EXAMPLE OF POORLY WRITTEN
IER-INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION REPORT

CRITERION 1 - EXCELLENCE
Score: 4.7

Sub-Criterion 1.1
Quality and credibility of the research/innovation action
(level of novelty, appropriate consideration of inter/multidisciplinary
and gender aspects)

Strengths:
• The quality and credibility of the innovation is very high, with an interesting
  plan and cutting edge technology. The proposal touches in several aspects
  that are worth investigating. The proposal focus heavily in the role
  of SETDSIDA in methylation, it is not clear that SETDSIDA is indeed....
+ This aspect of the proposal is well organized.
+ The proposed methodology/approach is sound and feasible.
+ This reviewer consulted literature and concluded that methods
  seem to be appropriate for the proposed studies
+ This proposal is well above the average of the proposals I have seen in
  this call
+ Some of the methodologies are mentioned only briefly, possibly due
  to space restrictions, but at least a reference should have been given
  to help the reviewer to evaluate of the suitability of the methods....
+ The interdisciplinary aspects of the proposal are well explained.
+ This very good application should be funded
+ As an expert in nanotechnologies, with over 25 years of experience
  researching, I can....

Weaknesses:
- The collaborative opportunities are insufficiently presented.
- The approach is over-ambitious.

MSC IEF evaluations do not expect evaluators to
"introduce" the proposal nor to express judgments
or make statements that summarize the proposals
and/or introduce the scientific topic(s) covered.
Only "strengths" and "weaknesses" must be listed.
When drafting IERs use "+ " (to list "strengths") and
"- " (to list "weaknesses") .

Which aspect? Be more specific...poor
English...can an aspect of the proposal be well
"organized?"

Can you elaborate? Why is the
methodology/approach sound?

Do not include comments based on personal
knowledge/experience. Also avoid using expressions
such as "seems" or "could" and instead use statements
such as "is" or "are".

Do not make a direct comparison
with other proposals in this call.

This looks like a weakness and should not be under
"Strengths". Anyway it must be more precise.... which
part of the methodology requires more details? Avoid
making suggestions about how the proposal is written or
guessing what the applicant may have meant.

The crucial issue is whether this proposal is
inter/multidisciplinary and not only if
inter/multidisciplinary is well presented. Something
could be well presented, but not necessarily convincing
/adequate

Do not provide suggestions about possible funding...

Is this the right sub-criterion for this
comment? This comment should be under
sub criterion 1.2 or 1.3

Be specific about how the approach is over-
ambitious? Specific tasks are better discussed
under criterion 3 under "Coherence and
effectiveness of the work plan"
**Sub-Criterion 1.2**
Quality and appropriateness of the training and of the two-way transfer of Knowledge between the researcher and the host

**Strength(s)**
+ The host, University of XXX Ireland, and professor YYY have extensive documented neuroimaging research qualities which will benefit the researcher.
+ The expertise of the researcher and prior experience match well the research field of the host institution and the supervisor, a fact which can ensure the productive two-way transfer of knowledge.

**Weakness(es)**
No weaknesses identified

Don't mention people's names. Best to avoid university's or company's names as well.

This is not a clear statement! If somebody’s expertise matches or overlaps, it does not mean that bi-directional transfer of knowledge will occur.

**Sub-Criterion 1.3**
Quality of the supervision and of the integration in the team/institution

**Strength(s)**
+ There are plans to integrate the researcher in the European host institution.
+ The supervisor was elected to the national Academy of Science in 2010 and has held the position of Professor of Molecular Biology at the University of XXXX since 2004. He has organized two international conferences, and he will organize. As for the proposed host institution, the XXXXXXXX is a German centre of excellence for research and higher education.

**Weakness(es)**
- Some expertise necessary for the plan not completely part of the host

Poor English. Statements are too generic. Be more specific: is the quality of the mentorship described in the proposal adequate, is the integration of the researcher inside the hosting team adequate (e.g. the possibility to be inserted in initiatives generated to the host, exposition of the researcher to the pre-existing network of collaboration of the host institution etc.).

Is this a strength? There are no adjectives that qualify the plans as a strength.

Express your judgment or opinion. Do not repeat or copy/paste from the application.

Unclear or incomplete sentence. Which plan? Be specific. Which expertise is missing?
Sub-Criterion 1.4
Capacity of the researcher to reach or re-enforce a position of professional maturity/independence

Strength(s)

+ The past experience and CV of the researcher indicate that he has all the capacities to use this award to re-enforce professional maturity/independence.
+ The proposed work fits within the research interests of the researcher.
+ Researcher has published 3 papers in well-known peer-reviewed international journal, which is a good amount considering their stage in their career, all are 1st author papers. Together this is indicative of their high productivity and capacity.
+ The researcher has a strong background in research areas related to the topic, which will ensure the achievement of the research goals.

Weakness(es):

- The researcher would have benefitted from performing the work proposed in a country where German is not the common or national language or where there is another academic climate than the German. There are more academic groups in the world where this type of research could be conducted.
Criterion 2 – Impact
Score: 4.5
Sub-Criterion 2.1
Enhancing the potential and future career prospects of the researcher

Strength(s):
+ After completion of the grant, the researcher will have acquired an impressive set of new scientific skills and experimental knowledge in multidisciplinary fields, and will have gained further knowledge on managing people and becoming independent. This will help make the researcher 'well rounded' and well equipped towards being an independent researcher leading their first own research group.

Weakness(es):
- There is nothing different in this proposal compared to others about career prospects: the applicant has a good track record and will get more papers and experience in the new group. But how is that different than any other applicant?
- The fellow is too young and unexperienced to perform the described research activities.

Sub-Criterion 2.2
Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the action results

Strength(s):
+ Research papers and conference presentations are mentioned
+ The exploitation of the activities of the proposed secondment is not yet detailed, however this seems reasonable given the potential delays and complications a detailed dissemination plan likely would come across
+ The measure proposed for the exploitation and dissemination of results are convincing.

Weakness(es):
- The plan for the exploitation of results is too ambitious and not sufficiently clear.

- As the host institution is in the UK, this reviewer wonders whether Brexit will impact the exploitation and dissemination of the results.
Sub-Criterion 2.3
Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the action activities to different target audiences

Strength(s):
+ The project will lead to press-communication aimed to the academic community and the general public.

Weakness(es):
- The acquired knowledge will be distributed through a variety of channels. It is a bit unclear how these events in the case study country will be set up. Are they already arranged?

Criterion 3: Quality and efficiency of the Implementation

Sub-Criterion 3.1
Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan

Strength(s):
+ The Gantt chart shows a clear plan with milestones and deliverables/milestone throughout the duration of the fellowship
+ Although an alternative solution is proposed, the applicant could also use Surface Plasmon Resonance, which is not only highly specific, but provides additional information on interactions such as Ka and Kd.
+ A secondment period is planned
+ The amount of work assigned to the tasks seems to be reasonable to be executed in the allocated time

Weakness(es):
- There is insubstantial detailing of the calculation of work hours/days needed for every step.
- There is an ethical concern, related to the need for using adipose tissue specimens from live women, which has not been mentioned in the proposal.

Sub-Criterion 3.2
Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources

Strength(s):
+ What is the exact support that the researcher will receive from others (number of technicians, hours of machine use, etc.)? The proposal refers/speaks only in general terms to support.
- This referee is slightly concerned that the WPs may be too short for some tasks, also given that WPs are performed in parallel.

Sub-Criterion 3.3
Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures, including risk management

Strength(s):
+ Potential risks have been clearly laid out and alternative experimental procedures as contingency plans were suggested, though the risk of getting the methodology to work was not listed

Weakness(es):
- More, and more specialized risks are likely to arise and endanger the project (such as delay in data collection).
- Too ambitious plan for 24 months.
- The researcher can ask for help from the Technology Transfer Office, which however might still be insufficient for a demanding project such as this.

Sub-Criterion 3.4
Appropriateness of the institutional environment (infrastructure)

Strength(s):
+ The host institution is a well-known university so the proposed lab should offer good hosting conditions for the project.

Weakness(es):
- It is not well detailed how the neuroimaging training at the host institution will take place, which is nonetheless key to the training of the researcher with respect to his future career.

This statement contradicts, at least in part, with the strengths. Is the risk assessment not comprehensive? Have other potential risks, e.g. data collection, not been adequately addressed?

This comment contains both a strength (first part of the sentence) and a weakness. Please decide which is more suitable and then rephrase it as ONLY strength or a weakness.

Aspect already highlighted this as a weakness under Excellence. A proposal must not be penalized twice for the same weakness.

Delete this weakness since you do not have a proof for your statement regarding possible TTO weakness.

Don't rely only on reputation but check if the infrastructures, logistics, facilities offered to the researcher are described and convincing.

If in the application there is no reference in this comment to the lack of infrastructure/equipment then this comment should go under criterion 1 “Excellence.”