

# Marie Curie Individual Fellowships

Jean Provost

Marie Curie Postdoctoral Fellow, Institut Langevin, ESCPI,  
INSERM, France

# Deux Soumissions de Projet

- Marie Curie International Incoming Fellowship
  - Finance la venue en Europe d'un non-Européen pendant 2 ans.
  - Score: 97/100 (2011, financé)
- Marie Curie CIG
  - Finance l'établissement en Europe d'un non-Européen pendant de 2 à 4 ans.
  - Score: 83.2/100 (2013, non-financé)

# Structure

- B1 Research and Technological Quality
- B2 Transfer of knowledge
- B3 Researcher
- B4 Implementation
- B5 Impact

## Objectif général et objectifs spécifiques

Problème de société

Limitations du 'State-of-the-Art'

Approche proposée

- Mise en valeur du labo et de l'applicant

Méthodologie proposée en 2 ou 3 sous-objectifs en crescendo:

- 1) Développement (physique, électronique)
- 2) Validation (biologie, pré-clinique)
- 3) Application (faisabilité, adaptabilité)

Hypothèse, Défi, Approche, Impact

## Impact

Si tout fonctionne comme prévu, comment est-ce que le problème identifié au premier paragraphe sera réglé?

## **Background and Significance**

- Résumé des connaissances nécessaires pour comprendre le problème.
- Description du state-of-the-art pour chacune des techniques proposées  
(Bonne section pour mettre en valeur les contributions du chercheur et du labo d'accueil).
- Impact scientifique / académique

Reprendre tous les objectifs spécifiques et décrire dans le détails comment ils seront atteints.

# Marie Curie IIF

- B1 Research and Technological Quality
- B2 Transfer of knowledge
- B3 Researcher
- B4 Implementation
- B5 Impact

# Marie Curie IIF

- **B1 Research and Technological Quality (5/5)**

- The proposal is excellent with a clear clinical impact. The research and technological quality is very high, original, timely and relevant to the field.

- Multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary aspects of the proposal are very good.

- It comprehensively analyses the problem, provides means to address it with appropriate methodology and approach.

- State-of-the-art is art is deeply covered with proven and updated references. The relationship to the state of the art, timeliness and relevance is well described.

- The host and supervisors demonstrate excellence.

- B2 Transfer of knowledge

- B3 Researcher

- B4 Implementation

- B5 Impact



# Marie Curie IIF

- B1 Research and Technological Quality (5/5)
- **B2 Transfer of knowledge (4.8/5)**

Strengths:

- The proposed research program provides a good basis for the transfer of knowledge.
- Transfer of knowledge is consistent with the research programme and is articulated with the intersectorial activities.

Weaknesses:

- Exploitation of knowledge transfer between public and private sectors is too briefly described.

- B3 Researcher
- B4 Implementation
- B5 Impact

# Marie Curie IIF

- B1 Research and Technological Quality (5/5)
- B2 Transfer of knowledge (4.8/5)
- **B3 Researcher (4.9/5)**

Strengths:

- The research experience is extensive and extremely well suited for the project.
  - The research results are impressive for a PhD student.
  - Independent thinking, leadership qualities and capacity of transfer knowledge are well demonstrated.
  - The CV of the applicant and the match between the researcher profile and the project are excellent.
- B4 Implementation
  - B5 Impact

# Marie Curie IIF

- B1 Research and Technological Quality (5/5)
- B2 Transfer of knowledge (4.8/5)
- B3 Researcher (4.9/5)
- **B4. Implementation (4.8/5)**

## Strengths:

- Overall the implementation strategy is very good and is in place to foster the project onwards and move it beyond the state of art.
- The quality of the infrastructure provided for the project is very high.
- The practical arrangements for implementation and management are good. There is clear demarcation of responsibilities. Synergies and complementarities will be exploited.
- All will benefit from the networking activities. The work plan is feasible and credible.
- The practical and administrative arrangements, and support for hosting of the fellow are sufficiently described.

## Weaknesses:

- The quality of international collaborations is not sufficiently described.
- B5 Impact

# Marie Curie IIF

- B1 Research and Technological Quality (5/5)
- B2 Transfer of knowledge (4.8/5)
- B3 Researcher (4.9/5)
- B4. Implementation (4.8/5)
- **B5 Impact (4.7/5)**

## Strengths:

- The impact of the proposal is well identified.
- There is a good potential in this project for establishing long term collaborations and mutually beneficial cooperation between Europe and the US in this research field.
- There is a great potential for development of new knowledge and novel competences. The researcher shows clear professional maturity despite not holding yet a PhD degree.
- The project contributes positively to European research excellence and competitiveness. This proposal has potential for commercial exploitation, and has great potential for a wide and broad scientific, technological and social impact.
- The mobility to the European Research Area will be beneficial.

## Weaknesses:

- The impact of the proposed outreach activities is insufficiently substantiated.

# Marie Curie CIg

- **B1 Research and Technological Quality (3.9/5)**

Strengths of the proposal:

- A comprehensive background literature review is presented.
- The objectives and specific aims are clearly defined.
- Timeliness and relevance of the project are fully substantiated.

Weaknesses of the proposal:

- The pursued methodology is not fully presented and elaborated in the proposal.
- The innovative and original aspects of the proposal are insufficiently justified.

- B2 Transfer of knowledge
- B3 Researcher
- B4 Implementation
- B5 Impact

# Marie Curie CIG

- B1 Research and Technological Quality (3.9/5)
- **B2 Researcher (4.7/5)**

Strengths of the proposal:

- A very good career development potential for the period of reintegration is presented.
- The researcher has an excellent track record in terms of peer-reviewed publications, participation in conferences and research projects, delivered invited talks and possesses a number of patents.
- The match between the fellow's profile and project is very good.
- The applicant clearly demonstrates independent thinking.

Weaknesses of the proposal:

- Leadership qualities are insufficiently demonstrated in the proposal.

- B3 Implementation
- B4 Impact

# Marie Curie CIg

- B1 Research and Technological Quality (3.9/5)
- B2 Researcher (4.7/5)
- **B3 Implementation (4.2/5)**

Strengths of the proposal:

- The quality of the host is very high.
- The infrastructure and facilities of the host organisation are well described and appropriate.
- The work plan has the necessary milestones and deliverables for monitoring the progress of the project.
- Practical arrangements for the implementation of the project are appropriate.

Weaknesses of the proposal:

- The overall feasibility of the research project is not clearly demonstrated.
- The IP issues are not fully considered although patenting is envisaged.

- B4 Impact

# Marie Curie ClG

- B1 Research and Technological Quality (3.9/5)
- B2 Researcher (4.7/5)
- B3 Implementation (4.2/5)
- **B4 Impact (3.8/5)**

Strengths of the proposal:

- The researcher's integration will contribute to the enhancement of European scientific excellence.
- The potential to transfer knowledge to the host organisation is high.
- Plans for the dissemination of project results are appropriate.
- The project will positively impact the career prospects of the applicant.

Weaknesses of the proposal:

- The exploitation plan and outreach activities are unclear and general public engagement is not considered.
- Cooperation with industry is not appropriately considered in the proposal.



# Diagnostic

- Le projet IIF financé
  - relativement simple et facile à expliquer
  - Un seul objectif, un seul problème sociétal
  - basé sur des technologies maîtrisées à la fois par moi-même et par le labo d'accueil.
  - Risque d'échec faible en général
- Le projet CIG non-financé
  - plus ambitieux et plus risqué
  - basé sur des technologies pas encore développées
  - Impact sociétal plus important mais plus difficile à définir, circonscrire.

# Erreurs administratives

- IIF
  - Prise en charge du conjoint
- CIG
  - Invited Referees