

INSTRUCTIONS

Please fill out this review as thoroughly as possible. For each category, please give an overall score by deleting the qualifications that are not applicable.

In case you feel the score is between two qualifications, delete the qualifications that are not applicable and leave the two that are (for instance: VERY GOOD/EXCELLENT indicates a score between very good and excellent).

Please give a brief motivation for each score. This motivation can either include strong points of the proposal with respect to the category, or weak points or oversights.

In the final assessment of the proposal (number 5), the reviewer can indicate whether the project would be a worthwhile addition to NICAS, mention general strong and weak points, as well as recommendations, for the project as a whole.

I. DETAILS

Title of proposal:	
Main applicant:	
Reviewer:	

2. SCIENTIFIC QUALITY (60%)

2a. Originality/soundness of the topic and approach

Given your knowledge of the field and the current state of the art, how would you rate the subject of the research proposal? This can be either in the originality or the soundness of the chosen approach.

INSUFFICIENT/SUFFICIENT/GOOD/VERY GOOD/EXCELLENT

(Motivation)

2b. Clearly formulated goals and a feasible work plan

How would you rate the goals and work plan of the proposed project? Are these clearly formulated and is the work plan feasible in relation to the goals and the dedicated man power in this project?

INSUFFICIENT/SUFFICIENT/GOOD/VERY GOOD/EXCELLENT

(Motivation)

2c. Scientific relevance and urgency

How would you rate the relevance and urgency of the proposed project? Does it address significant gaps in current knowledge? How would it advance research in this field?

INSUFFICIENT/SUFFICIENT/GOOD/VERY GOOD/EXCELLENT

(Motivation)

2d. Expected effectiveness of proposed methodology

How would you rate the proposed methodology? In your opinion, are the proposed methods expected to yield the desired results?

INSUFFICIENT/SUFFICIENT/GOOD/VERY GOOD/EXCELLENT

(Motivation)

3. Relevance to NICAS (25%)

3a. Contribution to one of the research areas of NICAS;

How would you rate the contribution of the proposal to one (or more) of the research areas of NICAS? Please consult nicas-research.nl/about for a general description and links to the five research areas.

INSUFFICIENT/SUFFICIENT/GOOD/VERY GOOD/EXCELLENT

(Motivation)

3b. Coherence and cross-links with other projects within NICAS

How would you rate the way in which the proposed projects fit in with current and past NICAS projects? Is there synergy between this proposal and other NICAS projects? Please consult nicas-research.nl/projects for a list and description of projects.

INSUFFICIENT/SUFFICIENT/GOOD/VERY GOOD/EXCELLENT

(Motivation)

4. Potential of project (15%)

How would you rate the overall potential of the project? Will the output of the proposed research lead to new technology, insights or applications? Please assess the potential contribution to science, technology and/or society, considering that the project may either be:

- a seed money project, intended as a pilot for a larger research project, in which case you should mostly consider the potential of the extended research to which it may give rise;
- a stand-alone project that does not necessarily lead to a longer-running research project, in which case you should mostly consider the deliverables of the project as is.

INSUFFICIENT/SUFFICIENT/GOOD/VERY GOOD/EXCELLENT

(Motivation)

5. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

How would you rate the proposal overall?

INSUFFICIENT/SUFFICIENT/GOOD/VERY GOOD/EXCELLENT

(Motivation)