



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 (SE Panel)

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



Table of Content

1. Introduction	2
2. General Information on Evaluation Procedures	3
3. Evaluation Criteria for MSCA-IF-2018 Call	4
4. Contact information of Net4Mobility+ Project	5
5. Comments of Evaluators to various proposals submitted to SE Panel	5

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 **Society and Enterprise (SE) Panel** have been taken into account during the preparation of this document. There were more than 200 ESRs available and NCPs had to choose 60 of them by creating a pool with different scores. (For the analysis of ST-CAR-RI-GF Panels 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);

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.

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.

¹ For further information about H2020 MSCA IF calls and SE Panel: <https://ec.europa.eu/research/mariecurieactions/>

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 <i>ex aequo</i>		
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 SE Panel

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, interdisciplinary aspects of the action etc.)

- The objectives of the proposed research are of great value, attaining to strategic developments in telecommunications and cutting-edge technologies of Digital Signal Processors.
- The **methodological approach** is convincing, based on modularity to achieve system scalability.
- The proposed research has a high level of originality
- **Gender aspects** have been correctly discussed.
- The project addresses an original and important area of European regulatory demand for rapid “in silico” analysis of potential genotoxicity.
- The **state of the art** in lithium-based batteries and the unmet research needs in the area are clearly outlined.
- The proposal features some originality, with valid scientific suggestions that offer the opportunity to truly understand the fouling phenomenon as well as provide opportunities to mitigate fouling
- The general objective of the proposal is highly interesting and relevant concerning welfare issues. The theoretical background is clearly demonstrated.
- The proposal very clearly defines the current **state of the art**, the research topic, objectives, and **methodology**. The results are expected to advance the state of the art within the field and have translational potential.
- The **methodological approach** is excellently described and involves a precise technology with a straightforward workflow. The experience of the researcher and collaboration with their network will ensure completion of the project.
- The proposal is of high quality and **interdisciplinary** (cancer, immunotherapy, in vitro techniques, molecular biology).
- The proposal clearly defines the current **state-of-the-art**, the research topic and objectives for the project.
- The originality and good quality of the proposed research lies in the development of a novel diagnostic platform to simultaneously detect four parasites in the field using a microfluidics device.
- The proposal presents a good **multidisciplinary approach**, as it includes activities in the areas of microfluidic technology, parasitology, and molecular biology.
- The proposal’s objective of research is **innovative**.
- The proposal is **multidisciplinary**, bringing together the fields of international relations, sociology, security studies and political science.
- The **state-of-the-art** is well articulated and referenced; goals and objectives are also clearly and convincingly stated.
- The proposal is original, **innovative** and timely. The objectives are well justified and sufficiently addressed.
- The project has the potential to improve the knowledge concerning the development of resistance against antibacterial antibiotics and on the resistome of populations with different environment exposure to antibiotics and different life style.
- The project covers **interdisciplinary** aspects as it combines the fields of bioinformatics, modern molecular microbiology and next generation nucleic acid sequencing techniques with geography, population genetics and studies on human behavioural patterns.
- There is appropriate attention to the **gender aspects** of social entrepreneurship.
- The project is **multidisciplinary** involving specialized branches microbiology including appropriate analytics for oil characterization.
- The **state of the art** is well presented
- The presented **state of the art** gives a solid introduction to the topic of the project. Available cohorts of sufficient quality allow the application to address whether or not Cd has an impact on DNA methylation in circulating blood cells, and whether neonatal exposure to Cd correlates with breast cancer later in life
- The project is unique in having access to the biobank and databases of human samples, especially neonatal blood spots collected.
- The **gender aspect** of the sequenced samples is sufficiently discussed.

- The bioinformatic analysis of the genome-wide sequencing study is well presented
- The research quality of the proposal on gait deficits in Parkinson's disease is high and the research objectives are clearly described.
- The proposed research methodology is appropriate to address the proposed research objectives. The research program has clear interdisciplinary approach. The project is innovative as it will use novel wireless technology to record and analyze local field potentials in real time.
- The proposal has a level of innovation to develop a point of care diagnostic test for HIV/HCV detection.
- The background and state-of-the-art in proton therapy are very well described, highlighting unsolved questions as well as research and clinical needs.
- The aim to use a Zn-based contrast to improve PET verification of proton range is highly innovative and promising, with clinical application
- and the possibility to lower costs of proton therapy.
- The project includes highly interdisciplinary and inter-sectoral collaboration.
- Gender issues are appropriately considered; both male and female phantoms will be used.
- The proposed methodology is appropriate to reach the objectives.
- The project has a good potential for clinical translation within a relatively short period of time.
- The proposal accurately describes the state-of-art in the sector of acoustic wave sensor for ctDNA, as demonstrated by numerous references to the literature
- The objectives of the project are well described; they are of notable novelty and hold value for breast cancer patients.
- The proposal demonstrates good interdisciplinarity as it links social and medical sciences.
- This is a very interesting and high-quality research project in metastatic colorectal cancer. The research proposed is original and the combined targeting of the unfolded protein response (UPR) and endoplasmic reticulum (ER) stress response is an innovative area of research. The scientific objectives are clearly described and appropriately integrated, and the well-designed research approach provides a holistic study including identification of targetable elements and potential prognostic biomarkers. The proposal is multidisciplinary and brings together various experts in the field of ER, clinical/translation research and model systems (organoids and PDX). Several innovative and highly sophisticated methods will be used within the research and training activities.
- The proposal addresses a broad range of relevant contemporary problems, e.g. climate change, migration, activism, marginalised voices, and focuses its discussion in context of the city.
- The proposal intends to work in interdisciplinary ways, including geography, sociology, design, technology, arts, visual and literary studies, by elaborating a critical practice-led perspective
- The project deals with a topic of high societal relevance, namely the interlinkage of migration, social cohesion and food insecurity.
- The proposal has a suitably strong focus on relevant gender aspects.
- Interdisciplinary aspects are sufficiently well addressed
- The proposed research area (pricing innovation) shows good practical relevance to the tourism industry.
- The proposal is focused and credible as it is based on previous studies conducted at the hosting institution with positive results.
- Details for the optimization of the process, have been clearly provided. There is a sufficient technical description without open options.
- The project is innovative in the area of using 3D printing for drug pre-clinical development
- Identifying the interactions between fungi and insects is timely and innovative and may lead to new biocontrol products that would reduce the use of insecticides.
- The proposal is part of a larger on-going project in different agro-ecosystems and will benefit from this while providing complementary new data.
- The work is well organized and the objectives are very clear, and some methodologies have been described in detail.
- The proposal is multidisciplinary, including microbiology, entomology, NGS, bioinformatics and statistics.
- The experimental methodology uses up-to-date technologies for high throughput sequencing.
- The multidisciplinary nature of the research project is convincingly stated
- The research topic proposed is highly relevant, complete and of great interest for computational outcomes, but consequently also for the real future applications.
- The analysis of the state-of-the-art adequately describes current progress and the remaining challenges against the proposal objectives. The objectives are very well formulated. They are specific and relevant to the project goal.
- The proposed idea and approaches are well developed. They are suitable for achieving the proposal objectives.

- The proposed research is **interdisciplinary**, combining knowledge from chemistry, physics, biophysics and computing.
- The project is strongly **innovative**, original and carefully prepared. The research agenda is clear and built up around four major objectives which are convergent. The proposal demonstrates that the action would have well balanced interdisciplinary aspects stemming from medicine to humanities.
- The **research methodology** is described in relevant detail and is well articulated. The use of oral history is appropriate and very valuable for the development of the field of the history of medicine/technology.
- The research topic is expected to become a new field of research in which the researcher would occupy a prominent place
- The **state of the art is up-to**-date and well-detailed comprising of the critical analysis of literature studies.
- The action is original and addresses a relevant research topic for the EU on early indicators of Alzheimer's disease (AD).
- The research is clearly **innovative** in devising original methods and techniques for investigating anosognosia.
- The objectives are clearly formulated and the research methodology is precisely articulated.
- The sample sizes for the studies are well-justified.
- The **gender-specific issues** are addressed adequately and they are in accordance with the project aims.
- The proposal could have a potential relevant impact in pre-clinical studies. The state of the art and the objectives are clear and well written.
- The **innovative and multidisciplinary aspects** are very well described.
- In the proposal, there is convincing evidence of the importance of the field addressed with an interdisciplinary approach.
- The topic considered by the proposal is timely, addressing an area of high practical value.
- The **state-of-the-art** is sufficiently elaborated and presents a comprehensive view on the subject with the objectives of the project well formulated and convincing
- **Gender aspects** are credibly considered by the host institution
- The action focuses on a highly topical area of biofeedback using a novel combination of recently developments in wearable devices and other sources of feedback.
- The **state-of-the-art** and objectives of the research action are clearly depicted and highly relevant. Cutting-edge technologies will be used.
- **Innovative aspects** are well justified, as the research may result in the creation of new resilient rice genotypes.
- The proposal involves **multidisciplinary approaches** covering, e.g., molecular biology, genetics and plant physiology.
- The proposal adequately demonstrates the socio-economic significance of the proposed work and justifies the main objectives of research.
- The approach is strengthened by the fact that the project emerges as a continuation of an existing project developed by the host institution
- This is a very interesting project which aims to develop novel LPS purification methods, provide information on LPS structure-function relationships, and ultimately to pave the way for developing modified LPS as a vaccine component.
- The proposal is very clearly presented with an excellent level of detail as for aims and research approaches.
- The proposal provides a convincing justification for the research project. The overall approach of the action is novel in the sense that it aims to produce a methodologically sound evaluation of a social innovation programme.
- **Gender dimension is considered** both in the entrepreneurship area and the participatory nature of the research and there is adequate consideration of the interdisciplinary aspects.
- The **state of the art** is very well described in detail and gives an overall view of the problem and the need to carry out future investigations is clearly stated.
- The proposal is **innovative**, ambitious and the results will have great potential, for instance in the development of soil health strategy and in sustainable fruit production systems by decreasing the use of chemicals in fruit products for baby food
- **Inter/multidisciplinary** issues involving cross-disciplinary aspects, e.g. soil science, horticulture, phytopathology, entomology, sustainable fruit and food production, human health and environmental protection are proposed.
- The **research methodology** is clear and innovative, including modern molecular and genomic techniques, e.g massive sequencing for determination of genetic diversity of soil fungal communities
- The collection of data for the project will be enhanced through UN-promoted public and industry awareness of 2017 as International Year of Sustainable Tourism for Development
- The proposed research has good practical relevance and adequate policy implications in the field of fuel poverty

- The project addresses an important clinical question.
- The proposed hypothesis is credible as it is supported by strong data produced by the Researcher and other research groups.
- The experimental approach is coherent and realistic with clearly defined aims.
- The objectives of the proposed research are of great value, attaining to strategic developments in telecommunications and cutting-edge technologies of Digital Signal Processors.
- The **methodological approach** is convincing, based on modularity to achieve system scalability.
- The proposed research has a high level of originality.
- **Gender aspects** have been correctly discussed.
- The proposal is highly **interdisciplinary** as it combines engineering, simulations, cell biology and pharmacology.
- Research topic's timeliness and relevance are convincing, the goal is very ambitious and important for the development of the new drug delivery, which is based on vitamin transporter protein.
- Rationale for carrying out further research in the field is reasonably justified.

Quality and appropriateness of the training and of the two way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host

- Given the long academic experience of the researcher and that in the field of quantum computing, the project has the features of a knowledge partnership between the researcher and the industrial host. The researcher's and the host's expertise are complementary, and the **two-way transfer of knowledge** is clearly delineated and credible.
- The researcher will benefit professionally by training in new scientific skills, and especially because he will learn to work in a company's R&D laboratory
- The project includes a relevant secondment. The researcher will develop skills in QSAR and related statistical approaches, complementing in a general way their prior experience.
- The researcher brings specific skills in organic and medicinal chemistry which will be useful for the applicant.
- Attendance of several courses on transferable skills would strengthen the researcher's previous professional experience.
- The host institution would benefit from the researcher experience in human non-verbal communication and comparative psychology.
- There would be **knowledge transfer** about dolphin behavior through training at the host institution, which has settled collaborations with scientists of different institutions.
- The experience of the project will benefit the researcher to broaden the field of expertise and gain further soft skills in managing research projects
- The potential for new collaborations to be established for the host institution, are clearly outlined.
- An effective two way ToK is convincingly described between the host and the researcher
- High quality of scientific and complementary **training** is provided by the host consistent with the researcher's background and expertise.
- Potential for **two-way transfer of knowledge** is adequately described. The mix of knowledge transfer from the host institution to the researcher and from researcher to the host institution will foster the development of this microfluidics device for the detection of parasites in Europe.
- The researcher has a high profile as a think tank director who can bring significant knowledge of the region to the host institution. The researcher has significant networks and experience and a track record of research method implementation.
- A **two-way researcher-host institution transfer of knowledge/training** is clear through the researcher's involvement in networking activities, organization of scientific events, and participation in Seminars at the host institution.
- **Training** for learning CRISPR/Cas9, significant for the proposal success, is conveniently organized in the secondment institution
- The main host valuable knowledge (e.g. transcriptomics, bioinformatics, plant pathology, plant molecular biology) will be transferred to the researcher.
- The researcher expertise will benefit from attending seminars or courses offered by the institution and by a nearby well-recognized University.
- The **transfer of knowledge** from the host organization to the researcher is clearly described, for example, they will receive training in methods of specialised RNA/protein biochemistry, cell line development and receive training in multiple business skills relating to entrepreneurship, marketing, project and financial management.
- The transfer of knowledge from the researcher to the host is adequate. For example, the researcher has previous experience in collecting and processing samples from human populations in remote regions and on

several antibiotic phenotypic resistant methodologies and will transfer this knowledge to the host.

- The researcher will benefit from involvement with the social enterprise school and the networking of social enterprises already embedded in the host's activities.
- The host institution proposes a clear and ambitious **training plan** for the researcher including lessons, seminars, workshops referring to turning R&D idea into products
- There is a complementary and good confluence of expertise and competences that match to the proposal goals.
- The **transfer of knowledge** in both directions is properly explained.
- Through the collaborative team at the host institute the applicant will have the opportunity to gain valuable **additional training/knowledge** in genetic epidemiology and genomic and epigenomic biostatistics.
- The proposed **training plan** gives the applicant an opportunity to get a set of transferable skills, i.e. project management, preparation of grants application, mentoring students.
- The host will benefit from bringing new knowledge in general public health research, epidemiology and epigenomic analyses and researcher's expertise and collaborations in the field of developmental origin of cancer through prenatal environmental exposures
- The **two-way transfer of knowledge** between the researcher and the host institution is convincingly described. The researcher will transfer the previously acquired knowledge and skills in the development of computational tools to recording a modeling gait and brain states to the host group.
- The researcher will be exposed to the clinical aspects of translational neuroscience
- There is clear synergy in the skill sets being brought by each partner.
- The researcher will not only have exposure to the technological aspects, but will have access to the process of bringing a diagnostic to market and the business development aspects. Given the stated career goals of the researcher this will be a good environment for the researcher
- The inter-sectoral nature of the project has the potential to open up career possibilities for the researcher.
- The researcher describes credible and detailed **training aims** at the two host organizations. The training is valuable and diverse including measurable hands-on training and transferrable skills, combining product development, commercialization, leadership, management and communication, which will promote the researcher's career.
- The contribution to the host is well specified, as the researcher will be able to **transfer new knowledge** on acoustic wave sensors, microsystems, microfabrication and biosensors experiments to the host institution
- Specific courses have been identified to help train the researcher on particular aspects of transferrable skills
- The **two-way transfer of knowledge** between the researcher and the host institution is appropriate and the exchange of ideas, skills and technological experiences are useful for both participants
- The researcher will gain novel knowledge in microfluidic diagnostic technologies, product development and entrepreneurship.
- The researcher will bring expertise and novel knowledge to the host institution in various aspects of nucleic acid chemistry and extraction technologies such as technologies of nucleic acid detection and identification, amongst others
- The **training objectives** of the proposal are justified and clearly explained in the proposal, and will provide the researcher with ample experience in various technologies with opportunities to translate in vitro study results to in vivo models. The researcher will get additional high quality training during the two planned secondments. In addition, numerous possibilities of training in soft skills that will enhance the researcher's career development are included in the proposal. Previous collaborations of the researcher will be extended to the host institution.
- The project would provide the researcher with increased knowledge in general horizontal areas (e.g. scientific publication, scientific editing, and remote learning).
- **Transfer of knowledge** will be achieved by direct communication and participation in regularly organized meetings and seminars
- The experienced researcher will **transfer the knowledge** into the host institution towards the technical staff.
- The experienced researcher will be trained in formulation development, fabrication procedures and characterization techniques.
- Several **other training** activities are planned including leadership, innovation and entrepreneurship, scientific networking and career development.
- **Training** during the fellowship will allow the experienced researcher to complete their transition from academia to industry
- The researcher will be trained in NGS, bioinformatics and multivariate statistical analyses and complementary skills, such as project management and communication skills.
- The researcher will **transfer knowledge** to both the host and secondment institutions on arthropods and their interactions with entomopathogenic fungi

- The researcher will be trained by renowned experts from various disciplinary areas
- New important skills in emerging technologies will likely be developed by the researcher within the sector of industrial water quality management and water epidemiology
- The two-way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host institution is reasonable, with adequately interconnected knowledge-sharing strategy objectives.
- Career's development possibilities and collaboration opportunities are convincingly argued in the proposal.
- The amount of knowledge, that the researcher will acquire from the Host by training-through-research is considerable and very well structured and described
- The two-way transfer is clearly described and is appropriate
- Training and knowledge transfer from the host organization are coherent with the aims stated in the project and they are based mainly on training through research and two university courses
- Concrete actions to transfer knowledge from the researcher to the host institution are presented and are well thought through
- The two-way transfer of knowledge between the host and the researcher is clearly demonstrated. The host institution will provide the researcher with development of entrepreneurship skills and develop/improve their technical skills in designing microfluidic systems. The researcher will provide the host with expertise in tissue culture, networking opportunities with academic collaborators and experience in academic laboratory settings
- The training offered to the researcher is professionally prepared and it offers increased competence in research and transferrable skills, covering efficiently also aspects related to the industrial development of research products.
- Several training activities are planned, related to technical and also entrepreneurial skills. Training of the researcher on micro-device fabrication as well as the enhancement of suitable analytical skills are appropriately proposed via specific courses.
- Complementary management trainings for managing start-ups and projects are well chosen by the host institution. Hence, it is anticipated that the researcher reaches credible industrial experience large portfolio of trainings in scientific and translational skills is provided by the host.
- A useful element of the training is a secondment.
- It is convincingly depicted that the researcher will gain new knowledge during the project at the hosting organisations in terms of gene editing, digital phenotyping and biostatistics.
- The researcher will acquire experience in translational aspects of vaccine research in a biotech company that is novel for the researcher.
- The proposal demonstrates a high quality experience of the host in project management
- The researcher will gain strong research skills by a training-through-research approach, and will work with a group of colleagues well experienced in the proposal's field of study.
- In addition to laboratory based training, the researcher will receive training in transferable skills such as grant writing and project management.
- Taking into account the sound expertise of the researcher, there is a very good potential that an effective flow of knowledge occurs
- The researcher is an experienced educator, with a unique inter-cultural exposure. The two way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host is clearly presented in two tables that summarize the transfer of skills and competences that would open perspectives on research methodology for the host institution.
- Sufficient information is provided on transfer of knowledge and skills from the host organisation to the researcher
- The researcher has competencies in data analysis and GIS that would be valuable for the host.
- The training in soft skills encompasses transfer of useful knowledge in entrepreneurship and commercialization
- The two way transfer of knowledge is ensured by the researcher's background and the experience of both host institutions on the subjects addressed within the proposal.
- New data will be generated with the researcher's work.
- The training objectives are clearly evident and well presented for expanding knowledge on sustainable management practices (soil quality and microbial processes) and improvement in communication, dissemination and networking skills.
- The researcher will gain knowledge of the enterprise and entrepreneurial skills, such as commercial awareness, creative and innovative thinking and negotiation and persuasiveness skills that are not scientific.
- The applicant will receive a very good training in a number of new experimental techniques. The host labs offer a very good environment promoting integration and professional development of the researcher. The two-way transfer of knowledge is of good quality since the ER will transfer their acquired expertise to the host institution and will be embedded in a high expertise environment.
- Given the long academic experience of the researcher and that in the field of quantum computing, the project

has the features of a knowledge partnership between the researcher and the industrial host.

- The researcher will benefit professionally by training in new scientific skills, and especially because he will learn to work in a company's R&D laboratory
- The researcher will acquire relevant technical and transferable skills and competences, which will contribute towards their further professional development
- The expertise of the researcher in colorectal cell culture and animal studies is highly relevant for the proposed project and will suitably complement the knowledge and approaches available at the host.
- The researcher plans to leverage existing contacts to help with experimental challenges; this is a clever strategic add-on.
- The researcher gains industry experience and experience in interdisciplinary techniques.
- The two month preliminary training is likely to enhance the integration by familiarizing the researcher with the company environment and practices.
- The researcher would gain relevant knowledge and skills from both the host organisation and the secondment organisation, including insights into business development and generally the private sector.
- The researcher will acquire relevant technical and transferable skills and competences, which will contribute towards their further professional development
- The researcher gains industry experience and experience in interdisciplinary techniques.
- The two month preliminary training is likely to enhance the integration by familiarizing the researcher with the company environment and practices.
- The researcher would gain relevant knowledge and skills from both the host organisation and the secondment organisation, including insights into business development and generally the private sector.

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

- The main supervisor is a top-level scientific manager at the host and has a very good profile for guiding the research. The profiles of the other supervisors are very good.
- The hosting environment is ideal to guarantee the integration of the researcher and support to the project.
- The host site consists of a small team ensuring good day to day contact with other team members.
- The supervisor clearly has a background in private sector QSAR modelling and will provide the researcher with some knowledge of the academia-industry transition.
- The supervisor has a scientific background relevant to the current proposal, with extensive project leadership and mentoring experience
- The nature and quality of the research environment as a whole is high, with many staff members offering different and complementary skills relevant to battery technology.
- The supervisor matches with the topic of the research, being an expert in dolphin behaviour engaged in several projects.
- The hosting arrangements are clearly described in the proposal and the integration of the researcher in the team and host institution is good.
- The supervisor has extensive and proven experience on the research topic, as evidenced by publication record, clinical research studies, EU research projects, a relevant SME, and also has proven record of mentoring.
- Measures to integrate the researcher to the host institution are adequately described
- The hosting institute is well-respected in the microfluidics field, scientifically of very good quality and offers a good lab environment for the researcher.
- The scientist in charge has extensive experience in entrepreneurship, as evidenced by established companies, relevant track record of publications, EU-ITN projects and shows a good record of mentoring.
- There are clear descriptions about the integration of the researcher to the host institute and research team which is of very good quality.
- The Host is very experienced in mentoring researchers and the host company regularly hosts postdoctoral researchers.
- The host company has established links into academia and commercial biotech clients.
- The applicant will be well integrated into a small team of research scientists and will develop networks within the broader local campus context and beyond
- The supervisor has good experience and an adequate scientific track record in genomics in the area of microbiology,
- The researcher will be provided with the necessary lab space and equipment and integrated into the team of the supervisor, hosting arrangements are in place.

- The researcher's **integration into the host team** and the related organisations is well established and discussed. The host organisation offers involvement in international fora and community projects and a wide network of peers and associates.
- The quality of the **supervision** and the competences of the supervisor are high and match the project needs. The supervisors are highly experienced in supervising PhD students, in international collaborations, and they have a good publication record including a high number of citations.
- The supervisor is an experienced scientist, who contributes with important advances to the field of epidemiology and public health. The professional experience of the supervisor is described. The supervisor is experienced in gaining/managing international project, supervising/mentoring students.
- A **collaborative team** of senior colleagues with different (i.e., cancer epidemiology, health inequalities and life course epidemiology, and genomic and epigenomic biostatistics) yet complementary expertise that can support the proposed project.
- The **integration of the applicant** with host laboratory is well presented. The applicant is already involved in other projects running within the research division
- The **supervisor's level of experience** is relevant to the research project. The host scientist's experience in the field is very good based on several previous publications in the field. The host institute is directed by a world-leading expert in Parkinson's disease and deep brain stimulation.
- There are very good measures in the project described for the **integration of the researcher** within the host institution.
- The company provides a suitable **environment** for the proposed project, as both supervisors are experienced in commercialization of products and managing international projects. The researcher will be in an environment where all the skill sets are available to support their personal development in the technical aspects
- Both host **supervisors** have a strong track record of achievements in complementary (industry and academic) fields, and a proven record of large-scale international collaborations and publications. The academic supervisor has a strong track record of supervision of experienced researchers.
- The measures for **integration** of the researcher **into the host institutions** are excellent, including a well organized plan for supervision; the researcher will be given full access to the R&D department and needed infrastructure.
- The **supervisor** has mentored postdoctoral fellows and doctoral students before
- The researcher will be well **integrated** within the host institution. The applicant already worked within the **host institution**. This fact will greatly accelerate the fellow's integration.
- Administrative aspects of the hosting are well covered, and the persons who will assist in the **integration** are clearly identified
- The **hosting arrangements** are carefully prepared. Detailed **integration** of the researcher within the team/institution is provided
- The **supervisors** from the host institution and partner institutions are well recognised scientists carrying unique expertise in different but complementary fields fully relevant for the proposed project topic, although their experience in the immunology aspects of the project (R02) is not well documented in the proposal. All supervisors have an excellent track record of publications and grant funding, and their experience in supervising and mentoring experienced scientists is very good.
- The **host institution** offers several fields of knowledge and competences which are of relevance to training on research topics addressed as well as networking opportunities through EU-projects.
- The researcher will be **integrated** as a member of the **host institution's** current activities, including participation in monthly team meetings, and joint publications of the output.
- The supervisors are experienced professionals / researchers in a related field. The host has adequate experience in training / mentoring the researchers.
- An independent mentor, from a department different from experienced researcher's allocation will contribute to soft skill development, enhance networking opportunities and provide impartial career guidance of the applicant.
- During the fellowship the experienced researcher will participate into an institutionally established talent management system and employee supervisor dialogue courses
- The **supervisors** have appropriate skills, scientific expertise and supervision experience. The Researcher already has research links to the hosts.
- The **supervisor's** track record and mentoring experience are outstanding. Their professional background proves the competences that very well address the project requirements and may convincingly provide good ground for the candidate professional improvement
- The **supervisor** and its collaborators have a very good track record of publications and scientific responsibilities. The team of researcher's consultants is very strong.
- The **hosting arrangements** at the host institution are very well identified. The researcher will be integrated in a

scientific center specifically dedicated to the studies at the intersection of neuroscience and human sciences. The hosting institution is very active in its field of expertise and will provide the researcher with good networking opportunities

- The **supervising scientist** is widely recognized in the field of neuroscience, with high-level expertise and impact in terms of high-level publications, and strong international cooperation experience. The supervisor also has strong competencies in supervising Ph.D. students and postdocs.
- The nature and the quality of the research environment clearly support the achievement of the aims of the project as well as the professional development of the researcher
- The teaching experience of the **supervisors** is sufficiently explained.
- The measures to **supervise** and **integrate** the researcher in the **host institution** are satisfactorily described. The supervisors have extensive experience in European actions.
- The **supervisor's** expertise in providing the type of training planned is adequately demonstrated by their track record. Other members of the host group possess additional skills confirming the good quality of the hosting environment as a whole. Moreover, the group shows to have planned an adequate strategy to carry out the researcher's integration successfully.
- The host has also a certain number of international collaborations which will benefit the researcher's activities during the fellowship
- **The host institution** demonstrates extensive experience in research activities and industrial projects
- **Measures to integrate the researcher** in the research team are well planned and include regular meetings, brainstorming sessions, events, project proposal drafting, team building activities, scientific conferences, etc; all are well-integrated in the activities of the host institution.
- All three **supervisors** have significant expertise relevant to the action and in working with each other. The beneficiary is a place with a tradition to host researchers and will provide support of the fellow in administrative and scientific manners.
- The supervisor is an experienced academic scientist with an established track record of postgraduate supervision.
- The quality of the **supervision team** is of high standard. The researcher would benefit from the experience of the host supervisor, who has several years experience in the youth, community and social services sector, and the secondment supervisor, who is an experienced professor in education who has obtained a significant number of research grants. The proposal describes adequately the team and the integration of the researcher in the host institution, and the support from the secondment organisation. The researcher has been recently based in the offices of the host, thereby facilitating smooth integration into the team.
- The host organisation and the secondment host are of good quality and would provide a supportive research environment for the research with the **supervisors** and other officers contributing through an advisory panel
- The nature and quality of the research group and research **environment at the host institution** is well addressed, including the international networking opportunities the host could offer and the outstanding expertise in the management of major European grants.
- **The supervisor** has a strong record in mentoring young scientists in entrepreneurship. The candidate will be exposed to good quality expertise in business administration.
- The quality of the supervision is high considering supervisors' track record and the width of areas that they cover.
- The establishment of an interdisciplinary **supervisory panel** is proposed to adequately respond to the supervision needs linked to the complexity of the proposed research.
- The plan for the **integration** of the researcher at the host institution is adequately described.
- The **Supervisor** is an experienced, worldwide recognized scientist in the research field of the proposal, with an excellent record of publications and mentoring.
- The **main supervisor** is a top-level scientific manager at the host and has a very good profile for guiding the research. The profiles of the other supervisors are very good.
- The **hosting environment** is ideal to guarantee the integration of the researcher and support to the project.
- The **supervisor** has extensive experience in the field of QSAR and participates actively in other relevant European projects.
- The qualifications and experiences of the **supervisors** match the proposed research actions and are well demonstrated in the proposal.
- Two **supervisors** with very good industrial experience in the energy sector are involved.
- The **supervisor** has extensive experience in the field of QSAR and participates actively in other relevant European projects.
- Two supervisors with very good industrial experience in the energy sector are involved.

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

- The researcher possesses a good track record related to the project objectives. On this basis, the fellowship will enable the researcher to achieve full **technical maturity** in the field of industrial semiconductor design and a position of professional independence.
- The host has outlined a high quality training programme for the applicant and is committed to ensuring the necessary training and guidance towards **career progression**.
- The project training will support the transition of the candidate from research in academia to the private sector.
- The researcher has an extensive CV with experience in teaching, supervision, project design and management, and an appropriate publication record in good quality journals for their **career stage**.
- They show a good level of **professional maturity**, and appear to be in a position to move to a position of professional independence.
- The researcher has an active history of industrial and academic activity in thin film analysis and techniques, with several publications in this field. This relevant experience will be reinforced during the proposal.
- The researcher is a medical oncologist who will receive technical and management skills during this fellowship.
- The researcher's track record shows breadth and depth of experience, relative independence and leadership skills as evidenced by, professional experience, high mobility, supervising experience, high impact first name publications, oral presentations in international conferences, funded projects awarded, and awards received. This indicates a **strong potential** for the researcher to achieve scientific independence after successful completion of the project.
- The researcher's past experience in parasitology and molecular techniques will significantly contribute to the microfluidics knowledge and the lab-on-chip device that will be generated during the project.
- The researcher has very good scientific leadership skills, as demonstrated by obtaining an award, receiving funding, making oral presentations, and establishing collaborations.
- The researcher's track record, supervising experience, teaching experience, publications, awards, and funding received are of very good quality.
- The researcher's track record in relation to the number of years of research experience is very good.
- The **Researcher's CV** shows a heightened ability to plan a professional career and international mobility.
- The Researcher has worked in high reputation institutions and shown very good productivity, including several substantial first author articles.
- The choice of Host for this action represents a good opportunity for the **Researcher** to add competence in applied biotechnology and business development to their skill set and to embark on a career in research within the biotech industry.
- A **career development plan** will be devised in collaboration with the supervisor.
- The **research experience** and qualification level of the supervisor is very good, particularly in terms of attracting external funds and participating in research projects. The nature and the quality of the host research group are good.
- The publication track record of the researcher, in relation to their level of experience, is good. The capacity of the researcher to reach a position of professional maturity and independence in research is convincing.
- The **researcher** has shown mobility and has extensive knowledge on epidemiological studies, involving the collection of samples and DNA processing, along with several antibiotic phenotypic resistant methodologies, has presented their research findings at international meetings and has a publication record with several articles in national and international journals which is very good for their present stage of career.
- The **researcher** has experience in teaching and supervising undergraduate students. Therefore, the project has the potential to re-enforce the professional career of the researcher in the home country.
- The **researcher** holds a number of awards, and has shown long-standing persistence in addressing complex biofuel problems to their successful solution while cooperating with fuel industry.
- The proposed study will re-enforce the upward trajectory of candidate, as substantiated by **their CV**, and will substantially enhance their maturation as an independent researcher.
- The **researcher's** publication track record indicates a solid academic maturity, when considering the level of experience. The proposed research will clearly re-enforced to the researcher's professional development towards a position of professional maturity.
- The **researcher** has already demonstrated the **capacity** to work independently and to initiate collaborations. The research and the interaction with the host teams will re-enforce the researcher's professional maturity and independence.

- The researcher has a solid track record in medical physics and computer science, which are complementary to the expertise of the host research groups, and the transfer of knowledge from researcher to host institutions is highly valuable.
- Given the professional experience of the researcher, with expertise in medical imaging and proton therapy, and their plans for further development in specific areas as well as the international networking opportunities, the proposal demonstrates a credible plan towards achieving professional maturity and independence
- The applicant has shown good leadership skills and networking abilities in previous (non-research) areas of endeavor
- The researcher's career is very clearly presented in the proposal. The researcher has expertise relevant for the project and a good publication record. The researcher shows clear leadership abilities and independent thinking skills as shown by supervision and teaching activities and establishment of collaborations. The researcher also shows interest in innovation and commercialization of research. The researcher has been awarded several grants demonstrating high scientific ambitions and great capacity to reach research independence and maturity.
- The researcher shows strong interest in interdisciplinary work and has training in relevant disciplines as well as experience in different fields of professional practice relevant to the proposal.
- The researcher has already begun to reach out internationally via visiting fellowships, conference papers, and adequate publications.
- The proposal reflects a spirit of strong entrepreneurship to enhance professional opportunities beyond academia. A fellowship at the host institution appears well suited to advance these career perspectives
- The researcher has a suitable track record in research using statistical techniques
- The experienced researcher has demonstrated a certain maturity showed by the experience earned after the PhD and the current project provides a significant widening of the horizon of research experience acquired during the applicant's graduate studies
- The researcher's records from the last few years are of very high quality with articles in excellent journals and a contribution in a book with several chapters. These match the scope of the proposal and the researcher is first author in many of them. Some of the articles, published so far are in collaboration with the supervisor. The researcher's profile is additionally strengthened by several awards and grants, thus demonstrating scientific independence.
- The researcher has collaborated previously with different research groups across Europe, developing a research network and developing potential for communicating with researchers from different disciplines.
- The researcher will gain important expertise and new skills to an already well-formed base, so re-enforcing and completing their position as an independent researcher
- The researcher is able to situate his/her research career into the wider context and to assess the impact of the MSCA on his/her future career. The proposal clearly demonstrates that the past activities of the researcher in different European institutions are very well suited to contribute effectively to his/her professional development. It is clearly explained how will the project contribute to the improvement of researcher's position.
- The researcher's track of publication and achievements is outstanding and clearly above the average given his/her level of experience.
- The proposed research project is coherent with the researcher's previous work.
- The proposal demonstrates the researcher's high level of expertise in the field of virtual reality and cognitive processing via past personal experience in managing research projects, a list of high-level scientific publications, and skills in disseminating academic knowledge
- The capacity of the researcher to reach professional independence is clearly demonstrated. The researcher has a good publication record and experience in cancer research with many collaborative articles and several presentations and contributions to scientific meetings. The additional skills provided by the host in entrepreneurship and converting ideas into products using new technologies will help the researcher to re-enforce their maturity
- The researcher's previous experience especially in mentoring young researchers and independent thinking abilities confirm the capacity of the researcher to reach an independent position
- The scientific output of the researcher is appropriate for their level of experience.
- The additional experience of working in an industrial environment will contribute to the maturity of the candidate
- The researcher has already gained relevant professional independence and good scientific maturity during previous post-doc experiences
- The researcher has demonstrated the qualities of a mature scientist and the proposed project will strengthen their position as an independent vaccinologist
- The proposal adequately demonstrates the capacity of the researcher to adapt fast to international

environments, to work in different communities, and to develop into an independent researcher. The researcher's track record in terms of publications is good in relation to the level of experience and their future career would certainly be enhanced by the fellowship

- It has been adequately demonstrated how the proposed research will contribute to the professional development of the researcher and how it would foster the capacity towards professional maturity.
- The researcher sufficiently demonstrates interdisciplinary pathways, as well as sound professional experience beyond academia.
- During the work on their dissertation, the researcher gained experience of social networks quantitative survey that is important for the execution of the proposed project.
- A clear overview is provided of the researcher's career development strategy.
- Previous experience in the thematic area of the proposed research project evidenced by the publications in international peer reviewed journals and the participation at both national and international conferences demonstrate the capacity of the researcher to reach the position of professional maturity
- The researcher's past personal experience that could contribute to the professional development as an independent researcher during the fellowship is well described and comes from e.g. publishing the scientific papers in high-impact factor journals, as well as outreach scientific articles, and conference proceedings, organizing complex field and greenhouse experiments.
- The researcher's research potential is very well demonstrated in terms of a capacity to manage research projects, vast expertise in soil microbiology, molecular, programming and bioinformatic skills.
- The Researcher is experienced and has already provided evidence of high-quality research productivity, with excellent contributions to the literature, student mentoring and grant writing
- The researcher possesses a good track record related to the project objectives. On this basis, the fellowship will enable the researcher to achieve full technical maturity in the field of industrial semiconductor design and a position of professional independence.
- The host has outlined a high quality training programme for the applicant and is committed to ensuring the necessary training and guidance towards career progression
- The researcher's interest and commitment to research is convincingly demonstrated by a diverse research experience in different institutions, also abroad.
- The researcher has high potential to further improve professional maturity and independence during this project. This is supported by the already very good previous achievements in teaching and mentoring, collaborations and research communications.
- The researcher's scientific and methodological background is appropriate and the new skills and knowledge to be gained boost the prospects of reaching professional maturity during the proposed fellowship.
- The researcher's track record is appropriate in relation to the level of experience and indicates successful completion of the previous projects.
- The proposed career and skill development strategy is appropriate, and will provide the opportunity for the researcher to acquire new skills.
- The researcher's past professional experience, which includes research management in the private as well as the scientific sector, is relevant and is appropriate for the research proposed.
- The researcher has shown potential in exploiting research by their experience in filing patents.
- The researcher's interest and commitment to research is convincingly demonstrated by a diverse research experience in different institutions, also abroad.
- The researcher has high potential to further improve professional maturity and independence during this project. This is supported by the already very good previous achievements in teaching and mentoring, collaborations and research communications.

Weaknesses:

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

- The state-of-the-art is not sufficiently discussed, in particular as concerns the contribution provided by other researchers in the area of quantum algorithms and circuits for scientific computing
- The research design and methods are not adequately presented in the proposal. Scant evidence of how the research would be organised and how the collected data would be analysed is included. Furthermore, the proposal is unclear throughout about how and why these methods have been chosen.

- The **multidisciplinary** aspects are not adequately addressed in the proposal; a clear description is lacking.
- While the background to QSAR modelling is well described, the project in general is poorly defined and despite an extensive description of the context, provides insufficient information concerning the proposed work. This severely impact the credibility of the proposal.
- The originality **and innovative aspects** of the project are not sufficiently demonstrated.
- Nanomaterials are mentioned but not discussed in sufficient detail, notably what type or category of nanomaterial that will be considered, nor the link made to expertise of either the applicant or the researcher
- The definition of the objectives lacks sufficient clarity and does not provide suitable measurable indicators, such as the size and load of the target prototypes.
- The **research methodology** is not outlined in sufficient detail. A large number of variations are suggested both with respect to separator material types, their modification and alterations in the ratio of Li+/Na+,K+ precursors. Insufficient information is provided to describe the systematic nature by which these alterations will be made. The concept of liquid solution cathodes is inadequately explained.
- The reasoning of why the **interdisciplinary nature** of the proposal is essential to provide excellence is unclear and insufficiently substantiated
- Experimental procedures are not sufficiently justified: e.g., it is not demonstrated that trainers free to chose their non-verbal behaviour will provide more insight than trainers forced to comply with a restricted set of movements planned by the researcher. In addition, there are not sufficient details concerning data recording and analyzing of focal animals, number of trainers, etc. Basic assumptions to quantify observations and objective scientific testing for impact of a behavior on another behaviour lack explanation.
- The key scientific questions are not fully explained and the specific objectives are quite descriptive and lack detail.
- Statements of **interdisciplinarity and novelty** are not fully justified.
- The **methodological approach** has not been comprehensively described, especially about the samples that will be used to validate the prototype kit and the generation of a multiplex qPCR. In addition, lysis of oocysts, which is a fastidious process on a chip, is not sufficiently described. These problems may be underestimated and compromise the credibility of the project.
- The discussion of the **state of the art** is not strong and this has a bearing on the conceptual framework. It is claimed that the academic community is behind on the concept of local ownership's relation to violent extremism, but a lot of resilience literature on counterterrorism addresses this. It is also asserted that policy researchers are 'ahead of academia' - an assertion that is not argued, demonstrated, nor illustrated.
- The **methodological framework for** measuring factors of resilience is insufficiently explained and the methodological choice of the three case studies and of the three regions to conduct the survey is insufficiently detailed
- The proposal is based on the hypothesis that modifying the structure of plant cell wall pectins will increase resistance to fungus diseases, but lacks information of the resistant rice varieties and there is no discussion about the possibility of fungal pathogens adaptation to overcome this resistance.
- How the level of pectin modification will be studied in T1 plants is not convincingly and sufficiently discussed.
- The **interdisciplinary aspects** are limited: most activities deal with very close scientific areas (e.g. transcriptomics, bioinformatics, CRIPR/Cas9).
- The project is focused on molecular biology in a biotechnological context; thus, it is neither inter- nor multi-disciplinary
- Too many rough shortcomings in the explanations of this research rationale are present, decreasing the credibility of the research program.
- The **state of the art** and current know-how for organ-on-chip, are insufficiently presented.
- The **state-of-the-art** is poorly presented, failing to globally cover the topic of water purification with graphene-based materials. The innovative aspects of the research program are insufficiently discussed.
- Some of the **methods** used are not well defined. For example, the description of the populations used in the study is incomplete in respect to age and gender match and the number of samples to be analysed is not clearly defined. Therefore the significance of the results is not sufficiently demonstrated.
- The research objectives are not adequately aligned with the proposed specific work.
- The discussion of the **state of the art** pays insufficient attention to the large body of recent research on social enterprise, with for instance two dedicated journals, numerous long-standing EU-funded research programmes, and significant presence in annual conferences on social innovation and the third sector.
- The discussion of the **methodology** is much too brief and lacking detail; for instance on the justification for the choice of research sites; analysis of the qualitative data; and how the work and performance of the social enterprises will be examined.
- There is insufficient attention to the **interdisciplinary features**, especially in terms of locating social enterprise

research within the different disciplines within management and organisation studies

- The idea concept of the proposal is not sufficiently **innovative, since** the diatoms were considered a possible fossil fuel of the future in past scientific publications.
- The relevance of the proposed objectives is not sufficiently explained, as it is not fully clear whether the main goal is to advance in fundamental knowledge or to develop a new technology.
- **The research methodology** has not been addressed in sufficient detail with respect to the scaling up from a microfluidic reactor to a domestic prototype.
- The significant load of new knowledge in the field of S&T-driven entrepreneurship affects the credibility of the action regarding fundamental research.
- The proposal lacks detail in certain areas in order to fully convince of the quality and credibility of the research. No indications of what success looks like for the chip are given (sensitivity, specificity) and there is a lack of reference to specific characteristics of the AuNPs, the functionalized NP (and conjugates) and the RNA target molecule.
- The research action fails to describe clearly its goal. The aim of using 3D cultures for diagnostic purposes is not sufficiently detailed; it is not clear which diseases or clinically relevant conditions will be specifically addressed.
- The **state-of-the-art** is essentially absent.
- The **methodology** and approach are inadequately described.
- The **novelty and originality** of the project are insufficiently described.
- The project focuses on the study of a single reaction: addition of an electrophilic unit (dienyl iron tricarbonyl) to nucleophilic residues present in natural products. The proposed research is not demonstrated to be at the level of the highly competitive IF scheme.
- The research is not particularly **innovative**; the proposed iron complexes and their application in organic synthesis are well known in the state of the art.
- The **research methodology** is not clear, as the description lacks details on the approach.
- The proposed **technical objectives** aimed by the proposal are numerous and not sufficiently well scoped out. Their description is shallow and does not offer any tangible metric of success, making the quality of the research doubtful.
- The **research work** is presented as an add-on to an existing project, without clearly disambiguating the two projects. In particular, it does not specify the additional research with respect to that project. As a consequence, the **novelty** of the proposed action is not clearly demonstrated.
- The **interdisciplinary aspects** related to the researcher's activities are not properly justified
- The **methodology** is only vaguely presented, making mostly general references to different software tools. The proposal does not explain in sufficient detail how a prototype communication tool will be developed. Moreover, the selection method and the number of patients to be sampled are not clearly stipulated.
- The fact that the xxx product is not yet marketed creates some uncertainty about the credibility of the project.
- The review of **the state-of-the-art** does not explain in detail the different ways in which patients process the concept of risk in order to link them to the approaches of the project
- There is limited detail on how the key aims and objectives of the work proposed will be achieved.
- There is limited detail on the current **state of the art and** how weaknesses in existing technology will be addressed.
- **The novelty** of the research involved is limited.
- The description of pre-clinical tests is generic and limited lacking selection of specific targets.
- The objectives have not been outlined in a sufficiently clear way, as the themes are not narrowly addressed, their presentation is not convincingly focused, and their selection has not been adequately justified.
- The **state-of-the-art** outlined in the proposal is not convincing, for example, power dynamics associated with the presented phenomena are not convincingly included.
- The **methodological approach** is not adequately described. The presented methodological tools are not sufficiently combined and integrated. The function of the selected case study is not sufficiently explained.
- The epistemological complexities and practical difficulties associated with connecting different scientific disciplines through a practice oriented approach are somewhat underestimated.
- The overview and research questions are insufficiently clear in describing the focus of the research.
- The originality **and innovativeness** of the proposal are not sufficiently convincing. The project makes use of secondary datasets. It uses mostly standard indicators.
- The central themes are not convincingly linked with specific hypotheses.
- The proposal uses literature dated over twenty years (1993) to place the general context. It also takes conclusions of research in the USA without sufficient clarification of its applicability to the European context.
- **The state-of-the-art** of the research proposal and the research gap/problem to be addressed are not clearly presented. Thus, the research lacks clarity and focus on the specific research and training objectives.

- Scientific originality/innovativeness is not convincingly stated in the context of abundant research on business- and pricing models. The proposal does not convey really original research ideas or methods, the research methodology uses quite standard econometric techniques.
- The proposal does not sufficiently address the gender aspects, although gender issues can play a role in the proposed research.
- The interdisciplinarity of the proposal is not presented in a convincing way. It is not particularly clear from the proposal how the different disciplinary perspectives would be combined in a coherent way (e.g. using econometrics for investigating phenomena in economics or business does not imply interdisciplinarity).
- Insufficient information is provided in the proposal beyond the technical point of view.
- Interdisciplinary activities are very narrow ranged and not adding really other technology combinations and biology.
- It is insufficiently clear how the interactions between fungi and microbes and arthropods will be assessed, and if the experimental design and sample size and volume are appropriate to meet the stated objectives
- Novelty is limited, given the excessive focus on the application of existing methods for studies on biofilm formation and monitoring.
- The state-of-the-art is insufficiently articulated to highlight the project's relevance by comparison with previous studies.
- The proposed history of neuroimaging is quite technology-driven. The proposal does not sufficiently define the social and cultural context that is said to play a role in the history of neuroimaging. It is not sufficiently clear which wider questions the proposed analysis of the Nobel nominations would answer.
- The proposal underestimates the role that gender could play in the research, especially when dealing with the relations between neuroimaging and society
- The proposal does not sufficiently justify the assumptions that AD patients can be adapted to the body illusion/3D model of themselves and to what extent the proposed virtual reality training may affect neurodegenerative processes. The reasons for the choice of Mental Frame
- Syncing for the justification of anosognosia are insufficiently specified.
- The duration of the planned longitudinal studies is insufficiently specified.
- The proposed objective of developing a tool for reducing anosognosia symptoms is overly ambitious, given the fact that the tool only operates in one specific area (spatial localization of objects).
- In the research methodology, there is no detailed information on the procedure to obtain the hydrogel material with the required properties. Moreover, the hypothesis to copolymerise the base material with other polymers is vaguely defined and consequently not convincing. In addition drug loading process, the trigger for controlled release purpose, the control in dose and quantity are additional aspects which are not precisely covered.
- The innovative content of the project is not fully convincing, since no punctual description is provided of the additional features the hydrogel material will have with respect to competing materials/product.
- The proposed research methodology is not sufficiently elaborated. A clear description of the methodological approach to addressing this issue is absent specifically design, implementation and validation phases therefore the level of innovation is not fully clear
- The need for the proposed devices is not appropriately justified by the (very limited) description of the state of the art.
- While the proposal focuses on the development and validation of engineering microfluidic devices, the state of the art mainly describes the archaea functions and characteristics.
- The proposal has a modest degree of originality being focused on developments that are achievable using standard, well established technologies.
- The proposal does not describe with sufficient detail the objectives and the methodology of the proposed research. The biological and industrial importance of the proposal is not adequately described
- Since in the proposed action the novel neurofeedback system would be investigated in healthy subjects and in subjects with moderate symptoms, the action cannot satisfyingly solve whether this system is capable to improve severe mental disorders as addressed in the Introduction.
- Since it is not realistic that the novel system can be applied in the absence of psychiatrists, it's usefulness in regions with a lack of psychiatrists would be low and would not meet the need addressed in the proposal.
- It is confusing that neurological alterations are mentioned in the overview, whereas psychiatric disorders are the target of the proposal.
- The specific outcome variables for the analysis are not sufficiently described.
- There is insufficient information with respect to the rationale for the objectives, as anxiety is targeted by reducing right-temporal beta rhythm and upregulating left parietal alpha rhythm whereas it is not sufficiently explained why these parameters were chosen.
- It is insufficiently justified why performing transcriptome profiling is the most appropriate approach to identify

the genetic basis of sulfur assimilation.

- It is not clear how the non-homogenic nature of the studied phenotypes (cultivars from gene-bank) will be incorporated in the study.
- The strategy that will be used to select the most relevant candidate genes for genome editing is inadequately described.
- The proposed work bears very limited elements of **scientific novelty**. The presented background information does not support a high-level innovation in the proposed work programme. The proposal does not convincingly explain why a chloroplast system is more advantageous than insect cells or yeast system, which introduce glycosylation of the ectopic protein.
- The originality aspects of the proposal have not been highlighted in sufficient detail
- **The state of the art** is not adequately presented and does not give sufficient references on the fields that would be mobilized. Different notions are sometimes used interchangeably or without an adequate distinction made.
- The proposal does not sufficiently demonstrate a cogent understanding of the rigorous methodological design of the evidence-based research.
- The proposal does not develop a sufficiently sound **state-of-the-art**, and it does not demonstrate a sufficiently comprehensive understanding of the recent developments in research field.
- The **gender dimension** is not sufficiently integrated into the approach.
- It is difficult to judge the **state-of-art** of the field as a number of relevant references are missing. In addition, the implementation of THz spectroscopy in microfluidics has been established for some time.
- Many aspects of the **methodology** are unclear. As such, it is difficult to judge the feasibility and effectiveness of the project and its coherence with the main goal of the proposal
- The research objectives are not developed in sufficient detail and the research questions are not sufficiently linked to the existing literature.
- The subject area of the implementation science is inadequately considered.
- The **research methods to be** applied in various areas of the proposed research such as review of existing evidence or qualitative research methods for interviews and the survey development are not comprehensively developed. The foreseen use of the data sources is not sufficiently elaborated.
- The link between different areas of research (health economics, organisational development within social networks/ benchmarking, health systems research) and related outputs/outcomes is not sufficiently elaborated. The methods for benchmarking are not well described (e.g. which indicators will be used, what data will be collected and how).
- Different conditions leading to the need for palliative care are not satisfactorily explained.
- The overall research focus and how the ten specific objectives were derived is not addressed in sufficient detail or clarity.
- There is a lack of clarity regarding some of the key concepts such as sustainable practices, sustainable tourism and the economic, social and environmental challenges for the hospitality sector.
- The originality **and innovativeness** of the proposed project have not been fully elaborated.
- **The methodology** does not sufficiently describe how the interview data will be analysed; nor does it explain how the sustainability of any practices or models are to be evaluated.
- The interdisciplinary aspects of the proposed project are not sufficiently addressed.
- The proposal does not present the scientific **state-of-the-art** in the area of the proposed research. The references provided in the proposal do not exhaustively present the cutting edge literature in the field
- The project objectives, although clearly stated, are insufficiently grounded in the scientific literature and do not quite reflect the scientific research gap to be filled.
- The **methodological approach** is not adequately described. There are references to different qualitative and quantitative methods, but they are not enumerated or convincingly justified
- The researcher envisions outcomes that are not fully related to the specific and overall objective of the action
- The **state-of-the-art** is insufficiently developed, with inadequate referencing in relation to democratic transitions and policy-making theories.
- The **research methodology** provides insufficient details on how social network analysis and comparisons of historical and social factors in selected countries would allow the researcher to produce a normative approach of the democratization of cultural policy for countries in transition.
- A central research question is not clearly specified, and the identified research objectives are insufficiently clear in terms of their relation with the overall aim of the project: to assess the democratic nature of cultural policy making.
- The realism of achieving the **methodological** ambition within the proposal is not substantiated as its difficulties appear under-estimated.
- There is a lack of information about the existing data sets to be used and their suitability e.g. for validation. The

intention is to use data assimilation to integrate real-time data into the model to enhance predictive strength, however not sufficient information is given about this data e.g. the parameters included or expected errors in input values.

- Lack of references weakens the credibility of project.
- There is a lack of clarity on the **interdisciplinary** nature of the project
- In defining the project objectives the proposal fails to sufficiently clearly delineate the presented project from the previously funded project AIRE; this proposal does not sufficiently clearly state a hypothesis or problem that will be addressed by the proposed research.
- The **research methodology** is not adequately described and lacks sufficient detail on the methods to be applied in the different project phases. For example, the educational aspects of the project, namely to suggest appropriate training for job seekers, is not sufficiently reflected in the methodological approach; also there is a lack of an adequate discussion on the use of AI.
- While **gender aspects** are generally addressed, specific gender issues relevant for the project are insufficiently discussed nor put into context within the proposed matching algorithms.
- The project is overly ambitious in its aim to cover jobs across the whole EU in many languages, and does not sufficiently demonstrate how the language issue is going to be tackled.
- The proposal is insufficiently clear about its objectives, and notably, their novelty beyond the current **state-of-the-art**.
- The overall **novelty and** contribution of the project is over-stated, as other studies have also been conducted investigating similar variables presented in the proposal.
- The application of the model for specific research or development questions is not sufficiently described.

Quality and appropriateness of the training and of the two way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host

- How the **training** will be gained and knowledge transfer achieved is not clear, notably ways in which the researcher and applicant will interact.
- The description of the previous **knowledge** of the researcher to **be transferred** to the host is vague, with insufficient clarification of the exact skills to be transferred and how these would improve the existing expertise of the applicant.
- The methods by which the researcher will be **trained** in new research techniques are insufficiently outlined.
- **Training** of the researcher with the supervisor has focused on the establishment of a start-up company for the independent career of the researcher, however scientific and complementary skills trainings are not sufficiently elaborated.
- New collaboration opportunities are insufficiently described for the SME and other international collaborations of the supervisor and topics for networking opportunities are not outlined.
- How the Researcher will access **formal and informal training opportunities** (e.g. involvement in junior staff supervision, training sessions on communication or business practices etc.) is not clearly explained.
- How the researcher will contribute to **mutual training** is not described in sufficient detail.
- The **knowledge to be transferred** from the hosts has not been described in sufficient detail. For example, the expertise of the supervisors to teach advanced bioinformatics has not been described in sufficient detail. Furthermore the knowledge that will be transferred to the researcher during the secondment or in managing skills and in administration of scientific projects has not been described appropriately
- There is a significant lack of clarity and detail regarding the objectives and the specific activities of the training for the researcher
- The proposal provides insufficient detail about the content of "training-through-research", methods to be learned are not specified except DNA methylation mediation analysis.
- **Additional training** of the applicant in the leadership and mentoring skills is not sufficiently described in the proposal
- Due to the limited interdisciplinarity of the proposal, the researcher is exposed to only few stakeholders. This may hamper the impact of the learning experience, as only limited stakeholder management is required to conduct the project.
- Given the importance of **the training** on product commercialization on career advancement of the applicant, the involvement and extent of training is insufficiently explained.
- **Scientific training** is vastly neglected in the research action, undermining the possibility of the candidate to gain **additional skills** in its specific field of expertise. The training plan is not sufficiently documented
- The **training** objectives for the researcher are not sufficiently discussed, it is not clear from the proposal what significant additional knowledge the researcher will learn at the host group

- The **training** of the researcher is not sufficiently described
- The **transfer of knowledge** from the researcher to the host is not sufficiently elaborated, and the potential added value of the researcher's pre-existing competencies is not convincingly documented.
- The proposal aims to advance the establishment and extension of collaborations with industry and other groups of researchers; however, the description and planning are very generic in these aspects. Plans and strategies are not specified; foreseen connections and networks are not identified in a convincing way
- The proposal focuses on **transfer of knowledge** from secondments to the host institution and does not convincingly indicate the transfer of previously acquired knowledge and skills.
- The **transfer of knowledge** from the researcher to the host has not been adequately presented. It is not fully convincing how the host would benefit from the knowledge contributed by the researcher, and the planned joint activities are not comprehensively outlined.
- The proposal gives insufficient details of the means by which the researcher will acquire the skills listed.
- The proposal does not sufficiently describe in what specific ways the researcher's previous knowledge would be transferred to the host institution
- The additional value of collaboration with a small commercial organisation is insufficiently well explained.
- The proposal does not specify the **necessity of a secondment**, nor does it clarify in enough detail its relation to the topic.
- The proposal provides no specific **training** measures in relationship with the training objectives, and the skills to be acquired.
- The activities of **knowledge transfer** from host organization are quite generic and they are not linked to a list of specific competences. The knowledge transfer by the researcher to the host organization is not presented in enough detail, for example the proposal does not sufficiently elaborate teaching activities to be performed in the host organization
- There is an insufficiently detailed description on the experienced researcher specific activities in the **training**
- The **transfer of knowledge** from researcher to the host is not discussed in sufficient amount of details. The channels of transfer are not clearly defined. Supervision and mentoring activities of the ER with junior scientists or students are not mentioned
- In the proposal, there is no clear evidence of the objectives of the **knowledge transfer** from the researcher to the host and of the means that will be adopted to provide this transfer
- The **training** activities of the researcher at the hosting organisation are not fully presented. Specific skills gained during the project are not described in sufficient detail.
- The **training of the** researcher on IPR aspects fails to be appropriately describe
- Although some **training** courses are named, hands-on training and courses on organism biology fail to be provided by the host institution, which will hamper for the researcher the process of reaching professional maturity.
- The proposal does not adequately describe specific measures **to transfer the researcher's knowledge** to the host
- The potential to open new avenues for the career of the researcher is limited by the narrow scope of the proposed research programme.
- The host offers a too narrow range of competences to be developed during the fellowship.
- The experience of the researcher in virology and cancer research is not supported by publications; thus the benefits of the host from the expertise of the researcher in this domain remain unclear
- The **training** in technical skills, such as microfluidic device fabrication, is not specified in detail despite the candidate lacking such expertise.
- International networking opportunities for the researcher are not described in detail.
- The activities to assure the **transfer of knowledge** are not sufficiently elaborated. The knowledge transfer from the host to the researcher is not comprehensively developed and documented.
- The proposal does not sufficiently explain, how the **transferred knowledge** to the host will be utilized.
- The proposed **training** is not described in sufficient detail; the training in qualitative methods is not adequately considered
- There is a lack of detail and clarity regarding the **training** objectives and activities for the researcher, both for the host beneficiary and the secondment at the partner organization
- The proposal provides insufficient detail on what career possibilities would be made open by the fellowship.
- **The training activities** of the researcher are not sufficiently linked with **the training objectives** and different sets of skills to be received during the fellowship. The specific details on the training activities at the host and secondment organization are lacking in the proposal. The presentation of the transfer of knowledge from the researcher to the host organization is very generic and lacks detail. It is not clear what would be the means for transferring the researcher's knowledge to the host.
- The proposal fails to clearly identify and number the amount of courses and seminars or workshops to be

- attended and fails to clearly address new competences and skills acquired
- Knowledge transfer from the researcher to the host is not described.
- There is a lack of information concerning transferable non-scientific skills training
- Training activities are not sufficiently detailed/ vaguely described.
- There is a lack of detail on how the data assimilation skills of the researcher will be transferred to the host.
- It is not adequately explained how new knowledge concerning managing research projects, collaboration and communications will be gained through seminars and workshops
- The two-way transfer with the host is not described in detail. It is not clear why and how exactly the host organisation(s) will benefit from the researcher's specific skills and previously obtained qualifications.
- The project identifies only a limited number of knowledge transfer channels.
- The proposal does not sufficiently explain in what specific aspects the experience of the host in building operation optimization can be beneficial to the project in terms of energy analysis.
- The proposal does not sufficiently explain in what specific aspects the experience of the researcher in data science can be beneficial to the host institution.

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

- The international networking opportunities offered by the host at the academic level are not discussed in sufficient detail
- Integration of the researcher into the host institution is not clearly elaborated.
- No details of the host environment are provided, which makes it difficult to assess.
- International networking opportunities are not obvious outside the proposed secondment.
- Insufficient concrete initiatives are provided to ensure integration of the researcher into the local host team.
- Insufficient initiatives are described to promote integration the researcher into the international networks of the host.
- The supervisor's experience in supervision is insufficiently detailed
- Wider institutional integration is insufficiently discussed
- The supervisor and the researcher show complementary profiles and competences that match very well with the proposed project.
- The supervisor is an expert in molecular plant pathology and has publications in high impact journals.
- Specific plans to integrate the researcher in a group within the institution or to become responsible for graduate students or technicians are not provided in the proposal.
- The interaction between the candidate and the supervisor is low
- The practical hosting arrangements for the researcher are not precisely presented.
- The proposal does not sufficiently specify networking opportunities that would promote the career perspectives of the Researcher
- It is not clear enough how the interaction with the team of 19 scientists will be accomplished. Mention of monthly team rotation and one-to one coaching is made, but it is not clear what this entails in terms of content, structure, duration.
- The proposal fails to describe properly the measures for the successful integration of the researcher within the host organization
- The international networking opportunities the host offers are not evident and specified
- The integration of the host into international networking programs has not been clearly mentioned in the application.
- There is insufficient evidence of the quality of the research environment as a whole
- There is limited expertise in the host team that can support the biological implications of DNA methylation in blood cells that can mediate the development of breast cancer.
- Some details in the presentation of the supervisor are insufficiently indicated, i.e. publication track record, achieving patents, a key publication of the host laboratory, showing supportive evidence for this project, is not formally identified.
- The supervisor's team has modest experience in the field of research and insufficiently demonstrate the requirements needed for the supervision of a scientifically and technically challenging cell biology project. The researcher will need to apply knowledge independently
- The researcher's integration into the host team and institution is not sufficiently elaborated to be convincing.
- The choice of mentors is not well justified, because the secondary mentor is actually better qualified to instruct the researcher on the specific questions and methods of the project than the primary mentor. In this context, the foreseen interactions with the secondary mentor are not clearly sufficient to drive the project.

- There are some elements of the work proposed where there is insufficient **supervisory support** outlined, for example in the "infection biology aspects" of diagnosis of bacterial and viral diseases
- The measures to **integrate the** researcher in the host institution are not clearly stated
- The proposal does not provide sufficient information on the quality of the research environment
- The presentation of **hosting arrangements** lacks clarity regarding the integration of researcher within the team, especially the essential aspects of integration at the host institution, the integration within different areas of expertise and disciplines, and the international networking opportunities
- It has not been sufficiently described how the contacts will be made with the animal experiment performing units as well the ways to assure interactions with other groups / specialties / and PostDocs
- Details on **the integration** of the Researcher into the team/institution have not been provided in sufficient detail.
- It is unclear to what extent the researcher will be smoothly **integrated** into the host institution's research team.
- International networking opportunities offered by the host are lacking due consideration.
- The benefit of the international networking opportunities that the host could offer are insufficiently stated in the proposal.
- The description of the **hosting arrangements** does not sufficiently address the concrete opportunities for integration of the researcher within the research group at the host institution.
- **Hosting arrangements** are not adequately described. The measures taken to integrate the researcher into different areas of expertise and disciplines are not well elaborated
- International networking opportunities provided by the host to the researcher are not defined.
- The host company is partner of a number of European training programs, but the training record of the company is not described with sufficient detail. It is not evident from the proposal whether the training personnel is employed.
- The proposal does not demonstrate any significant international visibility of the host in the field of project.
- The plans for **integration of the** researcher in the host team are not well elaborated.
- The measures taken to **integrate the researcher** in different areas of expertise and international networking opportunities are not clearly detailed.
- The proposal does not sufficiently describe how the researcher would be **integrated** into the different areas of expertise/disciplines.
- The experience of the **supervisor** in supervising researchers is not comprehensively described.
- The researchers at the **host institution** work on a large array of projects, and the proposal does not clearly show how the researcher plans to discuss their ongoing work with them.
- **The supervisory team's** expertise in biology and chemistry, that is the subject of work package 3, is not demonstrated in the proposal
- The **hosting arrangements** are described in a generic manner and specific arrangements to be made for the researcher are not comprehensively explained. There are several secondments planned, in addition to numerous site visits, and it is not clear, how the researcher would be integrated at each organisation.
- The **integration of the supervisory panel into the supervisory process** is not explained with sufficient detail.
- Concrete **supervision measures** (apart from 6-monthly meetings) are not explained in sufficient detail.
- The quality of the **research environment at the host organisation** is not convincingly demonstrated with insufficient details of team members or integration measures.
- The ways in which the hosts would **integrate the researcher** (for instance through seminars or networking with a number of other distinguished researchers in the field, who are working or visiting the host organizations) are not discussed in sufficient detail. The proposal does not sufficiently describe the international networking opportunities available for the researcher.
- It is not clear from the proposal how the **host organization** would be able to contribute to the advancement of the researcher's career and reaching a position of professional maturity
- The international networking opportunities offered by the host at the academic level are not discussed in sufficient detail
- **Integration** of the researcher in the team/institution and hosting arrangements are not sufficiently elaborated/are illustrated with insufficient details.
- **Multiple supervisors** associated with different institutions in different locations will supervise the researcher. These complex supervision arrangements are not sufficiently clearly described.
- The **supervisor expertise in** data assimilation is not sufficiently demonstrated in the proposal.
- The **integration of the researcher** at the host institution and the secondment are not described in sufficient detail; e.g. the interaction and knowledge exchange process with colleagues is not sufficiently well described.
- **Integration of the researcher** in the team/institution and hosting arrangements are not sufficiently elaborated/

are illustrated with insufficient details.

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

- The proposal fails to demonstrate how the researcher would re-enforce a position of professional maturity in the field, as the CV presented fails to provide evidence of an adequate level of research experience. Furthermore, the CV lacks sufficient evidence for the researchers' work experience acquired in the past
- The exact skill set of the researcher and how it will contribute to the success of the project are not sufficiently clear.
- Insufficient clarification is provided on why the new experience of the current proposal would be essential for the professional maturity of the researcher beyond that of the industrial experience already acquired.
- The potential to gain mentoring experience of masters students during the secondment is non-functional, due to an insufficient time-allocation of only four months. Previous mentoring experience is insufficiently outlined.
- The researcher has yet to clearly demonstrate a capacity to lead research of the high scientific excellence. The proposal does not provide sufficient information on how the research action would reinforce professional maturity. The past publications are mainly in fields different from the planned research and mainly not in high-level journals
- The researcher has scientific capacity, a good publication track record, is skilled in a variety of topics related to the proposal and has been already involved in research and in training of some students
- The publication record of the researcher is not convincing with only 2 co-author publications and one first author manuscript submitted at the completion of their PhD work, implying that a fair amount of time is required for them to reach maturity
- The publication list of the researcher does not sufficiently demonstrate their independent thinking qualities in fundamental research
- While the track record of publications of the researcher is good, the number of citations to their papers is moderate.
- The researcher has a poor track-record of publications and insufficient professional maturity/independence.
- The action will only make small contributions to re-enforce the researcher's professional maturity in an industrial environment.
- Activities on entrepreneurship are planned but this will not ensure the successful completion of the defined tasks.
- The capacity of the researcher to reach a position of professional maturity is not sufficiently discussed in the proposal
- The proposal does not make a convincing case that the researcher will be able to move toward professional maturity and independence. Furthermore, the achievements and the track record of the researcher are not properly highlighted with regard to the applicant's level of experience
- It is unclear from the CV what hands-on research the applicant actually performed to obtain a PhD, which brings into question the researcher's ability to perform independent research
- The applicant fails to clarify sufficiently, how professional maturity and independence will be achieved
- The researcher's knowledge of the language essential for the proposed research, practical activities, and team integration has not been fully demonstrated, and adequate training for this appears not to be provided.
- There are insufficient details of how the proposed research would contribute to consolidating a position of professional maturity.
- The researcher's capacity for professional maturity and international career as an independent researcher is not obvious from the proposal.
- The presentation of scientific achievements is not convincing. Curriculum vitae lacks coherent structure;
- The experienced researcher has a very limited publication list with only one paper accepted although a patent application was deposited.
- The experienced researcher has unclear dates (open dates) in the CV and this makes the track record unclear
- The quality of the career development strategy is not convincingly demonstrated. Considering the limited novelty of the project, the potential of the researcher to develop into a position of professional maturity/independence is not evident.
- It is not sufficiently clear what the specific role of the researcher will be in the action, nor how the present action is related to the fellow's previous research experience. The relevance of the researcher's skillset to the action proposed is not sufficiently described. The researcher's capacity to change from a molecular/cellular focus to a clinical therapeutic focus is not well described.
- The publication activity of the researcher is not commensurate with the stage of the professional career and

(SE Panel)

does not evidence any strong leadership potential.

- The **researcher**'s publication record gives only limited evidence about the international academic excellence and innovative nature of the research carried out previously
- It is not clear from the application how the past experience of the applicant and the research proposal would contribute to future professional development during the fellowship
- The proposal fails to demonstrate how the **researcher would re-enforce a position** of professional maturity in the field, as the CV presented fails to provide evidence of an adequate level of research experience. Furthermore, the CV lacks sufficient evidence for the researchers' work experience acquired in the past
- The publication record of the researcher in relation to the time spent in academic research is very modest. The capacity to reach professional maturity is not yet demonstrated.
- The publication record of the **researcher is** good, but not particularly strong with respect to the time already spent in research.

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.)

- The fellowship will provide the researcher with new top level industrial knowledge, which will be extremely valuable for enhancing the researcher's careers prospects in industry
- Exposure to European regulatory frameworks within REACH, will position the candidate in an area outside of more conventional academic career paths in a field of expanding international importance
- The fellowship offers a good opportunity to the researcher to re-enter an interdisciplinary area with appropriate prospects for a career in industry.
- Valuable opportunities to acquire extended skills are offered to the researcher.
- The researcher clearly defines medium-term and long-term career goals and convincingly demonstrates how the experience in a foreign start-up company will help reaching these goals.
- The researcher will receive the opportunity of the secondment in a prestigious research group in the energy efficiency domain which will open up new opportunities for the development of their career.
- The planned research and training complements the previously acquired knowledge and skills, enhancing researcher's employability and widening the career prospects in the academic and private sector.
- The planned actions are likely to improve researcher's entrepreneurial mindset.
- The host institute participates in national collaborations which could provide networking opportunities for the researcher's future career.
- The project consists of an inter-sectoral exposure for an already experienced researcher to the private sector, so it may open opportunities for future career moves out of academia.
- The proposal to some extent addresses how the research will enhance their career prospects. For example, the new networks could potentially open further collaboration options and the researcher would be able to exploit new knowledge gained in the project.
- The scientific and complementary training will have a significant impact on the researcher's career development by providing essential skills in cancer research, project design, management, and mentoring and enhance the potential to set up an independent translational lab-based research group in the field of cancer immunotherapy
- The project will allow the researcher to develop expertise in personalised/precision therapies for cancer.
- The results of the project will give rise to a new diagnostic tool that can be used in the field to detect parasites and thus the fellowship is likely to add value to European knowledge-based economy.
- The fellowship would expand the researcher's networks.
- The academic outputs and targets for policy circles are appropriate in principle
- The work in the proposed institution will help the researcher to be introduced in the dynamics of a company. This will be helpful to establish a career and/or to set up a startup company.
- The researcher is experienced in plant pathology and will acquire new cutting-edge technologies during the fellowship
- The Applicant will certainly gain options for a new career direction in the biotech industry from working on this 'inter-sectoral' project in an entrepreneurial environment.
- The action will clearly enhance the future career prospects of the researcher by combining the acquisition of new technical skills, a new and diverse network and soft skills in project management.
- The action will improve the capabilities of the researcher to structure long-term research and development projects and to attract funding.
- Combining iPSCs to organ-on-chip technology will be an asset for the researcher. The researcher will expand their knowledge in microfabrication techniques with potential impact on their future career prospects.
- The project would further improve fellow's conceptual understanding of what it takes to commercialize research promising applications

- The impact of the planned research and the training that will be acquired during the fellowship on the **career prospects** of the researcher in the R&D sector after the termination of the fellowship is promising. The added value of the fellowship on the future career of the researcher is sound and clearly described.
- The working conditions and surroundings will improve the skills of the researcher that will have an impact on the development of a **professional career**.
- The researcher will have the opportunity to generate new knowledge in the basic mechanisms that influence the development of antibiotic resistance in developing countries and to gain experience in modern nucleic acid sequencing technologies. The researcher will be endowed with newly acquired professional expertise to advice the health authorities of the home country in measures for sensible use of antibiotics
- The multidisciplinary program will enhance the researcher expertise and skills driven by technical and research oriented demands of industry.
- The enrichment of the professional knowledge of the researcher, in device design, in marketing, communications and soft skills development via the proposed research has been well described.
- The proposed research has considerable potential to provide the applicant with additional insights into new areas of epidemiology that will strongly enhance their future career prospects.
- The applicant's long-term aims in research are mentioned in sufficient detail.
- The networking opportunities that could be offered to the researcher are presented
- The applicant has very good potential to acquire relevant competencies during the fellowship period. The expected **impact of the planned research and training** on the experienced researcher's **career prospects** is clearly described, and thus the **added value** of the fellowship on the future **career opportunities** of the researcher is substantial
- The researcher will gain exposure to support their future **career prospects**. Valuable competencies in research, management, administration and entrepreneurship will be acquired by the researcher
- The proposal is clearly aligned with the researcher's **future career plans** of becoming a professor with ties to industrial R&D.
- The researcher will acquire new competencies in intersectoral and transferrable skills which will greatly contribute to fulfilling their future career goals especially in academia, and the proposed project would clearly contribute to significantly enhancing the **researcher's professional status**.
- The project will contribute to allowing the researcher to increase their qualifications to apply for further European funding to continue this research program in the longer term.
- The impact of the proposal upon the researcher's **career development** is very positive. The industry networking and insights offered via the project will provide an introduction to the field of consulting, mentioned as a secondary career goal.
- The researcher will benefit from the experience working in a start-up environment, which will enhance potential employability at the end of the project.
- The project aligns very well with the **researcher's career goals** and is highly likely to impact very positively on the researcher's career reinforcing a position of professional maturity and independence. The researcher will gain expertise in cutting edge technologies and translational research as well as extend their own mentoring and teaching experience and skills in grant writing, data presentation, results dissemination and commercial exploitation. The researcher will be trained in an interdisciplinary environment including academia, clinics and the industrial sector which will make the future career prospects and opportunities of the researcher even more interesting and achievable. The partner institutions have strong networks that will also add value to the future career opportunities of the researcher
- The intersectoral and interdisciplinary character of the proposed research could in principle enhance the future career prospects of the researcher in different fields, including applied research, arts and culture, and non-profit and activism. In order to engage in a career outside academia, the researcher intends to develop relevant skills and competences, and develop cooperation with partners in diverse sectors.
- The anticipated publications would be the main added value for the researcher.
- The fellowship would benefit the potential of the experienced researcher to establish international collaborations and by expanding their network.
- Understanding of the structure, strategies and responsibilities involved in the functioning of R&D in a big pharmaceutical company will also help the experienced **researcher's future career plan**
- During the fellowship, the researcher will acquire state of the art techniques in high throughput sequencing and bioinformatics as well as complementary skills, such as staff supervision and communication. Such skill acquisition will enhance general **employment opportunities**

- The training in the industrial environment and the application of established methods in wastewater treatment and membrane processes will essentially enhance the researcher's **career prospects** as a highly-skilled technical expert.
- The project will help the researcher to develop a career in industry.
- The positive impact on the researcher's **career development** is convincingly argued.
- The project will create personal links to potential future collaboration partners or employer
- The impact of the MSCA-IF on researcher's career is clear and is described in detail.
- The proposal precisely indicates in which ways the fellowship would be beneficial to the future career of the researcher, for example by pointing **to future research positions** and by securing new funding. The fellowship will help the researcher to refine his/her skills related to scientific project management, which are relevant for the kind of career he/she is seeking
- The planned research offers good future **career prospects**, based on the combination of previous and newly acquired theoretical knowledge and research experience, as well as on newly acquired transferable management skills.
- The techniques and technological advances developed during the proposed research would be of potential importance with respect to healthy aging, as well as in diagnostics of cognitive impairment, also outside the field of research on AD.
- The fellowship will provide the researcher with a level of maturity in different techniques, and additional skills to offer new **career perspectives**.
- The networking with medical and pharmaceutical industries will provide the researcher with new knowledge in marketing, communication, entrepreneurship and finance management that will help to advance their career after the fellowship
- The applicant professional skills will be reinforced in such a way that career prospects will be measurably enhanced after the end of the fellowship.
- The researcher will acquire relevant new skills not only on technological aspects, but also on managerial and industrial aspects.
- The researcher's current expertise is in the academic sector. It is anticipated that the training in the host institution will likely enhance the potential and future career prospects of the researcher via a credible career plan including management training, networking, communication and dissemination strategies.
- The mobility of the fellow across different countries will make the fellow's professional profile more competitive
- The researcher has a very good opportunity to get insight into applied research.
- The training program will deliver skills and knowledge that go beyond the previous experience of the researcher and will increase their **career prospects in a non-academic environment**.
- The added value of the proposal will promote the future advance of the **researcher career** to some extent.
- The researcher has an established academic career and the proposal will contribute to update and stimulate their research capacity. The researcher has access to the supervisor's network of potential future collaborators.
- The researcher may generate novel products relevant for the pharmaceutical industry, creating future working opportunities for the researcher in this field.
- Due to the interdisciplinary nature of the topic that is rarely researched worldwide (impact of social innovation pedagogies), as well as to the excellent research environment provided by the host organization, the proposal provides a detailed and convincing explanation of how the fellowship would greatly enhance the future career prospects of the researcher by broadening opportunities in academia and nongovernmental organisations, by extending their knowledge in action research and impact in the civic world, by developing several transversal skills that are identified, and expanding their research networks
- The researcher's curriculum vitae shows a record of conferences and publications in the topic, that will be re-enforced by the program. The fellowship has the potential to add significant value to the future career of the researcher and open up new opportunities for **future employment especially in the third sector**.
- The proposal describes a convincing goal with respect to future development of the **researcher's career - involvement** in an initiation of a research institute. This general goal determines more detailed research and training goals.
- Added value of the fellowship has been clearly identified: the researcher would learn a new language, and the scope of their international networks would be enlarged.
- The network of the host will be beneficial for the dissemination of the results.

- Proposed measures for exploitation and dissemination are very action oriented.
- The planned research will have several impacts e.g for the primary productive sector (agro-food companies and farmers) and for the scientific community (basic and applied research) that are good. The project will also form a cooperative bridge with policymakers and managers who will be able to apply these sustainable practices widely.
- The development of the action plan will give to the researcher new skills in a multidisciplinary area with high impact on different levels that surely will have a positive effect on their career prospect.
- Enhancing the potential and future career prospects of the researcher is sufficiently demonstrated in terms of professional advancements in the proposed field of research.
- The proposal is shaped to facilitate the return and reintegration of the Researcher for a long-term research position in Europe

Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the action results

- The dissemination strategy is well suited to the research. In particular, the results are planned to be published in very high quality journals.
- The host institution is highly committed to support the researcher, that will bring exploitable expertise from the US to Europe, in the commercialization of the research outputs
- The subject area of the proposal is one with significant potential for expansion within Europe in the near future.
- Dissemination impact is maximized through inclusion of project results directly into the VEGA platform (available to both academic and nonacademic audiences).
- There is a possibility of IP generation, which is credited to the developers.
- Publications in scientific journals are envisaged with the contribution of the applicant to be specified beforehand.
- The researcher adequately outlines some dissemination channels such as making oral presentations in scientific meetings in addition to scientific publications, press releases, appearing on national news
- The researcher outlines web based dissemination channels, in addition to scientific publications and attendance to conferences, which will increase visibility of the project and draw the interest of scientific community.
- The IP which may arise from the project and industrial exploitation will be adequately handled with the support of the host institution
- Exploitation of final results will be facilitated by the company, which has also interest in IPR and in producing a corresponding patent.
- Outcomes of the action will be protected by patent, commercially exploited (most important given the biotech context of the work) and subsequently published in academic journals.
- Presentation at scientific conferences and the distribution of commercial brochures and other technical/advertising material will complement the approach.
- The action will build on the xxx/xxx-based expression system developed by the host company, a solid foundation that will likely lead to significant new IP
- Exploitation of results including IP is planned and the critical support of an IP director, is indicated
- The researcher has presented a detailed and concrete plan for effectively disseminating research results by scientific publications in high impact journals and by presentations at renowned international conferences. Exploitation of results and intellectual property rights is sufficiently demonstrated.
- The high likelihood that the action will generate IP has been satisfactorily shown and appropriate protection of IP is considered
- New results will be also disseminated to policy-makers and will significantly affect triggering further research activities and environmental prevention procedures
- The key target audiences are identified and methods to reach them are mostly described. The intent to gather end-user feedback on the diagnostic is a very strong addition to this section as is the proactive contact of potential future investors.
- There is a credible and valuable plan for dissemination of the action results to the scientific community, via publications, participation in conferences and courses as well as by various online platforms.
- The results from the action may have a commercial application in a private hospital in the near future, and if the results of this project lead to lower costs in the long run, then proton therapy might become more accessible to society.
- The exploitation strategy will be professionally supported by the commercial company who has a focus

on the exploitation of academic IP and creating commercial possibilities around the project.

- Dissemination is properly conceived via publications, presentations and other activities of good impact.
- The results and achievements will be exploited by using the structure and experiences of the host SME; a patent application and product development are foreseen.
- The dissemination plan is very well defined and included in the Gantt chart. The researcher proposes several good measures for result dissemination targeting the industrial, academic and clinical community and policy makers via scientific events, publications and potentially organized workshops/symposium and meetings.
- The strategy for exploitation of results and intellectual property rights is well elaborated, which is essential for non-academic beneficiaries.
- The commercial exploitation of the results and their protection will be carefully and appropriately managed. Patent applications are highly likely.
- Several dissemination activities to academia and public are planned. In addition to peer-reviewed articles and a symposium, the core output - an online platform - contributes to the dissemination of results in various contexts. Dissemination also includes potential artistic activities.
- The researcher would disseminate results via conferences, print and online media, and, most importantly, via journal publications
- Intellectual property protection will be managed by the hosting institution that has extensive experience in this field.
- Participation in several pharma congresses is anticipated and participation in meetings dedicated to 3D printing are also planned.
- The dissemination plan includes regular visits by the general public organised by the hosting institution. Other activities include, university student internships and school student visits
- Dissemination measures described are reasonable and include publications in specified high-ranked journals, conferences contributions, and a scientific workshop in the frame of an international conference.
- In addition, the obtained results will be uploaded to the database, created by the host and integrated to a virtual data Center, thus making them accessible over the world.
- A thoroughly made exploitation strategy is presented. In case of patentable results, measures will be taken with the help of the host.
- The dissemination agenda is clear and fits the needs of the project. The timing of the dissemination action is clearly described and well suited. The proposal fully describes a precise and diversified dissemination strategy (related to the presentation and publication of results), which also identifies the measurability of the various actions.
- Papers in academic journals as well as presentations at conferences to come are enlisted and are appropriate to the topic of the project.
- The measures for exploitation of the results and licencing and commercialization issues are clearly addressed.
- The proposal dissemination is of very good quality. The measures to exploit and disseminate the project results, properly considered the future use of data, with clearly identified needs and constraints including good consideration of IPR at the host institution. The dissemination plan efficiently targets both academia and private sector, in which market analysis for the valorization of the developed device is included. A proper balance between visibility and IPR protection is considered. Moreover, it is anticipated that the host institution is very well suited for the exploitation of intellectual property.
- Dissemination plans of the action results are well prepared as they include communication at international conferences, publication in high impact scientific journals and "info-dockets" at the host's website.
- Exploitation plans are good as they address translation of the research findings into health care biomedical devices
- The proposal contains a focused dissemination strategy that emphasizes impact on policy and practice. The outcomes of the fellowship activities would be disseminated, appropriately, to a range of target audiences through publications (in journals, conferences and monograph), networking and policy documents. The concrete planning is included in the Gantt Chart. High quality, concrete plans for the dissemination activities are included in a clear table within the proposal identifying target audience, when it would occur and metrics for measuring success.
- The dissemination strategies of communication with the users, potential users and the scientific community are well described and consist of several activities, e.g. meetings, seminars, workshops, participation in conferences, publications, blog, etc.
- The project's exploitation strategy is well described e.g. a company will apply the soil management

strategies in other relevant fruit production systems, the results will be of interest to farmers, agro-food industries, final consumers and the research community

- The dissemination strategy is well suited to the research. In particular, the results are planned to be published in very high quality journals.
- The host institution is highly committed to support the researcher, that will bring exploitable expertise from the US to Europe, in the commercialization of the research outputs
- Project data will be distributed directly via the VEGA platform (available to both academic and non-academic audiences).
- Distribution of intellectual property rights is described in the project
- Exploitation of results is strongly aimed at technology transfer resulting in product development of hosting organization start up, and related activities are well integrated into the Gantt chart.
- Exploitation plan of the potential results within the timeframe of the proposed fellowship is realistic.
- The intellectual property protection is well considered.
- A good and detailed dissemination plan is included.
- The developed algorithms and software will be made openly available to the scientific community.
- The possibility of novel IP has been contemplated and accurate measures have been outlined to ensure its protection and future exploitation
- Project data will be distributed directly via the VEGA platform (available to both academic and non-academic audiences).
- Distribution of intellectual property rights is described in the project
- The developed algorithms and software will be made openly available to the scientific community.

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

- The range of measures to communicate the research activities properly addresses various audiences with well-designed actions
- The proposal includes average strategies for communicating the results to different target audiences, including educational community and general public (e.g., the visitors of different museums). The proposal also show good means for its planned communication, including a webpage, printing brochures, and a flyer to be produced on the research results for institutions where an interested public is engaged.
- The outreach to potential end-users and some young PhD or Post doc students, are sufficiently outlined.
- Outreach activities have been planned for stakeholders and potential end-users, which are of good quality.
- The researcher makes strong use of social media.
- The researcher has excellent contacts and strong experience that would allow for good media communication.
- There are adequate plans for communication with academics, policy-makers and the wider public, through scientific articles, policy briefs and newspaper articles.
- The outreach activities are largely appropriate for reaching different target audiences.
- The Applicant will participate in in public engagement events such as European Researchers' Night and publish major outcomes in popular science magazines/web portals.
- The host company's web page will also disseminate the action's outcomes
- There is a plan to bring the results to the public via science slam, FameLab, European Researchers Night. The idea of a science corner in a local café is regarded positively
- The quality of the measures to communicate the action and its result to different target audiences is very good. A specific plan is presented and adequately analyzed. The dissemination measures to the media and the broad public are good and sufficiently discussed
- Target groups for communication are identified clearly and there are adequate plans for traditional communication activities.
- The advertising of the project at a worldwide scale has been discussed.
- Some measures have been implemented for the vulgarization of the results by the means of mass media (the company's website).
- Outreach activities towards the general public are specifically proposed in the application. There are very good measures proposed to communicate the project activities and results to target audiences such as students, general public, academic audiences and governmental agencies.
- The proposal convincingly describes the need to communicate the results of the action to the general

public, since proton therapy is still not well known or widely applied, and thus there is a great need to educate the population.

- There is a credible and detailed **plan of outreach activities to communicate** the research results to the general public through various means including conferences, blogs, newspapers, research nights, project website and public talks.
- There is an adequate frequency of outreach activities planned.
- The research outputs will be intensively **communicated** with various target groups, such as the general public, investors, laboratories
- The researcher proposes a **communication strategy** including numerous measures to target many relevant audiences in various ways.
- Communication will take place by the means of standard, but sufficient communication channels. Outreach activities target audiences that reach beyond the research community (e.g., the general public, policy makers).
- Potential of the project results to attract attention from the wider community interested in biocontrol has been clearly identified.
- The proposal rightly targets audiences from academia, research institutes and non-academic partners.
- The project's results and activities will also be **communicated** in workshops with invited international participants
- The **outreach and communication plan** is generally credibly described. The proposal provides targeted information to graduate students, postdocs and general public. The measures proposed are diverse and suitable and all of them are properly scheduled in the Gantt chart
- The proposal describes a comprehensive **communication strategy**, including different target audiences and ways to measure its impact.
- The **communication** agenda is perfectly scheduled and structured. The communication activities are original and thoughtful. The researcher has experience and is currently involved in regular communication activities
- In the proposal, suitable, measures are selected to address different stakeholders with potential interest for the project outcomes. In general, the overall strategy to carry out **outreach activities** is convincing
- Very good elements of **communication to** a wider audience of action activities include online press releases, social media postings in lay language for policy makers, clinicians and nonexperts, the host's network for pre-college students, organization of a "Girls-Day" and hosting of summer students.
- The **communication of the outcomes** to well targeted audiences of the wider public and the wider research community is highly adequate. It will take advantage of the company's and the researcher's links.
- The project clearly identifies economic-type of target audience **to communicate** the research results, which will support project funding in a long-term run.
- The quality of the proposed measures to **communicate** the project activities and results is excellent and target different publics: academics, policy, general public, educators. The proposed strategy for communication covers the whole research period and is targeted at a wide range of social actors, largely based on the evaluated programme existing infrastructure: social media, public events and local communities.
- Adequate **communication strategies** are presented for each of the work-packages. Timelines and frequencies of the communication measures and concrete settings are sufficiently outlined. The communication to different target audiences is explicitly considered and addresses most relevant stakeholders.
- The **communication strategy** targeted at interested public (people suffering from life limiting conditions and their families) and professional groups (clinicians, caretakers) are convincingly outlined.
- Proposed creation of the project website and the use of electronic **communication platforms** represent relevant dissemination channels.
- Expanding sustainable practices to food production systems are clearly evident and well demonstrated for international cooperation and innovation partnerships between the scientific community and food industry.
- The proposal shows an adequate **communication plan** with clearly defined target audiences, expected outcomes and channels. The communication plan of the action is comprehensive, including both conventional and digital means.
- The proposal describes very convincingly the numerous and well-suited **measures to communicate** the action results to a non-scientific audience with a remarkable motivation to attract students' interest

- The range of **measures to communicate** the research activities properly addresses various audiences with well-designed actions
- The existing networking structures of the beneficiary institution will be used to **communicate** to different target audiences.
- The proposal identifies measures to **communicate** the action activities related to product development and launch.
- The host's website will be utilized for **communication** to different audiences.
- The existing networking structures of the beneficiary institution will be used to **communicate** to different target audiences.
- The host institution has a dedicated marketing and communications department which will help for an effective dissemination of the project outputs to the lay public

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.)

- Although the proposal puts forward a discussion of how the planned research would boost the researcher's **career prospects**, it falls short in clarifying the researcher's underlying strategy for their own future plans as well as how the planned research would nurture the needing-to-be acquired key skills listed
- **The career strategy** is not elaborated in detail to translate the potential in a concrete path to enhance the future career prospects.
- The reduced training opportunities for the researcher limit the **potential impact** of the project on their future **career prospects**
- Insufficient details are provided on concrete actions that could generate impact or added value to the future **career opportunities** of the researcher. The new technical competences to be acquired and how these are essential for the development of the researcher are inadequately discussed.
- Description on how the networks formed during the proposal will play a critical role in the future prospects of the researcher is vague, without sufficient clarification.
- Insufficient information is provided on **future independent research activities** to be developed after the end of the current project and how the proposal would be beneficial for enabling such plans.
- Despite the potential benefit of new scientific networks, specific new scientific contacts derived from the research are not sufficiently explained and lack detail.
- The **researcher** may have sufficient professional maturity and expertise to get a position in an industrial setting or establish their own start-up after the fellowship ends, however clear statements about how these plans will be achieved are not well elaborated.
- There is insufficient discussion of how **the career development** will be enhanced and what specific **skills and capacities** would be developed.
- The training is ill-specified, leaving it unclear whether there will be a true upgrading of both **scientific reading skills**, and it is unlikely that the researcher will acquire specific **methodological skills** that the researcher currently does not master.
- Although referred to in the proposal, the specific means by which the applicant will be able to attract grants and investor funds were not well described
- The research and technological scope of the host institution is very much focused on molecular biology/biotechnology and is not suited well for the researcher to "look over the edge" in the course of the experimental phase of the action.
- The vaguely defined research program is likely to **impact on lowering the potential benefit** of the project on the researcher's future career prospects
- It is not convincingly explained that the expected gain in drug development experience could derive from immersion in a **start-up environment** specializing in microfluidics, in a situation where the mandatory biology expertise would have to derive from the fellow themselves. The described available support to the fellow concerning drug development issues, is on the low side: relying on planned (not guaranteed) interviews with academics and/or industrial scientists in order to meet the necessary requirements, is not enough.
- Considering the overall research objectives and plans, and the experience of the fellow, the proposed

- research exploitation, is less likely to be achieved
- There is insufficient evidence that the researcher will acquire the necessary skills to significantly enhance their future career prospects
 - The prospects of a future career enhancement in the area of microfluidic cells for biofuel production have not been sufficiently well addressed.
 - Inadequate details on how the researcher will be able to develop supervisory expertise, which will be essential for future career prospects as an independent researcher
 - Detail is missing on how the acquired skills and techniques will be applied beyond the project to support applicant's career goal.
 - It is difficult to evaluate if the action will enhance the potential and future career of the researcher since the proposed research is not properly defined.
 - The proposal does not convincingly explain how the future career of the researcher will be enhanced. In particular it is not clear how new competences will help the fellow increasing competitiveness in the marketplace
 - The acquisition of competences and skills by the applicant in Life Sciences, and specifically in the development of new diagnostic assays in microbiology and infection biology of bacteria and viruses, has not been adequately addressed.
 - The proposal does not sufficiently describe the methodological competences and professional skills required for a career in academia.
 - The proposal does not sufficiently well address the researcher's career prospects
 - The proposal provides no specific list of competences to be acquired during the fellowship. They are not linked to the specific training objectives. The added-value of the fellowship to the future career is unclear. The career goals are not clearly stated by the proposal. The research project would only marginally contribute to the future career prospects of the researcher. The opportunities of the researcher are presented in a generic fashion and cannot be fully assessed
 - The capacity for significantly furthering the scientific development of the researcher is not sufficiently demonstrated.
 - The proposal fails to convincingly specify what the concrete opportunities offered by the project to the researcher will be
 - Overall, the training received at the hosting institution will not contribute substantially to the career prospects of the researcher after the fellowship, given his/her already high level of maturity, and, especially, the fact that he/she has already worked at the host institution with the proposed supervisor.
 - The actions to enhance the future career of the researcher are not fully elaborated. Specific details on the main impacts and opportunities of the researcher are not sufficiently described.
 - New competences and skills which will be gained by the researcher during the proposed project are not fully listed.
 - The career objectives of the researcher are not sufficiently described. The researcher states that they wish to pursue a career in neuroscience technology but does not sufficiently describe which facet of this they wish to pursue and how this research experience will facilitate this.
 - Taking into account the advanced level of post-doc experience, it is not convincing that the proposed action will significantly contribute to the researcher's professional development and maturity. The description of career benefits is vague.
 - Given the low level of innovation of the proposal and the unclear character of technical training, the fellowship does not demonstrate potential to enhance the future career prospects of the researcher
 - Despite a dedicated work package, it is not sufficiently described in the proposal, how the project will enhance the future career prospects of the researcher.
 - The added value of the fellowship in relationship with the career objectives is not sufficiently clearly presented. The presentation of the opportunities for the researcher lacks important details
 - It is not sufficiently elaborated how the researcher will develop a new expertise in applied science able to support their career development
 - The proposal fails to provide a clear and detailed account of the non-academic skills and competencies to be acquired.
 - It is unclear from the proposal how the academic skills gained during the project (e.g. gathering and analysis of empirical data) would significantly help the researcher on the future career apart from gaining credentials for applying for a higher academic position
 - The proposal lacks a detailed description concerning the planned measures to ensure the intended career development strategy of the Researcher after the fellowship.

- It is not sufficiently clear how the current proposal will advance the **future career prospects** of the researcher, since no clear career plan or strategy is provided.
- The opportunities to acquire **complementary skills** seem limited and complementary training opportunities are not clearly addressed
- It is not sufficiently clearly explained how this fellowship would prepare the researcher for **competitiveness in the private, non-academic sector**

Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the action results

- Participation in SME-oriented calls or similar funding channels are not considered to further **exploit** the project's results.
- There is no clear **strategy for dissemination**. The measures proposed only consider participation in a few conferences in the field.
- The project has only a limited potential to lead to high-ranking publications in economic journals.
- The proposal does not explore in sufficient detail what kind of license will be assigned to the resulting software.
- The possibility of novel **IP** has been contemplated and accurate measures have been outlined to ensure its protection and future **exploitation**.
- The conference presentations of the researcher lack important information, such as titles and authorship
- **The dissemination activities** of publications and summer schools are shown as deliverables in the Gantt chart and are suitable.
- **Dissemination activities** regarding publication are limited. In addition, the description of dissemination activities to other stakeholders is unclear, and the mentioned policy paper lacks focus. Furthermore, the need for such a paper for NGOs is not clearly justified in the proposal.
- **Dissemination activities** regarding participation in conferences are relatively low.
- **IP potential** of the results including material transfer agreements, is not sufficiently discussed
- With regard to the **dissemination strategy** to an academic audience via conference participation, the proposal mainly mentions an ISA conference, without providing further elaboration.
- Measures to **exploit results** are not considered within the proposal scope but apart: the institution will be in charge of exploiting the results.
- **Dissemination strategy** is poorly described and remains vague. Dissemination through scientific conferences is insufficiently detailed.
- The **patenting strategy** aimed to be used is not clearly detailed.
- The anticipated time of the necessary legal protection of the central outcomes of the project will be near the end of the action and, thus, prohibits free distribution of results before this step. Thus, the potential for **high-impact publications** is not convincingly demonstrated
- **Dissemination** of scientific outputs to other laboratories, pharmaceutical industry and preclinical R&D teams and on a global scale, lacks detail and concrete goals. There is mention of webpage, investors and laboratories, but not fully convincing concrete dissemination plan (frequency, channel, content, goal etc) is described.
- Measures for **exploitation** and protection of intellectual property and for commercialisation of biological products have not been addressed in sufficient detail.
- The **dissemination strategies** to different target audiences and outreach activities are not sufficiently outlined in the proposal (or in the Gantt chart), being essentially limited to the researcher's home country.
- There is a lack of clarity regarding the focus and topics for the intended research papers.
- The proposal gives little indication how the project will engage with policy makers and other stakeholders or conduct follow-up activities to enable research subjects and the stakeholders to benefit from policy and practice-related suggestions
- The **issues of intellectual property rights** as well as potential exploitation of the results and technology transfer are insufficiently addressed
- The **dissemination** of applied methodologies and technologies to the broader research community were poorly reflected on.
- The plans regarding the **exploitation** of results to develop a diagnostic test are not completely addressed.
- The researcher fails to define what can be **commercialized**.
- The **exploitation** through the partners is not detailed or substantiated.

- The **measures to disseminate** research results are presented in a very general manner. They lack specific details to be convincing.
- Potential **IP protection** measures are not sufficiently elaborated.
- **Exploitation** is addressed in a vague manner, and the researcher's potential participation in patents is not properly clarified.
- The product development and **dissemination plans** are generic and lacking sufficient detail.
- IP issues are mentioned, however, exact strategies of **IPR management** and protection are not described in the proposal
- Partner laboratories are mentioned; however, limited details on the subject of collaboration or the flow of information are provided.
- Comprehensive **dissemination strategy** is not clearly outlined and it is not justified that it would be further developed in the course of the research.
- A **strategy for exploitation** and intellectual property rights has not been adequately addressed, which is a particular shortcoming regarding the specific field of the proposed research.
- The **dissemination part of the** project is not ambitious. The dissemination strategy lacks specific targets and quantifiable measures. The proposal insufficiently specifies the measures to exploit the action results. Proposal makes no clear reference to the electronic dissemination channels, such as webcasts, professional networking sites, blogs, or the open availability of project results for download. The presentation of dissemination in the Gantt chart is unclear
- The number of the planned publications and conferences is not clearly indicated and they are not scheduled in the Gantt chart.
- **Opportunities for exploitation** of the newly developed tool ("embodied machine") are insufficiently detailed and not credible enough. For instance, for success, stakeholders (clinicians, patients, caregivers) are not sufficiently identified as part of the project development.
- The **intellectual property issues** are not clearly explained. This is especially important due to the inherent commercial interest of the project and the private nature of the host.
- The **dissemination of** the activities to a specialized audience is not described with sufficient detail. The description of seminars, workshops and publications in journals and other measures to promote the action to the scientific community is not clearly shown.
- No clear strategy is presented to develop the full impact of the **exploitation** in terms of patents and plant variety rights
- The **dissemination strategy** is not convincing – most of the dissemination actions are connected with publication of a research report.
- Also the **dissemination plan** lacks details. Detailed information is missing on the number of planned workshops and conference presentations as well as on the journals where the planned articles might be published.
- The proposal does not adequately address the management of intellectual property deriving from the project
- The proposal does not explore in sufficient detail what kind of license will be assigned to the resulting software.
- **Dissemination events** are not planned in the Gantt chart, and no specific measures are given in order to disseminate results in peer-reviewed journals, conferences or scientific events.
- Insufficient detail is given on which aspects could be subject to IPR and no prior IP landscaping was done. No clear strategy is given on how to deal with IPR protection vs publication.
- **The IPR and exploitation issues** are not sufficiently considered; this is highly inappropriate in view of the targeted commercialization of the device.
- The role of private partners and innovative companies in exploiting results or a marketing plan are not sufficiently described in the proposal.
- Given the high application potential of the project, exchanges with potential end-users outside of the scientific community, e.g., the pharmaceutical industry or medical professionals, are not sufficiently emphasized.
- The **dissemination strategy** is not articulated and while there is a plan to publish peer-reviewed international journal papers and present at conferences, details of this are lacking.
- The outputs from the project are intended for operational deployment but details of their **dissemination** to practitioners are missing.
- The researcher's role in the **exploitation and dissemination** is not well considered.
- **Dissemination events** are not planned in the Gantt chart, and no specific measures are given in order to disseminate results in peer-reviewed journals, conferences or scientific events.

- Insufficient detail is given on which aspects could be subject to IPR and no prior IP landscaping was done. No clear strategy is given on how to deal with IPR protection vs publication.
- The IPR and **exploitation** issues are not sufficiently considered; this is highly inappropriate in view of the targeted commercialization of the device.
- The researcher's role in the **exploitation and dissemination** is not well considered

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

- A number of stakeholders have been identified as **target audiences** but this has been limited to the public and advocacy groups. Moreover, the proposal lacks further consideration of other relevant target audiences and a sound **communication plan**
- The **measures to communicate** the action activities and results that are listed in the proposal are presented in a very generic way; it's therefore difficult to appreciate their quality. The proposal lacks detail in the concrete number and type of action communication, mentioning e.g. "a number of press releases" without further clarification
- **Communication activities** are generic and basic. No active measures are presented and the proposal lacks any concrete strategy for wider communication.
- Some of the proposed **communication activities** are not duly elaborated, for instance YouTube is mentioned without any clear presentation.
- The secondment partner is not involved in any of the **communication activities**.
- Events for the general public are mentioned but are not described in detail, which limits the credibility of the proposed **communication measures**.
- Several suitable **communication initiatives** are outlined through various media outlets as well as presentations to high schools
- **Communication strategy** to reach out to a wide range of public audiences such as, high school students, stakeholders, and health authorities, is not sufficiently addressed
- A concrete **communication strategy** has not been clearly developed for the general public, especially school students to increase their awareness for basic science or entrepreneurship.
- **Outreach activities to communicate** with the general public are not clearly considered in the proposal. The actions are limited to producing papers in popular magazines
- The management of the **outreach activities** using different social networks, is not clearly presented in the light of the IP strategy.
- As presented in the proposal, the personal visibility of the researcher will be overshadowed by the profile of the host organization
- There is a lack of **communication detail** on when, where, how and what will be brought to the attention of the general public
- There is no participation or support from the host institutions in the **communication strategy**
- The extent of **communication activities**, especially those reaching school pupils/teachers and in the private sector (potential consumers), is not well described.
- The proposed measures to **communicate the action** activities to different target audiences are not appropriately presented.
- The proposed **outreach activities** are too limited and vague to be convincing
- The **communication activities** are not well defined. An effective plan to communicate the findings outside of the scientific community is not properly specified.
- It is not clearly presented how the mentioned **audience groups** and media would match with the communication needs of the proposed research.
- The proposal does not clearly outline how **to access the participants**, e.g., artists, writers, and video-makers, of the proposed activities. It is not well explained how the participants will be selected, addressed, and their contribution encouraged.
- The proposal does neither sufficiently explain relevant roles of international experts, politicians at EU and local level, nor other end-users, for advising and upscaling the results of the proposed research. It is not sufficiently demonstrated how the complicated theoretical rationales presented will be communicated to non-academic audiences, including artists, practitioners, policy makers, and the broader public.
- **Measures to communicate** the activities to **different target audiences** are included in the Gantt chart, but are insufficiently developed and quantified.
- The presentation of **communication measures** is fragmented and lacks coherence. The regularity of different communication measures is unclear. The presentation of communication measures in the

Gantt chart lacks details and clarity

- The description of the personal activity of the experienced researcher in the **communication activities** is not credible. There is a lack of any project related specific communication activities and plan. No web or social media communication is planned. No general public actions such as outreach activities are planned
- The frequency proposed for **communication activities** are not fully convincing. Additional useful tools (e.g. social networking websites or local TV media) to communicate the action activities to non-scientific audiences are insufficiently considered.
- **Communication** is included in the Gantt chart but specific activities are not indicated
- **Direct communication** with patient organizations is not planned in necessary detail.
- The proposal does not adequately consider the use of social media to increase the impact of the project and to broaden the **targeted audiences**.
- Although the proposed website is a good initiative to disseminate research results, the **measures to communicate** the action have only been superficially described, and they have not been sufficiently planned to secure an outstanding impact of the project. This affects the credibility of the communication strategy.
- While ideas for **communication** of research results are relevant, the proposal does not adequately define different target audiences and does not provide sufficient details about the frequency of communication measures
- The ways, in which the actions proposed would facilitate the interaction between the researcher and the **target group(s)** are not elaborated in sufficient detail
- A number of stakeholders have been identified as **target audiences** but this has been limited to the public and advocacy groups. Moreover, the proposal lacks further consideration of other relevant target audiences and a sound communication plan
- The **measures to communicate** the action activities and results that are listed in the proposal are presented in a very generic way; it's therefore difficult to appreciate their quality.
- The proposal lacks detail in the concrete number and type of action **communication**, mentioning e.g. "a number of press releases" without further clarification
- Plans **to communicate results** and engage with non-scientific audiences are not sufficiently addressed.
- No outline **communication strategy** or plan is presented for **target groups** beyond the research community with no mention of the use of social media, popular journals, TV, radio, etc.
- Apart from an open house day at the host, no convincing plans are presented for demonstration to potential users e.g. ministries, state agencies or the private sector.
- Concrete planning of **communication activities** is not clearly shown on the Gantt Chart.
- The researcher's contribution to the **communication actions** is not well described
- The participation in open events promoting knowledge and the development of science is not described at sufficient level of detail.
- The proposal does not adequately answer the question of how **the communication measures** will be **quantifiable** and what the **quantitative requirements** are e.g. the proposal remains very vague in describing the specific training and promotional events targeted towards SMEs and agencies; it is not clear, when and where these events are planned to take place.
- No outline **communication strategy** or plan is presented for target groups beyond the research community with no mention of the use of social media, popular journals, TV, radio, etc.
- Apart from an open house day at the host, no convincing plans are presented for demonstration to potential users e.g. ministries, state agencies or the private sector.
- Concrete **planning of communication activities** is not clearly shown on the Gantt Chart.
- The researcher's contribution to the **communication actions** is not well described
- The participation in open events **promoting knowledge** and the development of science is not described at sufficient level of detail.
- Given that public and industry interest in the research topic is likely to be very high, the **plans for communication**, especially to the international industry, are not sufficiently differentiated for different target audiences. In particular, there is insufficient evidence of how the hospitality management industry would benefit from the guidelines, reports and workshops

Criterion 3 – Implementation

Strengths:

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

- The work packages identified in the **work plan** are convincing and perfectly coherent with the research objectives. **Deliverables and milestones** are also convincingly identified and shown in the **Gantt chart**. The tasks are designed in a balanced and uniform way, with milestones and deliverables at the end of each work package
- The overall project structure is adequate with a clear work-flow divided among several **work packages**, and possibility for iterative improvement of earlier work based on later findings.
- The **milestones** are well elaborated and come at the right place in the plan.
- The **work plan** is very thoughtfully designed to reach the objectives aiming at a high impact results
- Tasks, **milestones and deliverables**, even timing of the planned outreach activities, are all provided with very clear descriptions
- The design of the **work plan** is sufficient with relevant deliverables and milestones.
- The overall organization of the tasks is coherent and appropriate for the proper development of the three **WPs**.
- **Deliverables and milestones** are well listed on the Gantt chart
- The **Work plan** is clearly organized in different **Work Packages, Milestones and Deliverables**. Work package are well defined, specified and entitled.
- The **work plan** is realistic and well suited to achieve the desired outcome in terms of research and development.
- The applied nature of this action will ensure that outcomes are directly useful and applicable in a commercial context
- The **Gantt chart** is very well structured and contains a consistent list of **deliverables and milestones**.
- The proposal highlights an efficient workflow for the action
- The five **work packages** have been coherently designed according to the past experience of the researcher and of the host.
- The lists of the **milestones and the deliverables** are adequately presented
- **WP5** dedicated to the commercialization and business aspects was considered a good addition to the proposal for the researcher
- The **work plan** is very well organized into coherent work packages including a sufficient number of milestones to track progress within each of the **work packages**, which makes it feasible and credible.
- There is an adequate time planning for the different aspects of the project. The **Gantt chart** fully corresponds to the proposed time scale, and includes information about planned deliverables and milestones.
- **The work plan** adequately integrates training, dissemination, exploitation and communication activities
- The scientific portion of the **work plan** is well described.
- **The work plan** is very well described and has a high degree of coherence. Individual work packages and tasks are clearly stated, and concrete deliverables and milestones are correctly specified and articulated. The work plan includes also dissemination, teaching, management and training activities that are precisely specified and integrated within the duration of the fellowship.
- The proposal includes a suitable **Gantt chart, with** information on time allocation for each of the work packages and a list of major **deliverables and milestones**.
- There is a comprehensive list of **milestones** for each **work package**
- In relation to the research activities, the Work Plan has been clearly presented. It is designed to achieve the specific scientific goals as well as the impact on the researcher's career effectively. The distribution and interconnections of **the work packages** are appropriate.
- The proposal includes a coherent and effective **work plan**, aptly summarized in a **Gantt chart**. It pays

due attention to the main components of the action, such as research, training and dissemination. All work packages as well as individual tasks are very well explained and prepared with great care. Deliverables and milestones are appropriate and described in relevant detail

- The overall length of the research is justified in view of the planned experimental studies.
- The secondment is correctly scheduled to fulfil and understand the planned gene editing.
- The proposal contains a coherent and effective work plan in accordance with the aims outlined earlier in the proposal, carefully designed and presented in the various work packages which are clearly named and detailed in a table.
- The detailed work plan and Gantt chart contained in the proposal provide sufficient information for the monitoring of the progress of the research at the host and while on secondment (e.g. work packages, deliverables, milestones, training). Communication and dissemination activities are precisely indicated in separate tables
- The proposal presents a list of detailed work packages that properly describe research, dissemination and communication issues.
- The list of deliverables and milestones is comprehensive and appropriate. They are well-founded and described in detail, which is promising in terms of the potential to achieve the desired impact in the field of research and training.
- The work plan describes how the different working steps are used to produce the result, i.e. towards an alarm system forecasting flash floods in karst environments
- The work packages identified in the work plan are convincing and perfectly coherent with the research objectives. Deliverables and milestones are also convincingly identified and shown in the Gantt chart. The tasks are designed in a balanced and uniform way, with milestones and deliverables at the end of each work package
- A detailed Gantt chart together with tables for deliverables and milestones present a good overview and depict a well planned course of action for the programme.
- The work package structure and work package naming is appropriate for the project.
- A detailed Gantt chart together with tables for deliverables and milestones present a good overview and depict a well planned course of action for the programme.

Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources

- Specific supervisors have been allocated to each WP, which seems appropriate for the proposed work and reduces the risk of failure.
- Allocation of tasks and resources are very appropriate to implement the research work and achieve the training objectives.
- The allocated research team is in place to enable the training and research objectives.
- The resources mobilized ensure that the research objectives will be reached.
- Laboratory resources have been allocated appropriately
- Tasks and resources are well allocated. The researcher will get full access to all facilities via a well-documented plan.
- The allocated resources are clearly outlined and supported by the plan of work
- The allocation of tasks and resources was generally considered to be appropriate to meet the goals of the program.
- The allocation of tasks and resources is very appropriate for the execution of the project
- All technical tasks are clearly defined and well elaborated.
- The project is very ambitious and the allocation of tasks and resources has in general been justified in a realistic way to achieve the project goals, but the scheduling of Task 1.1 may be tight considering that other experiments in the project depend on this result
- The allocation of resources is efficient and adequate to reach the objectives of the project. The person-months allocated to the task are commensurate with the amount of work involved in each task.
- The description of the experimental activities and their execution consolidates their feasibility in the time frame of the project.
- The tasks are appropriately allocated and properly resourced, with preliminary work on all three work packages already complete.
- The allocation of tasks and resources is organized aiming at time optimization and in an appropriate manner for the research objectives to be achieved. It would allow the researcher to have training activities, to pursue the research program and to disseminate the project outcomes.
- The proposal contains a convincing explanation of the appropriateness of the person-months allocated

to the research, e.g. explaining that the survey has already been produced thereby reducing time required

- The **allocation of resources** is clearly realistic and appropriate
- Specific supervisors have been allocated to each WP, which seems appropriate for the proposed work and reduces the risk of failure.
- The **resources** are allocated correctly

Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures, including risk management (organisation and management structure, research and/or administrative risks etc.)

- The **organization and management structures** are convincing and very well designed.
- Possible **risks** are well identified. **The mitigation measures** are convincing.
- The project includes a robust and appropriate **management structure**.
- Project planning properly takes into account measures to allow for unexpected delays.
- **Management** is reinforced by inclusion of a specific WP to this effect including progress monitoring meetings. **Project management** will be assisted by the infrastructural mechanisms available for visiting researchers at the host institute
- Some possible **risks** endangering the completion of the project are identified and contingency plans are established
- **Management of the project** by the host is appropriate and includes, face to face meetings of the researcher with the supervisor and Lab members and critical discussion of research outcomes in lab meetings
- A **risk analysis** has been performed and detailed contingency plans to mitigate the identified risks, is identified
- The proposal clearly identifies the key members of the host institution to ensure close progress monitoring. Meetings with the host supervisor are also well described and appropriate.
- The **management structure** is adequately described.
- The project clearly addresses the **organization and management** structure supporting its implementation
- The proposal clearly mentions regular meetings with the supervisor to monitor progress
- The host company has appropriate procedures in place **to manage the financial aspects** of the action.
- The host company has **transparent management structures** and well-coordinated **progress-monitoring mechanisms**. For example, the responsibilities for different aspects of the action are well defined and assigned to different personnel appropriately. The reporting line, as well as the frequency of the meetings, are clearly presented
- Perceived project risks are outlined and reasonable **contingency strategies** are identified.
- **Management structure** is well planned and explained. A set of periodic meetings and lab meetings with supervisors and teams at the host institutions is established, as well as frequent exchange of information with the supervisor and team to monitor results
- The proposals for the **management and monitoring** of the project are clear and appropriate, including weekly supervision
- Enough expertise in **project management** at the host has been allocated to this research.
- **The management structure** has been elaborated well and in detail. Milestones will be properly checked on regular bases, the budget will be managed by the applicant and the grant administrator in well balanced level.
- Since this is a small SME, then it was considered that this should greatly facilitate the **management** of the researcher and their work.
- The planned **management and administrative procedures** are very well described and adequate to support the researcher and the project
- The **risk analysis, including the risk management options**, are convincingly described and are appropriate for the project.
- The **risk management plan** is satisfactory as it includes major technical and organizational risks and mitigation plans.
- The **administrative management of the project** and the **progress-tracking mechanisms** are well elaborated, and the staff who will aid in these aspects are clearly identified
- The **management structures and procedures** are well presented and appropriate for the project. A management board at the host institution will be established to monitor the project progress. The researcher will oversee and manage the financial part of the project with guidance and help from the

management board.

- Potential **research and operational risks** have been appropriately identified and a good mitigation plan has been elaborated
- The **management** of the proposed research is adequately outlined with regard to the supervision and progress **monitoring facilitating** the researcher's integration within the team of the host institution.
- **Risk management** is well addressed, including mitigation measures
- The proposal appropriately identifies key risks and sets out credible responses to each.
- **Management structures** and procedures are well addressed
- **Progress monitoring** will be conducted via biweekly scheduled meetings with the supervisor.
- No **risk** associated with financial and legal stability are anticipated since the beneficiary is an established big pharmaceutical company with Financial and administrative aspects of the project handled by the designated Human Resources, Communication and Legal departments specialists within the company.
- **Administrative management** will be carried out at the host institution by a specialized office experienced in EU projects. Scientific management is clearly described with appropriate arrangements at both the host and secondment institutions.
- The **management structure** is quite simple, but overall well conceived. An effective monitoring of the project is convincingly argued.
- The **management structure** is well suited to monitor the progress of the project and to take actions if serious deviations from the work plan arise. A minimal number of risks has been taken into consideration and an adequate response to them is delivered and taken into account. The **monitoring mechanisms** are adequately described
- The **management structure** is commonplace, yet adequate. Progress monitoring mechanisms are based on regular meetings with supervisors and are suitable for the proposed research.
- Possible **risks** endangering a successful completion of the project are identified, and relevant contingency plans and risk **mitigation measures** are established.
- **Standard management procedures** involving the supervisor, the researcher and the host group are in place to guarantee an adequate monitoring of project implementation toward the final goals.
- The management structure is insufficiently demonstrated. It lacks specific details regarding management body, procedures and arrangements. Progress monitoring mechanisms are not described.
- Risk **management strategy** is not fully developed. It does not consider many organisational and technical risks which may influence successful completion of the proposed project.
- **Progress-monitoring** is well described. The measures for project oversight are well-planned through a credible plan that includes weekly reports, daily plan of the researcher's activities and short meetings with the supervisor.
- A well elaborated **management structure** is provided. The researcher will be trained to manage the project with the supervisor through regular meetings at every two months. The management plan includes data management, the **IPR strategy**, the adoption **of mitigation strategies**, and reports validation.
- There is a clear and appropriate **management structure**, with a transparent division of tasks and responsibilities.
- There is a **detailed risk management strategy** in place, with a credible contingency plan and appropriate **risk mitigation strategy**
- The procedures of **project management** are described appropriately, the proposal contains a convincing explanation of the management structure (including advisory team), dedicated support (for administrative, financial and communications/media) and progress monitoring procedures that would assist in achieving the research objectives
- There will be regularly weekly/monthly discussions on the project work, which will give appropriate feedback to the researcher
- The monthly meetings and daily communications are envisaged, as well as contacts with the supervisors and the partners.
- The **organization and management structures** are convincing and very well designed.
- The analysis of scientific and technological risks is realistic and appropriate contingency plans are proposed.
- The simple but clear **management** of the research activity is appropriate.
- The host's **intellectual property rights management structure** is appropriate for the project.
- The **management structure** is clearly articulated and well balanced regarding the nature of the proposed actions.

- The analysis of **scientific and technological risks** is realistic and appropriate contingency plans are proposed.
- The host's **intellectual property rights management structure** is appropriate for the project.
- The **management structure** is clearly articulated and well balanced regarding the nature of the proposed actions.

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

- The **infrastructure** in the host institution is appropriate and well suited to the objectives
- The involvement of the **host's top level management** demonstrates strong commitment of the host to achieve the objectives of the action.
- The applicant and participating institutions offer large experimental and intellectual resources that are useful and correct for pursuing the project goals.
- The appropriateness of the **infrastructure** to house dolphins is evident: the host institution is shown to have best infrastructure and resources to study captive dolphins in Europe, and so implementation of the research is highly assured in this sense.
- The proposal clearly describes the tasks of **the host** as facilitator of the action in giving access to the institution and to potential collaborators, as well as demonstrating the commitments of the host.
- The **host institution** and supervisor's lab demonstrate clear commitment to the project and to the training of the researcher
- **Infrastructure** of the host institution is clearly specified and sufficient
- **The infrastructure** of the host institution is well matched with the proposal and suitable for the execution of the project.
- **The host institution** provides a valuable working environment: in addition to the supervisor, other researchers will help the candidate in designing some experiments required.
- There is a sound combination at the **host institution** between research and the private sectors.
- The **main host** and the **secondment institution** have full-range infrastructures, covering all the candidate needs for the project development
- The host organization has a long track-record in hosting (inter)national researchers.
- The **host company** has all the required equipment and infrastructure, enabling the researcher to achieve the proposal objectives.
- The **host company** has a specialized business development and communication office.
- The applicant will be well integrated into a small **team of research scientists** at the host company and will be able to develop further networks within the broader local campus context and beyond.
- The **host institution** has dedicated staff to help the researcher with the administrative issues and the logistics of settling into the host's city.
- The active contribution of **the host organization** to the research and training activities is sufficiently demonstrated. The infrastructure and facilities offered at the host organization for the good implementation of the project are demonstrated
- The **host institution** and partner have good expertise in the study area of the project. The host will provide a good scientific surrounding and the institutional infrastructures, adequate equipment and facilities to the project completion (e.g. sequencing equipment, software tools) are very good.
- The **host institution** and the scientific as well the administrative environment of the host institution are most appropriate for the work on the proposed project, The host has an appropriate experience, facilities and infrastructure to successfully reach the project objectives.
- The applicant critically plans sufficient time frames for possible delays in regard to searching for suitable sample in biobank and related patients' data in databases as well as obtaining permission to obtain fresh patient samples depending on strong administration support of host institution.
- The **infrastructure** of the institution is fully appropriate and relevant to aims of planned research and achieving the results
- The beneficiary's active contribution to the research and training objectives is evidenced by providing the most appropriate infrastructure and support for the implementation of the fellowship.
- **The host institute** provides a suitable environment and infrastructure to potentially develop a novel diagnostic test
- The **host institute** provides an excellent environment and infrastructures for this research project and the secondment will take place in an environment with additionally needed infrastructure
- The **infrastructures** available at the host are of good quality and are sufficient to implement the research tasks

- The project will use state-of-the-art modern study and research facilities for various technical actions, such as improved sample preparation and development of microfluidic POC devices.
- The infrastructures of the institutions that will host the fellowship are very good and correspond to the needs of the project
- The proposal demonstrates appropriately the active contribution of the host to the research and training activities
- The necessary infrastructure, logistics and facilities are satisfactorily ensured by the host
- The host organization has some prospective facilities that are relevant to the project implementation. The host and partner institutions would provide the main infrastructure and support to the researcher.
- Feasibility evidence of the experimental setups described in methodology has already been established
- The experienced researcher will have the opportunity to follow the study from the beginning and to interact with the different units
- The host is a major pharma company with is of very high quality, with state of the art equipment and facilities.
- The laboratory designated to inkjet printing is already established with appropriate equipment for the 3D printer to accommodate specific experimental set-ups, or are being developed and set in place with the necessary assistance team
- Both the host and secondment institutions have the necessary facilities for running the project, including molecular biology, microbiology, microscopy and computing
- The host's infrastructure and facilities are appropriate and highly relevant to the project's requirements
- The proposal clearly shows that the institutional environment fits the proposed action very well. The hosting institution possesses all infrastructure, facilities and organizational capacity that are needed to carry out the project and reach its objectives.
- There is the commitment of the supervisors during all phases of the project
- The infrastructures and services to implement the project are sufficiently described and available for the researcher. The host has appropriate lab facilities for the proposed research, including for microfluidic/flow control instrument development and soft lithography facilities for microfluidic device fabrication
- The host is fully committed to provide active contribution to project activities.
- The role and active involvement of the partner institution hosting the secondment is also clearly motivated.
- The beneficiary's active contribution to the research and training activities is not fully presented in the project. It is not clear how much time will be dedicated to this project
- The technological and academic environment in part created by the host institution and in part by its collaborating academic institution are most appropriate for the proposed project. With an impetuous annual turnover, the host institution credibly shows its involvement for providing proper infrastructure of the project.
- The host company is well equipped to carry out the majority of the R&D activities and is committed to offer the necessary logistics, facilities, collaborating partners and scientific expertise for the proper implementation of the proposal.
- The host infrastructures are of high quality and very effective for a sound project
- The proposal identifies a very good contribution of the host organisation to the research and training activities and clearly presents the tasks of the two organisations showing their commitment with the proposed research programme.
- Both host and secondment organisations are extremely resourceful and experienced in providing an appropriate institutional environment, and would contribute actively to the success of the research by providing an appropriate training programme, research facilities and access to educators and learners. Implementation and to give a solid research training experience to the researcher.
- The host company will provide a very good logistical environment, with all the necessary administrative and technical support for the implementation of research.
- The proposal coherently outlines the beneficiary's active contribution to the research activities, including the description of the main tasks and commitments.
- The institutional facilities are excellent for the research purpose. Both Institutions offer a very good and multidisciplinary environment to implement the project.
- A broad network and collaborations of the company with world agro-industries, farmers, consumer associations and research institutions will allow the successful project execution and knowledge transfer among sectors.

Weaknesses:

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

- The content of the **work plan** is too generic which damages project credibility.
- The **deliverables** are not elaborated in detail.
- The **secondment schedule** and duration is not properly elaborated, for instance concerning the secondment period for the completion of WP4 which is underestimated.
- **WP1** is inappropriately long, reflecting the lack of proper planning in the project. In contrast, time allocation for core activities in WP2 and
- **WP3** are underestimated, particularly for complex nanomaterials.
- **Work package titles** are not provided in the description of the **work plan**. Although a global overview of each work package is described, insufficient detail is provided on the specific tasks that constitute the individual work packages.
- **The Gantt chart** is overly general and it does not sufficiently exemplify in detail some elements such as data collection and data transcription.
- **The work plan** and training schedule lack details. Furthermore, data analysis time is not clearly stated, while the six months required to write a manuscript is excessive and not explained.
- The **amount of person-months** for the host team in relation to the activities proposed is not clearly described.
- **The WPs** lack the necessary detail concerning when the analysis of results from the fieldwork would take place.
- The **work plan** is overly simplified with **just two WPs**.
- The proposal fails in addressing the **amount of person-month** in relation to proposed activities.
- The frequency of dissemination and exploitation activities is not adequately reported in the **Gantt Chart**.
- The **work plan** is not always adequately associated with the activities described. For example, WP2, from month 7 to 20 is dedicated to training and education, but the corresponding specific activities are not convincingly illustrated.
- The **Gantt chart** does not always fit the description of the **work packages**. For example, WP1.4 is only present in the Gantt chart.
- The **work plan** presents some incoherence such as the dissemination actions, which will occur ahead of the milestone M4 WP5 concerning the IP
- The description of the **work plan** is fair with no apparent intermediate milestones or check points for at least some of the research goals. The **deliverables** are not adequately described
- The timeline for the **work packages** is inappropriate, with excess focus on bibliographic search on state-of-the-art issues and well established experimental processes for the preparation of graphene oxide. The **amount of person-months** is unrealistic and inappropriate, spending excessive time on known processes.
- **Lists of milestones and deliverables** are presented in generic fashion.
- The presented **work-plan** is lacking clarity. For example, individual tasks, milestones and also deliverables have not been clearly identified.
- The **Gantt chart** is very poorly designed and not sufficiently informative.
- There is insufficient justification for the time allocations, for instance for Work Package 2 and for communication activities
- The **Gantt chart** mentions 5 WPs, but only 3 of them are described in the proposal (Criterion 1), information for WP4 and WP5 is lacking; the
- **Gantt Chart does** not clearly address project management, training and transfer knowledge periods, and public engagement either.
- **Insufficient attention** has been paid to the scaling up processes, in the way from the miniaturized device to a larger prototype delivering fuel from sunlight and CO₂. For example, milestones regarding the collection of the reaction product, the management of the device wastes, the turnover of live cells and of magnetic particles, have not been included in the **work plan**.
- WP3 includes the help of other unnamed person (technician, experienced postdoc or PhD student), but does not sufficiently explain the appropriateness of the inclusion of these extra personnel. The role of other members of the R&D team, besides the P.I., has not been adequately addressed either

- The attached Gantt chart unclearly locates the beginning of work package 1 and 3.
- The technological milestones indicated are not clearly defined. Deliverables are largely missing thereby reducing the credibility of the implementation plan
- The work plan lacks in detail with respect to allocating the experimental design and deriving tasks to the individual work packages. In this respect the effectiveness of the work plan is not adequately documented
- No deliverable is associated to the in-beam portable prototype which represents the end-product of the project.
- The proposal fails to correctly describe its work packages so coherence and effectiveness of the work plan is difficult to evaluate.
- The project milestones and deliverables are not clearly defined.
- The proposed number of WPs and tasks is excessive for the scope of the project. WP3-WP10 are not sufficiently detailed.
- The proposed time allocation has not been shown to be realistic. For example, WP3 and WP4 that address synthesis and characterization of new adducts of natural products are planned to run only for 2 months and the time allocated to WP7 (test of the cytotoxicity effect of the compounds) and WP8 (computational studies and modelling) is only one month for each.
- The work plan description lacks implementation details in the training portion
- Resources allocated in the work packages do not match the ones in the Gantt chart.
- The Gantt Chart, WPs, Milestones and Deliverables do not indicate, which viral and bacterial infections will be diagnosed with the new POC devices, what kind of diagnostic panels (and when) will be developed for the rapid diagnosis of viral and bacterial diseases.
- Insufficient explanation is provided about how the work packages mutually relate.
- There is insufficient consideration of activity scheduling. Thus for instance, some of the milestones do not appear in the Gantt chart (only M1 until M5 are in the Gantt chart).
- The work plan is insufficiently elaborated. The work packages have no clear topic-specified content, their titles are vague and the explanations of logic behind the work plan inadequate. Deliverables are not explained in any greater detail.
- A very basic and simple work plan is presented, lacking many details and therefore insufficiently described.
- It is unclear why a relation to animal experiments and in vivo testing are given, but do not appear in the WPs. It is not described in sufficient detail by whom those experiments will be done.
- The provided Gantt chart is not very readable and does not show well the parallel tasks.
- The work plan is not sound enough, it is unclear how results from individual work packages will influence each other.
- Important aspects, e.g. the characterization of mixed populations/biofilms, are not addressed in adequate detail.
- Planned deliverables are absent.
- The time allocation to the various tasks in the Gantt chart is insufficiently detailed to assess the feasibility of implementing the project within its proposed lifetime
- The work package "Training, dissemination" does not explicitly include task for training. Consequently, training is not included in the Gantt chart.
- The work plan is vaguely described and is not fully consistent with the research objectives. The list of deliverables and milestones is not clearly explained in the work plan.
- The milestone defined for WP 2 is not clearly formulated. Therefore, this milestone does not efficiently help in monitoring the achievement of project goals.
- The work plan is not clearly written and the description of the WPs is vague. For example, it is not evident which material is proposed to be used for the microchip construct to achieve the thermal balance in the two-layer microfluidic chip (WP3).
- The details provided on the development of a multimodal neurofeedback system are insufficient to ensure the effectiveness of the work plan
- The work plan does not explain the break during the 11-17 months period in the proposal.
- The secondment is not sufficiently detailed, its timing is not clearly specified and is not included in the Gantt Chart.
- The work plan as well as the Gantt chart lack sufficient focus on management and training issues, which may have negative impact on the proper execution of the project.
- The support of an assistant speaking the local language is planned, but the potential problems concerning the collaboration with an interpreter lack sufficient detail in the proposal

- **Deliverables** are indicated in the Gantt chart but are not detailed in the text. As such, it is impossible to judge their appropriateness.
- Some significant activities, such as the final advertising campaign and validation through comparison with other methods, are not properly reflected in the **Gantt chart**.
- The training activities are not developed in sufficient detail in the **work plan**.
- The implementation of the proposed **secondments** and site visits is not explained in sufficient details, especially with regard to their coherence.
- The feasibility to produce the relatively high number **of deliverables** during the project period is not convincingly demonstrated.
- The description of three **research oriented WPs** addressing three completely different research questions requiring different methodological skills is not sufficiently detailed, the coherence and feasibility of these WPs are not sufficiently considered.
- It is not satisfactorily demonstrated, how the **work planning** and the resources to be mobilised will ensure that the research and training objectives are achieved.
- The **milestones** are not adequate to the project, e.g. M2 - 1st year report, M4- 2nd year report.
- The project has insufficient information regarding the timing and period envisioned to conduct fieldwork in each of the six countries.

Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources

- The proposal falls short in fully detailing the allocation **of tasks** as a clear description of it is missing. Furthermore, the resources haven't been effectively allocated to the different tasks; indeed the proposal doesn't precisely address this aspect.
- The description of the appropriateness of the **allocation of tasks and resources** is insufficient, and fails to adequately clarify the allocation of effort to each scientific work package or the timeframe presented. Insufficient justification is provided to ensure that the highly ambitious goals of the proposal can be completed during the duration of the project.
- The three-month, continuous, time-frame allocated for conference attendance is too long.
- A second period to be spent at the secondment host indicated in the 19th month lacks sufficient explanation.
- The researcher's responsibility will be mostly on WP2, but the role of the researcher on the remaining WPs is not sufficiently elaborated.
- The exact involvement of academic personnel at the secondment institution on CRISPR/Cas9 is not convincingly described in the proposal.
- It is not clear how **tasks and resources** will be allocated. For instance, it is not indicated how the chemical library will be acquired, what will be its size and how it can be effectively screened within the time frame of the project.
- **Allocation of financial and human resources** have not been described in sufficient detail. For example, the amount of human resources allocated to each task is not discussed or presented adequately. This information is crucial to understand the feasibility of the proposed work plan.
- **Allocation of tasks and resources** has not been properly detailed. There is no sufficient indication of specific person-months allocation to most activities proposed.
- The specific contribution and role of other team members (aside from the two scientists-in-charge) that may be needed to support the proposed project are not clearly described.
- **Allocation of tasks is unclear**. For instance, it is not clear where mentioned courses will take place and who will teach them. Finally, as described, the project will rely on third parties for resources, such entities are not partners in this project and the availability of these resources is not fully justified.
- The **resources** of the present proposal are underestimated. The amount of time allocated to each of the task is not proportional to their complexity. Furthermore, there is a high number of tasks. The fellow runs the risk of overcommitting.
- The **amount of work envisioned** will clearly exceed the duration of the fellowship. The time to code and analyze the data from interviews is not sufficiently considered, and the complexity of the communication tool development process is severely underestimated.
- There is inappropriate **allocation of tasks and resources** with regard to testing of clinical samples, obtained during various viral and bacterial diseases. Neither clinical sample panels, nor sufficient controls (positive, negative, weak positive, etc., with known copy numbers of targeted pathogens or their nucleic acids) are selected and allocated to the R&D work in this proposal.
- Exact **estimation of person-months** for various work processes is not provided making it difficult to

assess the appropriateness and allocation of tasks.

- The proposal does not adequately reflect the **amount of time and person months** needed for the deliverables.
- The description of **tasks related** to collaborative activities entailing the participation of members of various groups has not been sufficiently described.
- **Resources allocated to** the design of an online platform are not comprehensively presented, e.g., the selection of the themes for the content of the online platform.
- The **allocation of resources and tasks** is not explained in a coherent fashion. Some areas of costs (e.g. time effort, pencils) require further explanation. No real justification is provided regarding the **person-months** related to the different tasks of the project. There is not enough evidence on how the resources mobilized would ensure that the research objectives would be reached, e.g. it is not quite feasible to develop a research plan and improve the time series methodology at the same time.
- **Training tasks** and appropriate courses have not been described in sufficient detail in relation to the overall work plan.
- The **allocation of tasks and resources** is vaguely addressed in the proposal, remaining unclear why many tasks run in parallel.
- The **number of person-months** required is underestimated regarding the number of analyses foreseen, on top of all the other work demanded by the project
- The **allocation of the tasks** and the **corresponding number of person-months** to the researcher and supervisor are not sufficiently justified. For instance, the high involvement of the supervisor in terms of person-months is not convincing in view of the tasks allocated to them.
- The proposal insufficiently describes to what extent persons other than the researcher would be involved in the recruitment of subjects and data collection. For example, the feasibility of the recruitment and data collection of the large number of subjects requested for WP2 and WP3 is insufficiently addressed.
- The **appropriateness of the resources allocation** is not described in sufficient detail and it does not convince on the project's feasibility. In particular resources dedicated to the demanding prototype up-scaling (WP3) are not convincingly adequate
- The **specific tasks** that are required to develop the prototype are not clearly defined (particularly for WP3 and WP4).
- There is insufficient detail presented in the proposal regarding **how tasks will be allocated**, and in particular which tasks will be the responsibility of the researcher and how the researcher will be trained prior to the development of a new hardware/software system.
- There is little information on the **contribution and resources available in the secondment institute**
- The proposal does not allocate the support and training responsibilities for specific research tasks to dedicated members of the host team.
- The proposal does not demonstrate sufficient funds and **human resources** to support the research actions during the current fellowship
- It is not possible to assess whether the research and training objectives will be achieved due to insufficient information regarding the implementation plan and task descriptions.
- The **allocation of time** to different tasks is unclear
- Despite the ambition of evaluating programme's impact on community, there are not adequate **resources allocated** to this. As data collection is overwhelmingly centred on learners and educators, the action cannot reach viable results on community impact, as intended.
- The proposal fails to clearly achieve an appropriate **allocation of time** to the proposed activities, thus affecting negatively the feasibility and credibility of the planned research
- The **allocation of tasks and resources** for training and progress monitoring is not described in sufficient detail. There is inadequate time factored in for the background knowledge synthesis on benchmarking, data collection, interviewing, qualitative analysis, transcribing, and report writing. The project time frame is likely to be too short for the planned impact assessment.
- The availability of **adequate resources to cover the cost of proposed activities** (e.g. travels, data collection, interview analysis, dissemination workshops) is not adequately explained.
- The specific resources necessary for the project execution, planned person-months in each activity and financial management of the project to ensure reaching expected outcomes are not clearly described
- The **allocation of time for academic publications** is inappropriate (1 month each for article and e-book is unrealistic).
- There is a very limited and unconvincing discussion on how resources will be mobilised to ensure that the research and training objectives will be achieved

- The efficiency and credibility of the project is jeopardized by not choosing target chemicals and materials in advance and dedicating first six months of the project duration for these activities.
- Time allocation for core activities is underestimated, particularly for complex nanomaterials.
- The allocation of manpower and infrastructure to work packages is not adequately specified. It is thus not sufficiently clear how the planned work will be achieved.
- The tasks are briefly and inadequately explained and the resources allocation is missing, other than in the Gantt chart and then only for technical tasks and without explanation.
- The allocation of tasks and resources for particular project participants is not fully clear. The proposal does not clearly define the main tasks and commitments of the partners involved in the proposed action.
- Appropriateness of the person-months in relation to the planned activities is not convincingly explained

Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures, including risk management (organisation and management structure, research and/or administrative risks etc.)

- Risk management related procedures have been addressed to a very limited extent and a list of sound contingency plans is missing.
- The management structures and procedures are addressed to a very limited extent, a sound comprehensive description is lacking in the proposal
- Monthly progress meetings are envisaged, which is not regular enough to address difficulties in short work packages.
- The researcher is insufficiently involved in the scientific and project management.
- A risk assessment and mitigation plans are provided, although there are additional risks in terms of project planning which have not been duly considered
- Insufficient scientific risk assessment and contingency planning is provided
- Risks concerning technical failures are not addressed in detail. For example, data damage is not sufficiently considered
- The proposal does not clearly describe how management structures of the host and the project will interact for monitoring the progress of the project, and precisely how the host will supervise and train the researcher (specific tasks and timing).
- The researcher is aware of the possible risks in WP 2 and 3 and has contingency plans to minimize them, however risks or contingencies have not been properly anticipated for WP1 or WP4.
- The section does not adequately identify risks. That is extremely implausible, and shows a lack of understanding of the potential pitfalls and dangers of conducting fundamental social-science inquiry on such a sensitive topic as the prevention of violent extremism and in relation to fieldwork activities. It does not identify a contingency plan.
- Procedures for managing and monitoring are insufficiently developed; only bimonthly meetings are specifically fixed.
- Risks are underestimated as, for example, the risk that infection experiments fail is estimated as low and that protocols are published
- The proposal does not appropriately consider the possibility that legal protection of findings will be delayed or very complicated.
- Unlike administrative, scientific risk analysis with mitigation strategies and measures, is not convincingly described. For instance, WP1 aims to find alternative bio-compatible polymers for the chip mold. However, the risk assessment of not finding such polymers including the accompanying mitigation measures, is not evident
- The contingency plan to overcome risks that may arise is of poor quality, failing to provide specific measures as alternatives to reach the objectives and goals of the project
- Potential risks have not been sufficiently anticipated. Scientific risks that may endanger the progress of the project have only partially been addressed.
- Contingency strategies have not been addressed in sufficient detail.
- The discussion of risk management does not sufficiently address a number of important issues, such as accessing research subjects in other countries and reliance on volunteer translators
- The risk analysis is weak as it concerns only two WPs. In particular, potential risk and the contingency economical plan (the impact on the overall cost production) in case of risk 2 is not convincingly addressed. The risk management related to developing a working solar energy harvesting prototype has not been convincingly addressed. The risk of contamination from previous samples as well as various cleaning and packaging schemes fails to be considered.
- The practical arrangements for successful implementation of the project are not sufficiently outlined

- The risks addressed in the risk management were considered to be only superficially addressed and did not fully consider all risks.
- If a patent is applied for, the risk that publications may be delayed is not sufficiently taken into account or discussed.
- The project management scheme within the group is not sufficiently discussed
- The proposal fails to identify an own appropriate management structure. As presented, it simply delegates management to a related project
- The description of progress monitoring is generic, concerning feed-back and reporting strategies
- The management plan does not include clear description of overall responsibility for the planned project activities. The proposal provides insufficient information regarding the progress monitoring mechanisms and quality assurance procedures. The proposal does not adequately address the risks involved. All risks are associated with the members of the management team, but not with the nature of the research project. Risk management plan is not comprehensive enough
- The risk management plan is difficult to be evaluated as no detail on the real work and the type of compounds to be printed is given and has insufficient details to understand if the risks can be mitigated.
- The proposal refers to limitations due to animal welfare regulations and the risk mitigation strategy described in the proposal does not provide sufficient details. Animal validation will be key for the validity of the approach.
- It is not discussed how this new approach will fit into the main strategy of the company, as it is not funded internally.
- The management structure and procedures are not suitably revealed.
- Risk analysis and contingency planning are insufficiently addressed. For instance, inadequate consideration is given to the variable characteristics of the wastewater to be treated.
- Only one of the addressed potential risks is connected with the research. The proposed mitigation measures for the stated risks are not sufficiently concrete.
- The management structure is not clearly shown. There is insufficient explanation of the means of communication of the supervisors involved in monitoring the project progress, or the timing and frequency of group laboratory meetings
- Although few technical risks are considered and the scientific risks have been identified, the mitigation plan is only superficially describe
- The strategies for managing the risks mentioned are insufficiently detailed, e.g. use of novel algorithms to improve signal to noise.
- Further management structures, e.g. with respect to administration and integration of the researcher, are briefly depicted but inappropriately confounded with facilities and infrastructure.
- The proposal fails in providing a thorough risk analysis, especially for the transcriptome analysis and genome editing tasks. E.g. the case that many differentially expressed genes are identified, or the case that transcriptome analysis fails to yield any candidate for the genome editing task, and pitfalls in the validation phase are not sufficiently considered
- Monitoring of the work progress is not clearly described. The host does not have an organized managerial structure to continuously monitor the progress of work packages and it is indicated that the proper functioning of the proposal will depend on the researcher's prior autonomy.
- The role of the supervisor in the work is not convincingly demonstrated. A system for mentoring by the supervisor has not been elaborated.
- The proposal fails to present a realistic analysis of the research risks.
- The proposal does not engage in a cogent discussion of possible risks, with the necessary level of detail. Insufficient information is provided in the proposal on risks that threaten achievement of the research objectives, and their contingency plans.
- The risk management table provides only a broad overview of risks that may impact on the achievement of the project outcomes.
- The risks related to the data collection for benchmarking including delays/disruption due to travelling and secondments are underestimated.
- The risks related to the supervisory board structure representing different institutes and responsible for different aspects of the project, which could undermine the coherence and effectiveness of its implementation, are not adequately considered
- The management structure and procedures are insufficiently specified for the coordination activities and responsibilities of the involved personnel in execution of the project tasks.
- The administrative management of the action is not described in necessary detail.
- The research and administrative risks are not convincingly addressed, for a project depending on data

collected from countries with few open databases, and since the potential contingency plan for the Belarus case has been working for more than a decade outside of the country, consequently, its representativeness is not convincingly established.

- Coordination of activities among the different supervisors is not sufficiently explained and communication and conflict resolution mechanisms are not well defined.
- The proposal does not include a convincing **risk assessment** or contingency plans, although there are numerous risks for the project.
- The researcher has underestimated the difficulties that could arise in the acquisition of data for validation (e.g. inadequacy of the existing database, difficulties about obtaining and integrating the satellite data, etc.)
- The proposal includes only a minimal description of **the project coordination structure** and does not sufficiently define the **management procedures** and **the progress-monitoring** mechanisms that ensure objectives are reached.
- **Contingency planning is perfunctory**. Few of the potential risks are not properly mitigated. For example, the comment on field trials absolutely does not address the risk of poor R&D results. In addition, the confidentiality of deliverables is not fully detailed.
- **Risk management** is listed, but this is not sufficiently detailed as the proposal sees the project as a low-risk one, and a detailed contingency plan is missing.
- **Coordination of activities** among the different supervisors is not sufficiently explained and communication and conflict resolution mechanisms are not well defined.
- The proposal does not include a convincing risk assessment or contingency plans, although there are numerous risks for the project.

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

- Insufficient information is given regarding the applicant **institutional environment** and **infrastructure**. Infrastructure and institutional environment at the secondment site is not described.
- It is insufficiently clarified why the use of **equipment** in an institute that is not included as a project partner will be necessary, as the proposal states that this equipment is to be made available at the secondment host
- The **logistics of access to the available facilities** in the partner institute is not explained in sufficient detail.
- The **scientific quality of the institutional environment** is not sufficiently explained, and so there is a lack of detail on, for example, statistical tools and other scientific/technical support to be made available at the host institution to assist the research.
- There is insufficient discussion of the provision by the beneficiary of essential **research infrastructure such as access to academic library facilities**.
- The **host organization experience** supporting international postdoctoral fellows is not sufficiently described.
- The proposal considers very little interaction with other people in the labs or offices (e.g. technicians, students).
- The appropriateness of the **institutional environment** is not adequately documented. Although it appears to be a dynamic SME environment, its appropriateness assessed on the basis of the requirements for virology and molecular analysis does not correspond fully to the requirements of the project.
- Given that some of the techniques the researcher is bringing represent a novel component to the SME, it is not clear that the host has all requisite **equipment** available, either presently or via partners.
- The **host infrastructure** and logistic is poorly described. The host does not have the appropriate infrastructure to carry out some of the proposed activities. For the latter, it relies on third parties, who are not part of this effort and have not made any demonstrated commitment to assisting the fellow.
- Insufficient **conditions and facilities** (host institute facilities or supporting collaboration network) are described concerning the aspects of microbiology, such as experience in diagnosis of viral and bacterial diseases, availability of necessary test panels, controls, conditions of validation, etc.
- The availability of the entire **infrastructure** required to undertake the project has not been fully demonstrated
- It has not been justified how the researcher will be assisted in the administrative and financial aspects during the fellowship.

(SE Panel)

- The **infrastructure** to be used at the host is not clearly presented, e.g., library, archives, etc. It is also not sufficiently clarified, whether the host institution is committed to provide any infrastructure required specifically to the proposed research (e.g. workspace).
- Insufficient information is provided about the connections with a broader research environment that the researcher will enjoy
- The **host's infrastructure** and **technical equipment** relevant to the implementation of the project are lacking detail.
- It is unclear to what extent the researcher will receive support from the host institution's technical staff
- There is insufficient information on the availability of **facilities** for the in vitro studies
- Details of the **facilities and equipment** that are relevant to the proposed research are missing.
- Not all steps of the research actions are feasible in the host lab and it is not specified, if the infrastructure is available for all key methods.
- **The infrastructure** for biological and chemical preparation and THz spectroscopy are not described in enough depth to allow their appropriateness to be judged
- No concrete commitment to the social and out-of-work needs of the researcher or even in terms of broader scientific interests are made.
- **Logistics in terms of accommodation, health care, and suchlike** are not elaborated.
- There is a lack of information concerning tasks and commitments of the partner organization.
- Allocation of **equipment in independent facilities** available on the premises of the beneficiary is mentioned, but not clearly demonstrated.
- The main tasks of beneficiary and partners are not described in detail, e.g. the active contribution of the **host institution** to the training activities is not sufficiently addressed, nor the interaction processes between the different partners