List of questions

for independent peer reviewers
concerning applications for research fellowships

**Guidelines for answering the list of questions:**

We should be very grateful if you would base your specialist statement (1-2 pages) on the documents you have been sent, addressing the following points in the order given. Please indicate the applicant’s respective strengths and weaknesses in relation to the individual points.

Your statement will, of course be treated with the utmost confidentiality by the Humboldt Foundation’s headquarters and selection committee. If you recommend a rejection we may forward selected passages – usually your summary of the positive and negative aspects of the application – in an anonymised form to the candidate and the academic host to elucidate the decision.

1. How do you rate the applicant’s academic record and academic achievements to date?

Please include the following aspects in your assessment: determination, mobility, breadth of specialization, academic productivity.

1. How do you rate the quality of the applicant’s key publications?

Please include the following aspects in your assessment: originality, innovativeness, impact on the continued development of the field, candidate’s personal contribution (multiple authorship).

1. **How do you rate the originality and innovative power of the applicant’s** research outline?

Please address in particular the following factors: significance for the advancement of the discipline, cogent choice of scientific methods, prospects for academic development, clear focus and practicability within the requested funding period, feasibility of conducting the project at the host institute. (**Please note**: The main focus of the assessment should be the innovative research idea. Applicants are therefore requested not to provide schedules or milestones and to present their outline on no more than five pages. Instead of an extensive bibliography, applicants are requested to name approximately five key publications to describe the current state of research.)

1. How do you rate the applicant's potential with a view to the future?

Please include the following aspects in your assessment: academic potential, continued academic development, career prospects.

*Only required for applications submitted by* ***experienced*** *researchers:*

1. How do you rate the applicant’s own research profile?

*Only required for applications for the* ***Georg Forster Research Fellowship Programme****:*

1. To what extent are the results expected to be produced by the research stay as well as the methods and techniques to be learnt of relevance to the continued development of the applicant’s country of origin?

**Please conclude by summarising the positive and negative aspects of the application in note form.**

*(Natural and engineering scientists please answer this question in English.)*

Questionnaire

for peer review

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Programme** |       | SB:  |
| **Applicant** |       |
| **Host/****Host institution** |       |
| **Reviewer/** **Institution** |       |
| How do you rate the applicant’s **academic record** and **academic achievements** to date? |
| Below average[ ]  | Average[ ]  | Well above average(top 15%)[ ]  | Leaders (top 5%)[ ]  |
| How do you rate the **quality of the applicant’s key publications**? |
| Below average[ ]  | Average[ ]  | Well above average(top 15%)[ ]  | Leaders (top 5%)[ ]  |
| How do you rate **the originality of the applicant’s research outline**? |
| Below average[ ]  | Average[ ]  | Well above average(top 15%)[ ]  | Leaders (top 5%)[ ]  |
| How do you rate **the applicant's potential with a view to the future**? |
| Below average[ ]  | Average[ ]  | Well above average(top 15%)[ ]  | Leaders (top 5%)[ ]  |
| Do the enclosed documents reveal any particular aspects which militate against sponsorship (e.g. potential conflicts with legally-binding principles of scientific ethics, danger of armaments-related technology transfer in terms of legal regulations, etc.)? |
| [ ]   | Yes (please use a separate sheet) | [ ]   | No |
|  **Recommendation to the selection committee** |
| [ ]   | **Refusal**  |
| [ ]   | **Border-line case**  |
| [ ]   | **Research fellowship**  |

In accordance with the Rules of Good Scientific Practice, I herewith declare that I shall not use the information in the documents entrusted to me for my own purposes or pass it on to third parties (c.f. Information for independent peer reviewers on the Humboldt Foundation’s website). I furthermore declare my impartiality in accordance with the regulations of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation (c.f. information on impartiality on the Humboldt Foundation website).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Place/date |  | Signature |

as of April 2016