

Proposal ID and preliminary declarations

Note: only after filling these data and confirming the final declaration you will access the evaluation section

1. Reviewer first name (and middle name, if any) *

Inserisci la risposta

2. Reviewer last (family) name *

Inserisci la risposta

3. Affiliation *

Inserisci la risposta

4. Proposal code: *

Note: this is the code starting with the letter "P" followed by 3 figures, which was shown in the emails with which we contacted you to ask your evaluation

Inserisci la risposta

5. Proposal acronym: *

Inserisci la risposta

6. Main project proponent: *

Note: if there is more than one listed proponents, the main proponent (or corresponding proponent) is the first one in the list

Inserisci la risposta

7. Declarations and commitments *

The undersigned declares not to be in a position of actual, perceived or potential conflict of interest, in his role as reviewer of the project proposal indicated above. In particular, the undersigned declares NOT to incur in any of the cases listed below and undertakes to immediately report any changes to this status that may occur during the evaluation work:

- have the opportunity to take advantage of the success of the proposal in question (or any other proposal submitted within the FRA2022 call);
- have a close personal or work relationship with the members of the research group of the proposal in question;
- being, or having been, in a relationship of strong scientific rivalry or hostility with one of the proponents;
- have an existing employment contract with the University of Naples Federico II;
- be involved or have been involved in a project/activity of close collaboration with one of the proposers in the last 3 years (note: in the case of very large collaborations, of several hundreds or thousands of participants, the mere fact of being included in the same collaboration in itself is not to be considered an automatic reason for conflict of interest, but it can become so if the work interaction has been frequent and/or intense);
- be in any other situation which calls into question one's impartiality or which may reasonably appear to be so.

Finally, the undersigned undertakes not to benefit from the project funds in any way, if the project is financed, and not to disclose the content of the project proposal to third parties.

I confirm 

I do not confirm (this choice implies to give up the proposal review)

Numerical evaluations on the three assessment criteria

(in the following screen, you will be asked also to input a brief text to explain the selected evaluation scores)

8. Criterion 1 (weight 50%): Creativity, originality and potential impact of the proposal for the generation of new knowledge *

- 5 - Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor. Based on the reviewer experience, the proposal falls within the top 5% of all proposals ever evaluated, taking into proper account the project limited budget
- 4.5 - Between Excellent and Very good
- 4 - Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present. Based on the reviewer experience, the proposal falls in the top 10-20% of all proposals ever evaluated, taking into proper account the project limited budget
- 3.5 - Between Very good and Good
- 3 - Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present. Based on the reviewer experience, the proposal falls within the top 30-40% of all proposals ever evaluated, taking into proper account the project limited budget
- 2.5 - Between Good and Fair
- 2 - Fair. The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses. Based on the reviewer experience, the proposal falls within the top 50-70% of all proposals ever evaluated, taking into proper account the project limited budget
- 1.5 - Between Fair and Poor
- 1 - Poor. The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses
- 0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information

9. Criterion 2 (weight 30%): Scientific qualification of the proponents *

(IMPORTANT: the CVs of possible "aggregate" participants to the project, even if listed explicitly in the proposal, must not be considered in this evaluation; consider only the proponents)

- 5 - Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor. Based on the reviewer experience, the proposal falls within the top 5% of all proposals ever evaluated, taking into proper account the project limited budget
- 4.5 - Between Excellent and Very good
- 4 - Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present. Based on the reviewer experience, the proposal falls in the top 10-20% of all proposals ever evaluated, taking into proper account the project limited budget
- 3.5 - Between Very good and Good
- 3 - Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present. Based on the reviewer experience, the proposal falls within the top 30-40% of all proposals ever evaluated, taking into proper account the project limited budget
- 2.5 - Between Good and Fair
- 2 - Fair. The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses. Based on the reviewer experience, the proposal falls within the top 50-70% of all proposals ever evaluated, taking into proper account the project limited budget
- 1.5 - Between Fair and Poor
- 1 - Poor. The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses
- 0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information

10. Criterion 3 (weight 20%): Feasibility of the proposed methodology, also taking into account the financial plan *

- 5 - Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor. Based on the reviewer experience, the proposal falls within the top 5% of all proposals ever evaluated, taking into proper account the project limited budget
- 4.5 - Between Excellent and Very good
- 4 - Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present. Based on the reviewer experience, the proposal falls in the top 10-20% of all proposals ever evaluated, taking into proper account the project limited budget
- 3.5 - Between Very good and Good
- 3 - Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present. Based on the reviewer experience, the proposal falls within the top 30-40% of all proposals ever evaluated, taking into proper account the project limited budget
- 2.5 - Between Good and Fair
- 2 - Fair. The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses. Based on the reviewer experience, the proposal falls within the top 50-70% of all proposals ever evaluated, taking into proper account the project limited budget
- 1.5 - Between Fair and Poor
- 1 - Poor. The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses
- 0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information

11. Optional indication of the cost considered appropriate for the project (in euros)

Note: this field must be filled in ONLY if the economic request reported in the proposal is not adequately justified. Only a reduced cost can be indicated.


Il numero deve essere compreso tra 0 ~ 60000

Report

12. Enter your report on the evaluated project and submit your evaluation *

(expected length between 1000 and 3900 characters, including spaces; in particular, please insert a brief explanation of your evaluation for each criterion above)

Inserisci la risposta

 [Aggiungi nuovo](#)