

## ASSESSMENT FORM FOR EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF SCIENTIFIC QUALITY

<b>Name of Reviewer:</b>	
<b>Date and signature:</b> (by signing the reviewer declares himself /herself to be impartial in relation to the application – see Guidelines for Impartiality)	
<b>Host Institution (field 2 in application)</b>	
<b>Project Manager / Ph.D. Student (field 3 in application)</b>	

Conclusion	Excellent	Very good	Good	Satisfactory	Poor
	A	B	C	D	E
<b>Overall scientific quality of this proposal as written</b> (place one X)					

**Please return a signed and scanned copy of the Assessment Form to the Faroese Research Council by e-mail: [gransking@gransking.fo](mailto:gransking@gransking.fo)**

**NB. The applicants have a legal right to receive a copy of the peer reviews concerning their own application.** According to Faroese legislation it is important that reviewers are not in any way biased in relation to an application. For further information about legal issues, please read **Instructions for Evaluating Research Proposals**.

The scientific quality of the proposal should be assessed on a scale of ‘Poor’ to ‘Excellent’ in relation to the criteria set out below. ‘NR’ means **Not Relevant**. The ‘NR’ column should be marked where a criterion is not relevant to the proposal.

**Please place only one X for each criterion. And please provide a qualitative assessment at the end of each section.**

1. Scientific quality of the project	Excel- lent	Very good	Good	Satis- factory	Po or	NR
Scientific relevance						
Scientific novelty						
Potential scientific impact						
Problem formulation, hypothesis and scientific method						
Inclusion of relevant scientific disciplines						
International collaboration						

**Qualitative clarification**

**My confidence level in assessing the scientific quality of the project (e.g., is the scientific area close to your own area of expertise and is sufficient information provided with the application?):**

Low	Medium	High

<b>2. Skills of applicant, research group (if relevant) and feasibility of the project</b>	<b>Excel- lent</b>	<b>Very good</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Satis- factory</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>NR</b>
Scientific competence of project manager/Ph.D. Student						
Managerial competence of project manager						
Combined scientific competence of research team						
Experience of host institution						
Research plan (management, timetable, milestones, resources, risks etc.)						

**Qualitative clarification**

My confidence level in assessing the applicant, the research group and the feasibility of the project (e.g., is sufficient information provided with the application?):

Low	Medium	High

**Concluding remarks (strengths and weaknesses)**

**Recommended corrections to the project**