**Call 7/2023**

**Phase 2 – review form**

**1) Quality of the proposal**

**1.1) Originality**: The applicant's proposal is original.

*Rate from 1 to 5, where:*

*1 = The proposal is merely a repetition of previous research by the grantee or others.*

*5 = The proposal is very original - it’s very unlikely that this has been tried before in this particular way.*

**1.2) Boldness**: The applicant's project is bold and creative.

*Rate from 1 to 5, where:*

*1 = The proposal follows well-established paths and approaches and lacks completely in boldness.*

*5 = The applicant’s project is very bold, demonstrating that the candidate is capable of out-of-the-box thinking and of finding creative solutions to scientific challenges.*

**1.3) Question**: The applicant's project addresses a big question.

*Rate from 1 to 5, where:*

*1 = The big question is not broad - even if successful, the consequences of the project would only be relevant to a small, restricted subset of the applicant’s scientific discipline.*

*5 = The proposal aims at a major question for the field, with the potential to change our understanding of the discipline as a whole.*

**1.4) Structure and presentation:** The applicant's proposal is well structured and presented.

*Rate from 1 to 5, where:*

*1 = The proposal is hard to understand and it is challenging to extract the point that is being made by the applicant.*

*5 = The proposal is very well presented and reads easily. It is cohesive and clearly presents its scientific argument.*

**2) Viability**

**2.1) Team composition:** The composition of the team meets the demands proposed for the development of the project.

*Rate from 1 to 5, where:*

*1 = The proposed team lacks the skills needed for the project and there is no plan to build those areas of expertise or the applicant fails to demonstrate a clear understanding of the challenges involved in the project's execution.*

*5 = The applicant's proposed team seems to have the skills, capacity and knowledge required for the successful completion of this project.*

**2.2) Financial resources:** The financial resources requested and deadlines are adequate.

*Rate from 1 to 5, where:*

*1 = The simplified budget and proposed deadlines are not adequate and the applicant does not demonstrate a clear understanding of the resources and time required for the completion of such a project.*

*5 = The simplified budget is appropriate for the project, with the applicant demonstrating a complete understanding of the resources required for the successful completion of this project.*

**3) Risk**

**3.1) Hypothesis conception risk**

*Rate from 1 to 5, where:*

*1 = It is likely that the proposed hypothesis is correct in answering the major question - i.e. lots of evidence already point to that being the case, it is just a matter of confirming what everyone already “knows”.*

*5 = It is unlikely that the proposed hypothesis is correct in answering the major question - e.g. a proposed effect could either not exist or not generalize, some other hypothesis might better explain the data, it goes against the mainstream position of the field.*

**3.2) Approach risk**

*Rate from 1 to 5, where:*

*1 = The approach is well-established and will likely provide information to test the hypothesis - i.e. it has been successfully used before to address similar problems.*

*5 = The proposed methodological approach, even if successful, is unlikely to provide useful information to test the proposed hypothesis - e.g. the object of study is too complex or variable for the approach, the mainstream position in the field is that it is impossible, the approach is very unconventional/heterodox.*

**3.3) Technical risk**

*Rate from 1 to 5, where:*

*1 = The proposed methodologies are quick and simple to implement, have no critical steps and no large material resources requirements.*

*5 = It is technically challenging to obtain the data following the proposed methodologies - e.g. the methods are hard to implement, have critical steps that might fail, require a lot of persistence and trial-and-error, require manipulation of complex equipment, require extensive field work or experiments, the object of study has many uncontrollable conditions or a long natural time (geological timescales or animals/plants with long life cycles).*

**Briefly explain your rationale for the risk evaluation (i.e. the three previous questions).**

Free text. (limite 300 caracteres com espaço)

**4) Quality of the candidate**

**4.1) Scientific capacity\*:** The candidate has the ability to develop rigorous research.

*\*The rigor of the research developed to date will be evaluated, regardless of the number of published articles.*

*Rate from 1 to 5, where:*

*1 = The applicant's previous experience in research provides little to no evidence of their ability to conduct rigorous research.*

*5 = The applicant's previous experience in research provides ample assurance that they are capable of conducting rigorous research.*

**4.2) Independence:** The candidate is able to generate their own ideas and has a broad national and international collaboration network.

*Rate from 1 to 5, where:*

*1 = The applicant has very few or no scientific collaborations and their research seems to merely follow in the footsteps of their previous collaborators or mentors.*

*5 = The applicant has a broad network of collaborators, both in Brazil and abroad, but they also have a discernible research line, independent of the path of their mentors or collaborators.*

**5) Oral presentation and interview**

**5.1)** The candidate demonstrates the ability to defend their overarching question and approach.

*Rate from 1 to 5, where:*

*1 = The applicant is neither able to address limitations in their proposal nor contextualize their question or justify their approach.*

*5 = The applicant has a deep understanding of the strengths and limitations of their proposal and is able to defend it from well-constructed critiques.*

**5.2)** The candidate shows a comprehensive understanding of their area of expertise and the context of their proposal.

*Rate from 1 to 5, where:*

*1 = The applicant lacks a broader understanding of the context and discipline where their work fits beyond their work itself.*

*5 = The applicant has a deep and broad understanding of their discipline and of how their work fits into their field as a whole.*

**---------------------------------------------------—------------------------------------------------------------------------**

**If the project involves human subjects, are the proposed samples representative in terms of gender and race? If not, is any exclusion well justified in terms of the scientific goals and strategy?**

* *Not applicable, the research does not involve human subjects*
* *Yes, the research involves human subjects and the proposed samples are representative in terms of gender and race*
* *Yes, the research involves human subjects and the lack of representativeness in the sample is well justified*
* *No, the research involves human subjects and the lack of representativeness in the sample is either not justified or insufficiently justified*

**Are there glaring reproducibility issues with the proposal?**

* *No*
* *Yes, please specify*

**Do you recommend this proposal for funding?**

* **Yes**
* **No**

**Would this proposal be able to obtain funding from major international funding agencies (NSF, NIH, HHMI, Wellcome, ERC)?**

* *Yes, it would be very competitive*
* *Yes, it would be very competitive, despite being out-of-the-box*
* *No, it would not be competitive because there are issues with the quality of the proposal*
* *No, it would not be competitive because these agencies are too conservative and this proposal is too out-of-the-box*
* *No, it would not be competitive, for some other reason (please specify)*

**---------------------------------------------------—------------------------------------------------------------------------**

**Evaluation Summary (to be sent to the applicant)**

**Summary of Proposal (up to 500 characters)**

|  |
| --- |

**Strengths (up to 500 characters)**

|  |
| --- |

**Weaknesses (up to 500 characters)**

|  |
| --- |

**---------------------------------------------------—------------------------------------------------------------------------**

**Internal comments to the Serrrapilheira executive team**

|  |
| --- |