

Science Fund of the Republic of Serbia – Program PRISMA			
Project Grant Peer Review	Project Reference No:	Excellence Score:	
	Subprogram:	Impact Score:	
	Project Acronym:	Implementation Score:	
	Review Date:	Total Score:	

Title of Proposed Project

Review Information

Response Due Date		Reviewer Reference:	
-------------------	--	---------------------	--

My judgement is that (Place an **X** next to the relevant option):

This is a very strong proposal that fully meets all assessment criteria	
This is a strong proposal that broadly meets all assessment criteria	
This is a good proposal that meets all assessment criteria but with minor weaknesses	
This proposal meets all assessment criteria but with clear weaknesses	
This proposal does not meet one or more of the assessment criteria	
This proposal is scientifically or technically flawed	

Compared to the previous work of the applicants, mark the novelty of the proposed idea (Place an **X** next to the relevant option):

It is a completely novel idea for the applicants	
It is a novel idea but based on their previous work	
It is partially investigated/developed in their previous work and represents justified extension	
It is incremental research compared to their previous work	
This idea has been implemented by one part of the applicants, but its application is novel	
The idea is concurrently developed and/or financed in other project(s) by the applicants	
The idea of the Proposed Project has already been implemented and/or published by the applicants	
Other (provide comment in the narrative section of the excellence score)	

Excellence

Please score and comment on excellence of the proposed research.

1.Excellence Assessment	Points (1-5)
1.1. Are the specific objectives for the Project clear and measurable?	
1.2. Are the specific objectives realistic and achievable within the duration of the Project?	
1.3. Is the proposed research scientifically founded in recent scientific publications?	
1.4. Is the proposed research work ambitious and goes beyond the state-of-the-art?	
1.5. Are the planned results of the proposed research likely to be significant and (where relevant) applicable?	
1.6. Is the proposed research likely to lead to publications in high-impact journals/books and other scholarly publications relevant for the scientific field of the proposal?	
1.7. Is the proposed research methodology appropriate to achieve the goals of the project?	
1.8. To what extent is the proposed research original and novel, not just an extension of previous results? (Briefly justify in the description of the Excellence score your judgement about the novelty of the Proposed Project compared to the previous work of the applicants)	
1.9. Does the PI demonstrate the necessary scientific/scholarly credentials and scientific leadership in the field of the project proposal?	
1.10. Do the key members of the Project team demonstrate the necessary scientific/scholarly credentials necessary for its execution?	
Total (max 50 points)	

Note: Assign points using scores as: 1 (poor), 2 (fair), 3 (good), 4 (very good) and 5 (excellent).

Description of the Excellence score (maximum 4000 characters)

Please justify the given score and provide argumentation. Make sure you state both strengths and weaknesses in the Excellence of the proposal.

Impact

Please score and comment on the pathway to impact identified for this work.

2. Impact Assessment	Points (1-5)
2.1. Does the proposed research have a potential to have a global impact on the society, economy, industry, climate change, environment, healthcare, education and other aspects of social development?	
2.2. Does the proposed research have a potential to contribute to the development of the specific scientific field?	
2.3. Does the proposed research have a potential to contribute to the science, economy or society at the national level?	
2.4. Are the proposed measures for dissemination and application of the results adequate and well planned?	
2.5. Will the research results and/or acquired data be made available for other researchers beyond the project team (open research and open data)?	
2.6. Does the proposed research identify stakeholders and beneficiaries who will be impacted by the Project?	
Total (max 30 points)	

Note: Assign points using scores as: 1 (poor), 2 (fair), 3 (good), 4 (very good) and 5 (excellent).

Description of the Impact score (maximum 4,000 characters)

Please justify the given score and provide argumentation. Make sure you state both strengths and weaknesses in the Impact of the proposal.

Implementation

Please comment on the applicants' ability and commitment to deliver the proposed project, the effectiveness of the proposed planning and management and on whether the requested resources are appropriate and have been fully justified.

3. Implementation Assessment	Points (1-5)
3.1. Are the proposed research methodology and work plan coherent and effective to achieve the Project objectives and impact, including adequate allocation of resources to tasks and members?	
3.2. Are the roles of the Project team members and consortium partners clearly outlined, and are their fields of expertise complementary, such that the Project team has all the necessary know-how and access to critical infrastructure needed to carry out the project activities?	
3.3. Is the risk management properly implemented and are the mitigation measures well planned?	
3.4. Is the budget realistic and well balanced?	
Total (max 20 points)	

Note: Assign points using scores as: 1 (poor), 2 (fair), 3 (good), 4 (very good) and 5 (excellent).

Description of the Implementation score (maximum 4000 characters)

Please justify the given score and provide argumentation. Make sure you state both strengths and weaknesses in the Implementation of the proposal.

Overall Assessment

Overall Score (enter the total number of points):	
----------------------------------------------------------	--

Please summarise your view of the proposal (maximum 4000 characters). Make sure you state both strengths and weaknesses of the proposal.

Reviewer Expertise (maximum 4000 characters)

Please indicate the areas of expertise that are relevant to your assessment. Take care not to reveal your identity to the applicant. For multi-disciplinary proposals please state which aspects of the proposal you feel qualified to assess.