

# Instructions for evaluating research proposals

## The Danish Council for Strategic Research

### Evaluation of research quality

When writing your evaluation, please use the assessment form which you may download at:

<http://en.fi.dk/councils-commissions/the-danish-council-for-strategic-research/on-the-peerreview-college/assessment-material/assessment-form-transport-and-infrastructure>

There are two main criteria in the assessment: 1) the scientific quality of the project, 2) the research group (applicants) and the feasibility of the project. The main criteria are divided into sub-criteria. You are asked to make assessments of each sub-criterion with ratings from *poor* to *excellent*, according to the following scale:

*An excellent* proposal: one which is extremely good by international comparison, with no elements to be improved

*A very good* proposal: one which only contains minor elements that could be improved

*A good* proposal: one which contains some elements that can be improved

*A satisfactory* proposal: one which is in need of substantial modification or improvement

*A poor* proposal: one which has severe weaknesses that are intrinsic to the proposed project

*NR* indicates that the criterion is not relevant

Please write comments for each main criterion. These comments are particularly valuable, both to the programme commission in its decision-making and to the applicants. The peer reviews will be made available to the applicants and can thus provide useful guidance for drafting future proposals.

Within each criterion you are asked to indicate your level of confidence as *low*, *medium* or *high*.

Finally, you are asked to make concluding remarks. If you assess the scientific quality of the proposal to be excellent or good, you are asked to state your recommended corrections to the project, if any. If you assess the scientific quality of the proposal to be poor, you are asked to motivate this.

### Consultative procedure, impartiality and confidentiality

The applicants have a legal right to receive a copy of the peer reviews and comments concerning their own application. The applicants will therefore also be informed about the identity of the peer reviewers. We will, however, ask them not to contact you.

According to Danish legislation it is highly important that reviewers are not in any way biased in relation to an application. We therefore ask you to inform us if you at any time realise that you have:

Specific personal or financial interest in the outcome of the matter

Recently worked closely with the applicant or a member of the research group

A close friendship with or animosity towards the applicant or a member of the research group

or if other circumstances can give rise to doubt concerning your impartiality.

According to Danish law, you are bound to observe professional secrecy concerning confidential information contained in the applications reviewed. We therefore ask you to treat the applications with confidentiality and destroy them after the evaluation.

### **Additional perspective to the research proposal**

The call in response to which this application was sent can be read at:

<http://en.fi.dk/councils-commissions/the-danish-council-for-strategic-research/about-the-council/research-funds-2011/research-funds-2011>

If you would like to read supplemental information, this may be found on the website of the Danish Agency for Science, Technology and Innovation:

<http://en.fi.dk/councils-commissions/the-danish-council-for-strategic-research>

Would you have questions or comments, please feel welcome to contact us at [tra@fi.dk](mailto:tra@fi.dk) or at telephone number:

+45 7231 8408 (Nadja Krichou),

+45 7231 8409 (Nele Høgsbro),

+45 7231 8393 (Klaus Rosenfeldt Jakobsen) or

+45 7231 8395 (Thomas Trøst Hanse)