

Panel/Name of reviewer:  
Name of applicant:  
Title of proposed project:

Application number:

**Please also write comments (not only numerical ratings) to each of the following sub-items.**

The numerical evaluation of the sub-items and Item 1 (Research plan), Item 2 (Competence of applicants, quality of research collaborations) and Item 3 (Overall assessment) is made with ratings ranging from 1 (poor) to 6 (outstanding).

1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, 4 = very good, 5 = excellent, 6 = outstanding

*The aim of this call is to generate internationally significant new breakthroughs in **Antarctic research**. The themes have not been confined to any particular thematic area but the call is open for all projects relevant in terms of Antarctic research. The research may also be global or it may focus on both Polar Regions, but it must be research that cannot be conducted without material on or from the Antarctic.*

## 1 Quality of research plan

Rating (1–6):

### 1.1 Project's relevance to the call

Sub-rating (1–6):

*Guiding question:* How does the proposed project match the call description?

### 1.2 Scientific quality and innovativeness of research plan

Sub-rating (1–6):

*Guiding questions:* Is the project scientifically significant? Does the project have potential for breakthroughs or exceptionally significant outcomes? To what extent are the objectives ambitious and beyond the state of the art (e.g. novel concepts and approaches or development across disciplines)?

### 1.3 Feasibility of research plan

Sub-rating (1–6):

*Guiding questions:* Are the objectives and hypotheses appropriately presented and is the research plan feasible (bearing in mind the extent to which the proposed research may include high risks)? Are the research methods and materials appropriate? Does the applicant acknowledge potential scientific or methodological problem areas, and how are alternative approaches considered? Is the management of the proposed plan appropriate and well planned? Does the research environment support the project, including appropriate research infrastructures?

### 1.4 Ethical issues and open access to research results

*Guiding question:* Are there any ethical issues involved and, if so, how are they taken into account? What is the intended level of open access to research results? Is the data management plan worked out in a sufficient way?

## 2 Competence of applicants, quality of research collaborations

Rating (1–6):

### 2.1 Competence and expertise of applicants

Sub-rating (1–6):

*Guiding questions:* What are the merits and scientific expertise of the applicants from both/all countries? Are they appropriate and sufficient for the proposed project? What are the competences of the applicants in terms of supervising PhD candidates/postdoctoral researchers?

### 2.2 Added value of joint research project

Sub-rating (1–6):

*Guiding questions:* Is the combination of the research teams from both/all countries appropriate? Is there any added value showing that the collaboration produces a better scientific result than that which would emerge from research carried out by the countries alone? What is the role and significance of other national/international collaborations (if applicable)? Does the research project support researcher training?

Panel/Name of reviewer:  
Name of applicant:  
Title of proposed project:

Application number:

---

**2.3 Researcher mobility**

**Sub-rating (1–6):**

*Guiding questions:* How does the mobility plan support the research plan? Does the receiving organisation stand out in the respective field of research? Is the length of the mobility period appropriate and is its timing right for the project?

**2.4 National research consortium (if applicable)**

*Guiding question:* If a national research consortium is involved, what is the significance and added value of the consortium for the attainment of the research objectives?

<b>3 Overall assessment</b>	<b>Final rating (1–6):</b>
-----------------------------	----------------------------

**3.1 Main strengths and weaknesses of project, additional comments and suggestions**

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:

Please note that the final rating should not be a mathematical average of the sub-ratings.