Definitions and Guidance on Review Criteria

1. **Impact**
The evaluation of impact assumes that the “scientific aims of the project are achieved” and/or will be “successfully completed”.

1.1. **Relevance**
- Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the research field?
- Does the project contribute to solve this problem in a sustainable (lasting) way?
- Is there a positive and relevant impact on a target group or an environmental issue?

1.2. **Potential for change**
- Does the project make a difference and has the potential to cause change by
  - Accelerating research / enabling a breakthrough by
    o removing obstacles like bottlenecks
    o cause a change of mind in the research-community
    o introducing new methods and approaches e.g. by interdisciplinary bridges
    o introducing transdisciplinary issues
  - Enabling / accelerating implementation of research by
    o closing knowledge gaps for hands-on problems
    o raising awareness and acceptance in user groups
    o implementing an application
- Does the project create leverage? (e.g. through a high degree of innovation, by involvement of other partners, causing additional fundings, rising awareness etc.)
- Are there clear and understandable criteria to determinate the impact of the project?

1.3. **Transfer potential / dissemination**
- Is there a potential to disseminate the results inside and outside academia?
- Does the proposal include a viable dissemination plan that is appropriate for the scope of the project, intended audience and tailors dissemination efforts to that audience?
- Will project results raise awareness and be used within the discipline/ in other disciplines/ in the broader society?
- Is there a potential that the results of the project are applied and multiplied in- and outside academia?
2. Scientific Quality

2.1. Novelty and originality
- Is the project original, novel and innovative? For example, does the project challenge existing paradigms or practice instead of repeating them?
- Is there a potential for the creation of new knowledge, exciting new ideas, new fundamental questions and approaches?
- Does it use novel technologies / methodologies?
- Is it an innovative application of existing methodologies / technologies in new areas?
- Is a refinement, improvement, or new application of theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation, or interventions proposed?

2.2. Approach
- Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project?
- Is the project-plan appropriate to the aims of the project?
- Has the PI addressed potential problems and alternative strategies if applicable?
- Does the application define clear criteria and goals to measure scientific success and impact?

2.3. Probability of success/ Risk
- How is the probability that the project will be successful? Which risks have to be considered?
- Are there clear criteria to determinate the scientific success of the project?

Please evaluate the probability of success. This is the only place where this question should be addressed. Other criteria should be evaluated under the assumption that the project aims are achieved.

3. Resources

3.1. Scientific competence of investigator(s)
- Is the Principal Investigator (PI)/ are the Principal Investigators, collaborators, and other researchers well suited to the project?
- If the PI(s) is/ are early stage investigator(s) or new investigator(s), or in the early stages of independent careers, do they have appropriate experience, training and mentoring?
- If established, have they demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s)?
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3.2. Leadership competence of investigator(s)
- Is the PI thinking out of the box/ beyond today’s common thinking in the community?
- Is the PI willing and able and has the network to spread the results in- and outside academia? Or is the PI able to initiate and support such a process
- Is the PI willing and able to initiate an application / multiplication of the results in- and outside academia?
- Is the PI willing and able to exploit the potential of the project?
- If the project is collaborative or multi-PI, do the investigators have complementary and integrated expertise; are their leadership approach, governance and organisational structure appropriate for the project?

3.3. Environment
- Are the institutional support, equipment and other physical resources available to the investigators adequate for the project proposed?
- Will the project benefit from unique features of the scientific environment, study populations, or collaborative arrangements?
- Will the project benefit from a communication office or department?
- Does the management of the organisation support the project?

3.4. Collaboration
- Are all necessary / any supporting discipline involved by cooperation?
- What is the kind of the collaboration (national, international, within one university, between different universities, involvement of target group)?
- Is the collaboration adequate to the research questions?
- Is the cooperation appropriately organised and budgeted? (E.g. is there a plan when and how involved collaboration partners will come together and share their knowledge and discuss conclusions?)

3.5. Budget
- Is the budget adequate? Do you recommend any budget modification?
- Is the contribution of the Velux Stiftung crucial for the success of the project and necessary to support this project or are there other possible funding partners?

4. Proposal: approval or rejection
Please choose if you would approve or reject the project considering the above criteria. An application has not to be strong in all criteria to be approved.
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