

The background of the slide is a blue field with a pattern of interlocking puzzle pieces. Overlaid on this are the twelve yellow stars of the European Union flag, arranged in a circle. In the center, there is a white silhouette of a person with their arms raised, possibly representing a researcher or a student. The text is centered over the puzzle pieces and stars.

European Research  
Council  
Advanced Grants



# Each proposal contains 3 elements

## ❖ SECTION 1:

- ❖ scientific leadership profile (2 pages)
- ❖ curriculum vitae (2 pages)
- ❖ 10-year track record (2 pages)
- ❖ extended synopsis of the project (5 pages).

## ❖ SECTION 2:

- ❖ full scientific proposal (15 pages)

## ❖ SECTION 3:

- ❖ research environment (2 pages)

# A minimum of 8 grants out of 95

~~€2.5M~~ per grant

- ❖ Step 1 consists of a remote evaluation followed by a panel meeting
- ❖ Remove as many weak proposals as possible. Focus on strongest and borderline cases
- ❖ Step 2 consists of a remote evaluation including the external reviews followed by a panel meeting
- ❖ Evaluation is on a 4-point scale, 4 is outstanding, 1 is reject, can use 1/2 points, cutoff is  $\geq 2$  for reapplication in 2 years, otherwise must wait 3 years
- ❖ The 13% interdisciplinary “extra money” is reserved for people breaking into absolutely new fields which do not fit into the existing categories



# EVALUATION CRITERIA:

## *Principal Investigator*

### QUALITY OF RESEARCH OUTPUT/TRACK-RECORD:

- ❖ How well qualified is the PI (and any co-investigator)  
e.g. quality of prior work and of published results in top peer review journals
- ❖ To what extent are the publications and achievements of the PI groundbreaking and demonstrative of independent creative thinking.
- ❖ To what extent does the quality and quantity of funding the PI has attracted during the last 10 years?



# EVALUATION CRITERIA:

## *Research Project*

### · GROUNDBREAKING NATURE OF THE RESEARCH:

- ❖ important challenges at the frontiers of the field
- ❖ ambitious objectives, which go substantially beyond the current state of the art
- ❖ novel or unconventional concepts or approaches
- ❖ well organized

### POTENTIAL IMPACT OF THE RESEARCH:

- ❖ Does the research open new and important, scientific, technological or scholarly horizons?
- ❖ Will the project significantly enhance the research environment and capabilities for frontier research?



# EVALUATION CRITERIA: *Research Project*

## · METHODOLOGY:

- ❖ Is the outlined scientific approach feasible?
- ❖ Is the proposed research methodology comprehensive and appropriate to the project?
- ❖ Will it enable the goals of the project to be achieved within the timescales and resources proposed ?

## HIGH-GAIN/HIGH-RISK BALANCE:

- ❖ Does the proposed research involve novel and/or unconventional methodologies, with a high risk justified by the possibility of a major breakthrough?



## EVALUATION CRITERIA:

### *Research Environment (pass or fail)*

.

#### CONTRIBUTION OF THE RESEARCH ENVIRONMENT TO THE PROJECT:

- ❖ Does the host environment provide the infrastructure necessary and an appropriate intellectual environment?

#### PARTICIPATION OF OTHER LEGAL ENTITIES:

- ❖ Is their participation justified by the scientific added value they bring to the project?

# SCORING AND QUALITY THRESHOLD

- ❖ 4.0 absolutely outstanding
- ❖ 3.5 internationally competitive and excellent
- ❖ 3.0 excellent in the field
- ❖ 2.5 very good but not exceptional

---

- ❖ 2.0 average
- ❖ 1.5 uncompetitive with weaknesses
- ❖ 1.0 totally insufficient



# 9 grants out of 95 awarded

- ❖ Top proposals (unanimously)
- ❖ Gray zone
- ❖ Unsuccessful (unanimously)



# Answers to FAQs by Turkish applicants

- PI must have an excellent publication record  
e.g. A successful applicant's CV had:  
8 Nature, 4 Nature Neuroscience, 1 Nature Genetics, 1 Nature Methods, 9 Cell, 5 Neuron papers
- PI must have a competitive research environment
- Relative weaknesses in the above fields might be compensated with a groundbreaking research proposal
- Low-cost budget does not help much
- Applicant's country is not taken into account in evaluation