RI)
- It is not sufficiently demonstrated whether the completion of the five proposed objectives and six work packages are achievable within the lifetime of the project. (RI)
- The planning of work package 3 is insufficiently substantiated as it is not based on work by the researcher but on the strong experience of the supervisors in this activity. (RI)
- Adequate description of the quantitative inputs needed for the life cycle assessment is missing which limits the effectiveness of the work plan. (RI)
- The secondments mentioned in the text of the proposal are not properly indicated in the work plan and Gantt Chart. (RI)
- The specifics and details of Personal Career development plan and Project Management Plan (Work Package 1) are not properly specified and is too vague. (RI)
- Three months of secondment may be too short for the corresponding studies to be carried out. (RI)
- Inter-dependencies between training activities and the collection of data are not sufficiently addressed. Concurrently to the pilot surveys, training activities are planned. The proposal foresees a course on survey design. However, at the time of the course the survey would already be conducted, hence, it is not clear how the course would facilitate the implementation of this project. (RI)
- The research proposal is focused on basic and applied science, as mentioned in the proposal, however, IP protection by patenting is not included in deliverables or milestones. (RI)

Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources

- Allocation of tasks in relation to content of project and time (person-months / task) is underestimated. (ST)
- Allocation of tasks and resources is insufficiently described. A proper description of resources and its utilization for the project implementation is not presented. (ST)
- With regard to allocation of the resources, WP4 (the secondment) is planned to run continuously during the 16 months of the project implementation, without giving adequate reasons for this arrangement. In WP5 the time allocated for the industrial upscaling appears to be underestimated. (ST)
- The volume of the work proposed is far too ambitious for the person-months allocated to the work packages.
- The resources necessary for each activity are insufficiently presented. (ST)
- The allocation of person-months to the different tasks is not clearly outlined. (ST)
- The appropriateness of the resource allocation plan is not convincingly demonstrated. Person-month allocation to specific research tasks is not clearly described. (ST)
- The resource allocation (as PM) to the tasks is incomprehensively distributed. For example, the researcher assumed that each work packages requires the same amount of time. There is no point of spending time on full mapping for each polyanion system, unless the material performs well. It is also not clear if the synthesis of materials will be guided by the computer modelling result or vice versa. (ST)
- The described workload in section 3 is overestimated for the resources allocated to specific scientific tasks. (ST)
- WP1 is focussed on the preparation of starting materials - mainly according to literature procedures - and learning the techniques involved. The allocation of a 10 month period of ER's time for such a preliminary task is not justified. (ST)
- It is not clear why WP1 (expanding the substrate scope) and WP2 (development of asymmetric synthesis) are planned sequentially in time, because these activities could be run in parallel as they require continuous recIPRocal feedback and close correspondence, based on the logic presented in the state of the art. (ST)
- The necessary information required to assess the appropriateness of the ressources allocated to work packages (WP) 1 to 3 is lacking. For example, it is mentioned in WP1 that three classes of compounds (each one with 5 different metal ions), will be prepared. However, the natüre and the number of the metallo-ligands is not clearly specified. It is unclear how many compounds (roughly) will be prepared in

this WP, and subsequently characterized in WP2 and WP3. (ST)
- The proposal fails to address allocation of resources for the proposed work plan. (ST)
- Major tasks and the commitments of the host organization to them are not clearly described. (ST)
- The tasks allocation is not appropriate, resulting in a non feasible work overload for the researcher. (ST)
- The project does not include a tentative proposal of time dedication of the different participants such as the host group leader, the second supervisor or other group members collaborators of the project. (ST)
- Discussion on the allocation of tasks and resources lacks detail and specifics. The role of the identified commercial partner and delineation of tasks and activities within the host's extended group are not discussed in sufficient detail. (ST)
- The time dedicated to scientific activities (18 person-months) is too short. (ST)
- The personnel efforts for the researcher and supervisors are not adequately specified. In particular, the time commitment of the supervisor in the project is not clear. The information about the equipment and lab resources is also insufficient. (ST)
- The allocation of tasks is not fully credible with respect to tests and numerical nonlinear analyses. (ST)
- The person-month amounts foreseen for each main task are insufficiently demonstrated. The specific allocation of each task to the researcher and to collaborators (e.g. supervisor, co-supervisor, technicians and other host staff, mentored students) is not clearly stated. (ST)
- Allocation of tasks is not sufficiently elaborated and simultaneous handling of ambitious and resource demanding tasks is not convincingly demonstrated. (ST)
- The costs of materials to be used during the experimental phase of the research are not considered. (ST)
- The amount of resources allocated for the the development of the different new methods that are needed to achieve the research's objectives has inadequately justified. (ST)
- The description of the allocation of tasks and resources is not sufficiently specific and does not sufficiently link to the proposed research activities. There is insufficient clarity about the resources mobilised to ensure that the research and training objectives will be achieved. (ST)
- The amount of person/months is slightly underestimated given the amount of work. (ST)
- The allocated time to develop inter-sectoral links is not realistic, given that the researcher expects to get a publication out of this. (ST)
- Given the breadth of experiments proposed, the proposal is missing a clear delineation of priorities. Tasks are inadequately allocated. (ST)
- This proposal lacks essential technical details on resource allocation. In particular, the researcher does not define the available computational resources. Furthermore, it is not clear how and when the biological material will be obtained. (ST)
- The specific tasks to be undertaken by the various members of the team have not been adequately described.
- The proposal fails to describe the concrete mobilized resources and person month efforts required to achieve the research and training activities. (ST)
- The technical environment provided to the researcher as well as person-months resources allocated are not described in sufficient details. (ST)
- The allocation of sufficient resources is not clearly presented. Taken the size of the project group involving participants from different countries and the task of managing several research sites complicates the management of the project and needs a better justification and a more clear definition of the tasks allocated to the Advisory Board members. (ST)
- The amount of human resources allocated to each task is not presented adequately in the proposal. The ER mentions that several tasks don't require large teams. This reasoning is prone to error; it is not carefully thought through and fails in anticipating all risks during the project's implementation. (GF)
- Resources allocated to project management have not been described with sufficient detail. (GF)
- Even though the allocation of resources are generally appropriate and in line with project objectives, the proposal lacks a sufficiently detailed account of the resources required for the case studies. (GF)
- The number of person-months is inappropriate as the time-span of some of the work packages is underestimated given the complexity and time consumption of the activities proposed (e.g. WP5) (GF)
- The overall allocation of the financial resources between research tasks, training activities and/or dissemination/communication measures is inadequately presented. (GF)
- The recruitment of two patient cohorts in two different countries reduces efficiency, increases costs and potentially weakens the coherence of the study. (GF)
- The appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources is not clarified well enough. For example, the short-term archival research conducted during summer breaks, as stated in the proposal, is unlikely to be sufficient for the achievement of some of the project's goals. The time allocated for visits to the

three Baltic States and for research in Russia and Ukraine appears to be insufficient. This casts doubts on the appropriateness of the time allocation for gathering data. (GF)

- Allocation of tasks and available technical support during the outgoing-phase is not adequately described. (GF)
- The lack of specific person-months allocated to each defined task is a drawback of the proposal. (GF)
- There is inadequate information on the general costs as well as on the specific costs allocated to tasks, which may account for a lack of awareness on the importance of such provisions. (GF)
- Financial resources allocation, responsibilities, and sufficiency are insufficiently discussed. (GF)
- The allocation of tasks and resources is not fully justified because the person month allocation in the return phase is underestimated considering the large number of activities foreseen during the third year. (GF)
- The project is overambitious and in part lacks focus. It is unlikely that all aspects of the work can be completed during the fellowship considering the complexity of the tasks and uncertainties associated with the use of new research tools. Too many risky tasks are planned in WP2 and if experimental methods are not successful from the beginning, the time schedule is be too tight. (GF)
- Bimonthly interaction with the supervisor during the incoming phase is insufficient. (GF)
- The distribution of effort between overlapping tasks (e.g. in WP1) is not clear from the project description. Taking into account that the material from available collections will be the main source of the empirical data, the effort allocated to field work appears too extensive. (GF)
- The proposal fails to justify the allocation of tasks and resources at the appropriate level of detail. (GF)
- The described allocation of tasks and resources is unbalanced, with an entire period of twelve months for writing a scientific paper and the organisation of an international symposium. The proposal refers in general terms to a plan to regularly publish papers and present lectures, but it is not clear exactly what weight these have for the foreseen activities. (GF)
- There is no information about the amount of person-months allocated to each work package. (GF)
- Neither the availability of financial means nor the appropriateness of the planned timeframe is sufficiently demonstrated for the construction of the whole test plant that will have a significant wastewater treatment capacity. (GF)
- The project fails to persuasively explain the resources mobilized for achieving the advocated objectives. (GF)
- The resources mobilized for the achievement of the training and the research results are not sufficiently developed. The ratio between resources (person-months) and envisaged activities to be performed is sometimes not convincingly explained (i.e. time allocated to preparing publications). (GF)
- The amount of person-months devoted to the writing of funding proposal for further research after the fellowship is not completely justified. reviewed; for example, the experimental design is based on currently available information which may change with new data. (GF)
- The timeline and concrete planning details for the researcher's work on xxxx are not sufficiently clear in their incorporation into the overall work plan. (CAR)
- The proposal does not present a clear allocation of tasks and resources towards the attaining the envisaged main outcomes, as the section is not adequately written with sufficient detail. (CAR)
- Time allocation for fieldwork is insufficiently justified in terms of the research to be done and contacts to be established. (CAR)
- Limited overlap in timing between work packages for the allocation of resources may prove challenging. (CAR)
- The time schedule is not supported with explanation of the feasibility of the planned activities within the time frame. (CAR)
- It is not fully clear if xxxx can be conducted within the project time. (CAR)
- The plans for xxxx articles for peer-reviewed academic journals within a short period of time, including a book submission, are not presented in a convincing way to believe that all these activities may be implemented during the fellowship within the limited timeframe. (CAR)
- The estimated time for writing each chapter is too short, without full consideration of possible indicated modifications after the review process, editing, etc. (CAR)
- The proposal does not provide adequate information on the resources mobilised to ensure the achievement of the project's goals. (CAR)
- Dissemination and networking activities are not well-planned around the first research outcome (the publication of the first book). (CAR)
- The fieldwork in xxxx is not presented in sufficient detail although it is important that the proposal includes one additional month to make up for difficulties regarding the research. (CAR)

- The allocation of tasks is not appropriate. For example, the time planned for training of the researcher is not well thought out (24 months), and the WP3 related to non-state actors is not elaborated sufficiently within the context of the project. (CAR)
- The rationale for the allocation of tasks is missing. For example, the polymer composites are planned to be developed with the help of master students, which requires justification. The collaboration with the Indian research institute has not been clearly described. It is not clear whether work package 4 contains a secondment. (CAR)
- The allocation of tasks and resources regarding research, training, and dissemination has not been explained with sufficient detail. How the work planning and the resources mobilised will ensure that research and training objectives are achieved has been not been satisfactorily explained. (CAR)
- The tasks identified correspond to an excessive division of research activities, rather than an overall task; (CAR)
- The rationale for distributing some of the tasks into the different work packages is not clear. For example, Task 3.4 (Establishing an interdisciplinarity network...) is included in WP3, when it is clearly more related to the objectives of WP5. (ST)
- Within the proposed allocation of tasks the balance is not evident for example: between the first four working package 18 months (WP1 Conceptual review, WP2: Data analysis ... WP3. Further data analysis) and the last but more important – 6 months (W4: First draft submission for publication). (ST)
- It is unclear whether the planned allocation of resources is appropriate. For instance, the researcher plans to conduct several randomized studies involving thousands of people in a period of a few months. Also, for the analysis of big data the few months planned do not seem to be sufficient, given the planning of the research in parallel tasks, including all planned training. (ST)
- The proposal does not adequately describe how the work planning and the resources mobilised will ensure that the research and training objectives will be reached. (ST)
- Who will collect samples from the ventilation system and how often has not been well explained in the proposal. The availability of corresponding resources (e.g. of the hygiene department) has not been convincingly demonstrated. (CAR)
- The allocation of person-months to the different activities and WPs is not well justified. For example, it is not clearly explained why WP4 (Database expansion) needs more person-months than WP5 (Drafting working papers). Moreover, details are missing about the identification of the WPs that include empirical (econometric) analysis. (ST)
- The resource allocation to realise the overall aim of this project within the given time-frame is insufficient and inappropriate. (RI)
- The allocation of tasks in the work plan lacks detail; for example it is not clear whether the work is going to be carried out by the researcher directly or by his currently supervised team of PhD and Master degree students. (RI)
- The time allocated to deliverables is not sufficiently convincing. In particular, it is unclear how the scientific objectives can be reached if patient recruitment takes 14 months to complete, ending at month 20 of the fellowship. The time allocated to data analysis, interpretation and dissemination of the outcomes is also not sufficiently convincing. (RI)
- It is not sufficiently clear how the work planning takes into consideration supporting personnel recruitment for the efficient implementation of the proposal. (RI)
- The time allocation for several tasks is not sufficiently justified; for example, the synthesis and, functionalisation of biocompatible /biodegradable microparticles overlaps with training activity for in vivo models and appears underestimated; although the proposed enzymatic bioconjugation approach is established in the literature, time for optimisation of the proposed particulate materials is not adequately considered. (RI)
- The capacity of the applicant to conclude the suggested research on time is overestimated. For example, there are demanding tasks and even with the relevant expertise, they require a wider time frame to be executed than the one presented in the proposal. (RI)
- There is insufficient clarity on the appropriateness of the proposed allocation of tasks and resources, especially with regards to the time allocated to draft the papers. (RI)
- The allocation of human resources to specific work packages is not convincing; in particular for work packages 3 and 5 which rely on the work of a Ph.D. student. (RI)
- The resources for the methodological work are seriously underestimated, given the complexity of the activity proposed. (RI)
- Publication potential is overestimated and timing of submission of first manuscript is unrealistic. (RI)
- Whether the person-months spent for each activity are appropriate and carefully planned is not evident

in the proposal. (RI)
- The proposal insufficiently specifies the time devoted to the part of the project that concerns the intervention itself. (RI)

Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures, including risk management (organisation and management structure, research and/or administrative risks, progress monitoring mechanisms put in place etc.)

- The risk management is presented in a generic way. The real scientific risks are not clearly identified and the contingency plan offers only general alternatives. (ST)
- The management structure is very good, including interdisciplinarity team of experts with complementary skills, and clearly supports the progress and monitoring of the project. (ST)
- Scientific risks are not sufficiently considered as only two potential risks are identified and their contingency plan is quite sketchy. The risks related to, for example, the first steps of the project (synthesis of the building blocks) are not sufficiently considered. (ST)
- Potential risks and mitigation measures are not convincingly discussed, because the discussion lacks details. (ST)
- There are some specific risks (e.g. equipment failure) that are not sufficiently taken into account. (ST)
- There is also a risk that milestone M3.3. will not be reached on time because the period of time allocated to Task T3.3. is not sufficient. (ST)
- Administrative risks and their mitigation plans are not very well described. (ST)
- The risk identification and contingency plan is not sound enough; critical steps such as issues with the microfluidic device fabrication and issues with the handling of the low sample volume are not properly considered. (ST)
- The research risks in WP(s) 2-4 were underestimated given the complexity of the activity proposed. The mitigation actions and potential solutions are not fully convincing. (ST)
- The progress monitoring mechanisms to ensure objectives are reached are not adequately described. (ST)
- The management structure and procedures are not sufficiently detailed to appreciate their appropriateness. (ST)
- Risks related with the large supervisory board are not properly considered. The mitigation measures for identified scientific risks are presented only in a general manner. (ST)
- Technical risk analysis is not adequately elaborated: research risks are not clearly identified and mitigation plans are not suitably considered. (ST)
- Most of the risks identified in the proposal are trivial, some solutions or work-around solutions are proposed but not fully adequate. ***(ST)***
- This is a high-risk project. The lack of catalytic C–E bond forming reaction is a major risk that is underestimated and convincing work-around solutions are not provided. (ST)
- References to the overall schedule are not adequately made. (ST)
- The organization and management structure, as well as the progress-monitoring mechanisms in place, to ensure that the objectives are reached are insufficiently disclosed. (ST)
- The planned times for the four medium risk work packages are quite short if contingency plans have to be initiated to circumnavigate unexpected challenges. (ST)
- The management procedure linked to the personal development of the applicant is poorly described and does not support its effectiveness. (ST)
- Some of the objectives require beam time allocation at large facilities. Despite being listed as main risks, the proposal does not propose a convincing contingency measure in case of restricted access. (ST)
- The risk analysis is superficial; the major project risks have not been adequately considered and contingency planning is limited to screening and changing reaction conditions. (ST)
- The management structure and organisational risks lack the necessary consideration. (ST)
- The proposed contingency plan remains basic and relies mostly on modification of the form and structure of target materials. (ST)
- Details concerning the administrative aspects of the management of the project have not been sufficiently provided. (ST)
- The standard practical arrangements needed for implementing and managing the research project lack deeper insight into much of the specifics of the work planning and the resources mobilised in order to achieve the stated objectives. (ST)

- The number of targets proposed is extensive in relation to time frame. The air-sensitivity of many of the targets limits the volume of work that can likely be achieved. (ST)
- The contingency plans for potential shortcomings have not been critically presented. Meetings with the supervisor are mentioned but details regarding the strategy for shortfalls in the project have not been well explained. (ST)
- All the management decisions are left under the supervisor's responsibility, eliminating the possibility for the researcher to benefit from practicing project management. (ST)
- The resources and the experts who take part during the project are not described sufficiently. (ST)
- Progress monitoring mechanism is not fully convincing due to the low number of meetings planned to occur between the researcher and the supervisor. (ST)
- Progress monitoring mechanisms are inadequately presented. No formal management structure is provided. (ST)
- The scientific monitoring plan of the research work is vague as it is mainly based on the decisions of the experienced researcher without a clear coordinated supervision of the host group leader and his principal collaborator. (ST)
- The risk management plan is only focused on very general risks with ambiguous and not credible solutions. This clearly decreases the credibility of the proposed research plan. (ST)
- The management procedures are too generic, particularly regarding responsibilities, rules for decision-making and assessment. (ST)
- The progress monitoring mechanism is not sound or detailed enough, e.g. is monitoring for implementation insufficiently displayed in the Gantt Chart. (ST)
- The time assigned to some work packages to develop the challenging research actions planned is not sufficiently justified, and accordingly the contingency plan does not consider enough the risks related to delays. (ST)
- The management procedures for decision-making and conflict resolution are vaguely described. (ST)
- Given the ambitions of the project, the identified low risk associated with all aspects of the project is not convincing. (ST)
- The proposed management regime is generally consistent with the nature of the proposed technological research work. (ST)
- Progress monitoring mechanisms are unclearly described, as only regular meetings are mentioned, however the frequency is not clear. (ST)
- The administrative and management WPs are insufficiently detailed with planning of workshops or meetings not appropriately justified. Coordination between host institution management structure / procedures and the researcher's responsibilities as project manager is not made apparent. The monthly project monitoring is not sufficiently justified given the complexity of the planned research and the possibility of risks arising. (ST)
- The project has no detailed risk analysis: the risks are underestimated and no serious contingency plan is provided. (ST)
- The risk contingency plan is too shallow. For instance, theoretical difficulties are dealt with by stating that they would be solved by discussing with experts in this field of research. Moreover, there is no overlapping in time between the work packages, which increases the risk of delays. (ST)
- Contingency plans have focused on only a limited number of possible problems. For these insufficient alternative approaches have been discussed, and other possible problems, e.g. with the reverse genetic screen, have not been addressed. (ST)
- The risks management is not sufficiently described. The use of alternative structural approaches should have been proposed. Considering the tight timing of WP4 (requiring training and experiments) risk minimization should have considered. (ST)
- The researcher offers clear evidence that the work planning has been suitably anchored with relevant figures at the host institution, and in case of need, there will be opportunity for the Research Office to lend additional monitoring support. (ST)
- The management structure has doubtful aspects. A progress monitoring mechanism is not evident. An interaction between the researcher and the supervisor is mentioned, but a sufficient level of detail is not provided. The proposal does not describe how administrative issues, day to day planning and decision making mechanism will be managed. Mentioning a Memorandum of Understanding and Cooperation agreement that will be signed between the hosts Institutes does not add on how the project will be managed on a daily basis, e.g. On how PhD students will be actually supervised and on how progress will be monitored. (GF)

- The proposal provides insufficient information on the actual risks, and no concrete risk analysis has been provided. Specific technical risks have not been identified. The identified risks are rather superficial, being for example associated with possible breakdown of key instruments and limited financial resources. The proposed contingency measures are not sound: for example, the contingency measure that the researcher will apply for several top-up funding is very weak. (GF)
- Despite the clear risk management concerning some specific risks, there is insufficient consideration given to the knock-on effects of failure at any given work package. Since the results of the work-packages are cumulative, any failure at an early stage will engender and propagate risk to subsequent work-packages. Furthermore, insufficient consideration has been given to risks arising from the human, rather than the technical element, such as failure to recruit sufficient children with intellectual disabilities for work package 3 or difficulties in tailoring the software to meet the requirements of the target population. (GF)
- Not all the counter-measures outlined to meet potential risks are shown to be appropriate: Additional analyses, proposed in order to address potential null results between conditions, are not detailed to show how to avoid false positive results. (GF)
- Compatibility issues with teaching duties and their risk for the implementation of the project in the return phase are not clearly addressed. (GF)
- The frequency of progress monitoring through bimonthly meetings is likely to be too low. (GF)
- The appropriateness of bi-annual reporting of project activities to assure adequate monitoring of project progress has not been satisfactorily justified. The relevance of separate supervisory meetings related to milestones in parallel or in addition to the supervisory committee meetings has not been well explained. (GF)
- The progress monitoring is exclusively focused on the two individual supervisors rather than the team. (GF)
- There is not adequate justification for the frequency of the meetings with the supervisors. (GF)
- The risk management plan only partly considers adequate contingency measures and does not describe, e.g., potential risks of the experimental approaches for quantification of cognitive processing. (GF)
- The proposal does not present in detail a strategy to prevent and solve eventual risks during the development of the research. A crucial concern for the success of the proposal is the data collection/interviews in China, but the proposal does not address in due detail a contingency plan for this critical risk. (GF)
- Insufficient information has been provided on host/secondment management-related interactions with the candidate beyond the collective three monthly meetings. (GF)
- A comprehensive risk assessment plan is not fully presented. The project is presented as a low risk proposal, where only ~10% of the molecular data needs to be generated, but risks/contingency plans are not fully developed. Especially administrative risks associated with the project are insufficiently considered and their mitigation strategies are not described in necessary detail. (GF)
- It is not considered how the use of line transects as an alternative to using drones will affect work package timing or the different types of risks involved. (GF)
- The risks associated to the identification of respondents upon arrival in Europe, including attrition, are not analysed with the necessary level of detail. (GF)
- The proposal fails to address a realistic risk assessment including the risk of lost or damaged samples during transportation, as well as a clear identification of management. (GF)
- The proposal provides an insufficient list of potential risks and the risk analysis has not been sufficiently described. The proposal does not offer sufficient contingency plans to be implemented in case any risk occurs. (GF)
- Risk management plans are superficial. It is not clear how the project can progress if during the validation process the newly developed experimental tools fail to deliver the expected results. (GF)
- The research risks that might endanger meeting the key research objectives are not adequately presented. Moreover, the administrative risks that might endanger reaching the key objectives of the project are not adequately addressed in the proposal. (GF)
- Risk management is not adequately addressed. Risks or mitigation measures have not been appropriately identified. Given the dense time schedule, this could give rise to problems. (GF)
- The project management structure is unclear and insufficient for the project with three different host organizations (outgoing, returning and secondment). It is not clearly defined, who is the main supervisor and how the possible conflicts are resolved. The frequency of reporting on the progress of the project is not adequately accounted for. (GF)

- The discussion of research and administrative risks is inadequate. It addresses only a limited number of risks. The risks that it does identify are potentially serious and the details provided about contingency planning are not sufficient, i.e. problems to find the archive documentation, difficulties with life stories. (GF)
- No risks are foreseen that would threaten the achievements of the objectives of the project, therefore no contingency plan is presented.(GF)
- The proposal fails to describe with sufficient detail some of the risks that might endanger the action, particularly regarding the recruitment of candidates in fieldwork. (CAR)
- The proposal inadequately discusses the research and administrative risks that might endanger the project. It identifies a very limited number of risks, and these relate primarily to the xxxx; risks in other areas are insufficiently considered. (CAR)
- The proposal does not adequately explain the possible research or administrative risks that could endanger reaching the project objectives. It does not identify possible risks with sufficient specificity and only a limited number of risk areas are considered (e.g. there is inadequate discussion of risks relating to outputs). (CAR)
- The risks of the empirical research, very uncertain given xxxx in the research country and the xxxx research question, are not sufficiently reflected or taken into considerations in the management procedures. (CAR)
- The project fails to mention adequately possible risks in the publishing activity which might be relevant as the focus of the research agenda is on the policy relevance of the project. (CAR)
- In the presented management structure, the objectives implementation depends mainly on researcher - mentor(s) relationships. The description of quality assurance through a well defined mechanism is insufficient. (ST)
- The management structure and procedures are not fully explained and the management effectiveness is not convincingly presented. (ST)
- Whilst adequate information on the management structure is provided, ways of an effective mechanism for the monitoring of the project are not elaborated in quality of detail. Moreover, specific details of management procedures in regard to the secondment are not sufficiently elaborated. (ST)
- Limited formal financial management arrangement is mentioned in the proposal. Sparse support to organise conferences and workshop is envisaged in the proposal. (ST)
- The project does not describe any specific mechanisms of management, postponing the definition of the management of the project to its starting point. The description is more a listing of persons involved and their roles than a full project management framework. (ST)
- The progress monitoring mechanism does not involve sufficient measures to evaluate progress (only interim and final evaluation is planned). (CAR)
- Risk management is not addressed in a clear and appropriate way. The proposal fails to adequately explain what risks matter and why. It is also unclear why translation from French is a risk for this proposal. It is not clearly explained why problems and risks would only arise during the critical text formulation and not at other times during the project. The proposal does not give confidence that all risks have been correctly identified and contingency plans put in place to deal with them appropriately. (CAR)
- Key risks and related measures are not convincingly shown. Specifically, risks are mainly related to the research. Other explanations on risks associated to the implementation of the project are not adequately considered. Mitigation measures are insufficiently developed. (ST)
- All risks are considered as having a low probability of occurrence. However, this rate is potentially underestimated for data collection as the proposal does not provide sufficient information regarding previous knowledge on databases by the research or staff members at the host institution. (ST)
- Possible risks for the achievement of project objectives and related risk mitigation measures have not been described with sufficient detail. The risk management and contingency plan has not been sufficiently developed. Risks described are mainly focused on operational hurdles and do not sufficiently take into account potential regulatory, organizational, financial or technological constraints. (CAR)
- The risk management plan does not address some of the important risks related to the research (for instance the risks associated with non- response and time constraints faced by the research participants from the business community). A potential outcome of the study, namely a 'negative impact of R&D collaboration on innovation performance' is presented as a risk, which is not convincing from the scientific point of view (for example there is a potentially built-in positive outcome bias). (ST)
- There are insufficient details regarding the venue and funding of the training course mentioned in the contingency plans regarding the main scientific risk identified - the need to master new algorithms. (ST)

- Risk management is not fully addressed. For example: the contingency plan does not allow to estimate the success in case of go/no go decisions and is mainly built on the not-guaranteed success of new projects. Also the researcher does not consider the risk that the experiments may lead to phases which are unexpected according to the considered models; no loop-back's from experiments to modelling is clearly planned. (RI)
- The strategy for monitoring project progress is described in too general terms. The roles of involved personnel are not adequately detailed. The involvement of the supervisor in the monitoring of the researcher's actions is not sufficiently clarified. (RI)
- Project monitoring activities to ensure milestones are not robust enough; for example, meetings with the supervisor are listed only in every six months, which is insufficient to assure successful completion of this rather ambitious project. (RI)
- The risk assessment is very weak, with an underestimated view of the risks associated with the proposal and inappropriate mitigation measures. (RI)
- The researcher does not properly describe alternative risks, which might occur in the course of the project realisation. (RI)
- The management structure and procedures for successful implementation of the proposal and quality management are not sufficiently detailed and the rules for decision-making and management of the fellowship are insufficiently addressed; for example, the role of host in management is not well defined. (RI)
- The risks to the work programme are not specifically highlighted and possible contingencies are not provided. (RI)
- Risks concerning data availability and data reliability are underestimated, and not properly addressed given the research subject and do not sufficiently consider the potential lack of consent of individual participants and their possible discontinuation of participation. (RI)
- There is inadequate description of the scientific input from the supervisor to ensure that the results are scientifically sound. (RI)
- The risk assessment is vague, e.g. the risk associated with a lack of data on the test case is identified, but the mitigation measure is inadequate. (RI)
- The organisation and management structure, as well as the progress-monitoring mechanisms in place, are not described in detail. (RI)
- The research and/or administrative risks that might threaten the achievement of the objectives, and the contingency plans to be put in place should such risks occur, are not successfully elaborated. The only risk foreseen refers to the potential political instability in xxx, and no risks regarding the international online survey (e.g. respondent rate; panel mortality) are discussed. (RI)
- The management strategy is insufficiently developed. The implication of research team members and technical support staff is not specified. The frequency of meetings between the researcher and supervisor and the schedule of regular group meetings aiming to discuss the project progress and future research activities are not clearly stated in the proposal. (RI)
- The risk of working at two institutes is not clearly addressed. (RI)
- A contingency plan is not described in sufficient detail; for example, the project relies on the successful development of novel targeted microparticulate system. Should this development fail, the project is left with the similar system commercially available, already validated for the proposed application. In such scenario, the novelty of the project is very limited. (RI)

Appropriateness of the institutional environment (infrastructure, logistics, facilities for GF role of partner organisations etc.)

- The proposed research would require access to computational facilities, however the specifications of such facilities in terms of RAM/CPUs are insufficiently discussed. (ST)
- There is no specific information addressing the contribution of the host in the training activities of the researcher. (ST)
- The institution-level contribution to training is not presented in a project-specific manner. (ST)
- Commitment of the Hosting Institution and of the Hosting group to provide non-technical training to the Researcher has not been presented in sufficient detail. (ST)
- Plans for the beneficiary's active contribution to the training activities are not provided in sufficient detail. (ST)
- The infrastructural support of the beneficiary and secondments in terms of division of the logistics and coordination tasks are too vaguely described. (ST)

- A plan on how to accommodate the experienced researcher during the research stay has only been adequately provided for one of the host institutions. (GF)
- The role of host institute (incoming phase) has not been clearly explained in the proposal. (GF)
- Insufficient information is provided on the institutional environment: the proposal does not provide sufficient information regarding the needed infrastructure for the proposed actions and on how the host institutions would provide a high quality and appropriate infrastructure to carry out the proposed research. (GF)
- Sufficient information concerning the working conditions and proceedings at the secondary host institutions is not comprehensively made available in the proposal. (GF)
- There are insufficient details on the support for the researcher in establishing themselves in the outgoing country; legal issues such as visa and working permits are not mentioned. (GF)
- The abroad institution does not participate as a partner organisation, and a commitment letter is not included; the facilities abroad are not adequately described, and it is unclear if the proposed activities can instead be carried out at either of the hosts.(GF)
- The appropriateness of the institutional environment and the relevant infrastructures are not presented in sufficient detail. (GF)
- Details on how the institutional environment of the hosts will help promoting new collaborations within and beyond current ones is not described in enough detail. (GF)
- The commitment of the beneficiary and of the partner institutions with regard to providing administrative support is not sufficiently explained. (GF)
- The availability of relevant infrastructure necessary for a successful completion of the project at host and secondement institutions is not satisfactory documented.face. (GF)
- The proposal fails to determine clearly the periods in which the researcher want to spend in the third country, and which in the European host institution. (GF)
- The proposal is not specific enough about the contribution of the two host institutions to the research and training activities of the researcher. (GF)
- In the incoming phase the researcher would resume administrative and teaching obligations and it is not sufficiently explained and justified that this would not negatively impact on the quality of the completion of the project. (GF)
- Although the generally required supporting infrastructural facilities are shown to be available at the host, and the type of xxxx / xxxx addressed by the host group is an important and well-developed part of xxxx, it is not clearly shown that the institutional environment is sufficiently equipped for specific state-of-the-art xxxx (xxxx and xxxx) as well as xxxx research in the context of the proposed project. (CAR)
- No adequate information is given for the appropriateness of the institutional environment. (CAR)
- The description of the active contribution to research and training activities and the main tasks and commitments of the beneficiary and partners lacking lacks required detail. (ST)
- The proposal does not sufficiently address the infrastructure, logistics, and the facilities of the host institution, which are necessary for the successful implementation of the project. (ST)
- The institution's management infrastructure required to host and train post-doctoral researchers is not described with sufficient detail. (RI)
- The host institute has general research infrastructure but there is not sufficient evidence in the proposal of the specific research infrastructure needed for this particular research. (RI)
- İntegration of the researcher into institutional environments is not described sufficiently. (RI)
- There is no adequate description of the computing infrastructure, software packages and tools to be offered to the researcher. (RI)
- The proposal does not clearly address the issues related to the presence of proper infrastructure to be offered to the researcher by the host institution. (RI)
- The specific infrastructure needed for conducting the research is not clearly presented. For example, network science and/or graph theory related software infrastructure, IT facilities to store and manage the data necessary for this research and cloud computing and highperformance computing infrastructure are not sufficiently described. (RI)
- The description of the infrastructure and planned involvement of the beneficiary is insufficient. There is inadequate information on the workplace for the researcher, as well as on help in organising the quite complicated and demanding research. (RI)