# Senior Clinical Investigator - Score Grid

## *1. Expertise of the candidate*

| Unacceptable | Weak (-2) | Reasonable (-1) | Good (0) | Very good (+1) | Excellent (+2) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***1a. Scientific background and independance*** | | | | | |
| There is no evidence of a scientific track record or scientific independence that is sufficient to carry out the mandate in a high-quality way. Indicators for scientific independence are: scientific background, supervision/mentoring of projects, promotorship, collaborations | • There is little or limited evidence of a scientific track record or scientific independence that is sufficient to carry out the mandate in a qualitatively way<br>• AND there is no evidence of developing a scientific reputation or suggesting an upward trajectory | • The scientific track record and independence are average<br>• AND there is some evidence of a starting upward trajectory or scientific reputation<br>• OR the starting up trajectory is not continuing | • The scientific track record and independence are good<br>• AND there is clear evidence of a starting upward trajectory or scientific reputation. | • The scientific track record and independence are very good/impressive.<br>• There is clear evidence of a starting upward trajectory or scientific reputation.<br>• AND the track record was built up within the last years | • Same as very good<br>• AND the research is ground-breaking OR<br>• There is emerging international recognition for influential research output. |
| ***1b. Clinical expertise*** | | | | | |
| There is no evidence of a clinical expertise of the candidate that is enough to contribute in a proactive way to the research | The clinical expertise of the candidate is limited. | The clinical expertise of the candidate is reasonable. | • The clinical expertise of the candidate is good<br>• AND in line with the FKM-research project; evidence for cross-fertilisation is starting-up. | • The clinical expertise of the candidate is good<br>• AND is in line with the FKM-research project; there is clear evidence of cross-fertilisation. | • Same as 'very good'<br>• AND the clinical track record of the candidate is outstanding.<br>• The candidate has reached a position of professional maturity and independence. |
| ***1c. Collaboration with research groups*** | | | | | |
| | There is no evidence of active collaborations with fundamental or basic research groups | | There is clear evidence of (an) active collaboration(s) with fundamental or basic research groups in the area of the proposed research programme | | • Same as Good<br>• AND the collaboration is clearly contributing to the translational gap between the lab and the bed |
| ***1d. Substitution for the clinical tasks (50%) of the mandate holder*** | | | | | |
| No evidence was given for the substitution (at least 40% or alternatively 20% *) of the clinical tasks of the candidate.<br><br>* as an alternative for the 50% substitution, in exceptional cases the candidate can opt for a 20% substitution in combination with the aid of a PhD fellow | A possible substitution is mentioned in the proposal,<br>• but without clear indications of name and profile,<br>• nor indication of the proportion of the substitution (the substitution should be at least 40% or alternatively 20%*)<br>• OR the proportion of substitution is less than 40% or less than 20% (*) | | • There is clear evidence for a substitution (name, profile of the substitute) of the clinical tasks during the mandate<br>• AND the share of substitution is minimum 40 % or alternatively 20%*. | • There is clear evidence for a substitution (name, profile of the substitute) of the clinical tasks during the mandate<br>• AND the share or substitution is between 40-50 %<br>• OR in case of the alternatively 20% solution: the share of the substitution is min. 20% AND the PhD fellow is already known | |

| *1e. Mobility* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | The candidate has developed no international co-operations. | The candidate has attended (nearly) no scientific or clinical stays (abroad).<br>OR<br>During her/his PhD study the candidate has cooperated fairly limited internationally. | The candidate has attended some relevant international scientific and clinical stays, that will represent an added value for the research tasks during the mandate<br>OR during her/his PhD study the candidate has cooperated internationally in a sufficient way. | • Same as 'Good'<br>• AND the candidate has developed an important international network, that will be of important added value for the planned research. | |

## *2. Quality and added value of the research programme*

| Unacceptable | Weak (-2) | Reasonable (-1) | Good (0) | Very good (+1) | Excellent (+2) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***2.a Originality and contribution to the scientific state-of-the-art*** | | | | | |
| The targeted research results are not original and will not contribute to the international state-of-the-art.; they will be clearly behind the current state-of the art. | The targeted research results have a limited innovative character.<br>There will be a very limited contribution to the international state-of-the-art. | The research proposal is moderately original.<br>There will be a contribution to the international state-of-the-art, but rather limited. | The targeted research results are innovative and original.<br>There will be clear added value to the international state-of-th-art. | The targeted research results are innovative and original.<br>They will offer a substantial added value relative to the international state-of-the-art. | The proposal is highly innovative and very unique. It provides an unmistakable added value with regard to the international state-of-the-art. It distinguishes itself in an outstanding manner from the ongoing research at the international level ("pioneering project") |
| **2b.** ***Quality of the research approach*** | | | | | |
| • The targeted scientific objectives will not be realised with the proposed research approach<br>OR<br>• The targeted scientific objectives are intrinsically not feasible<br>OR<br>• The research approach is insufficiently elaborated to allow a correct evaluation | The research approach is characterised by serious flaws or shortcomings. Structural adjustments to the research approach are needed. | The research approach is reasonable but contains some gaps or shortcomings. There is room for improvement. | The research approach is well elaborated and justified, and well matched to the realisation of the scientific objectives. There are no significant gaps or shortcomings. | • The research approach is well elaborated and justified, and well matched to the realisation of the scientific objectives. There are no short comings.<br>AND<br>• The research approach also includes a precise identification of the potential risks with alternative strategies and fall-back research options. | • Same as 'very good'<br>AND<br>• The research plan is focused on a high level of integration, cross-fertilization and synergy with the collaborating research partners (cfr. translational gap between lab and the bed).<br>AND<br>• The approach is cost-efficient. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***2.c Feasibility*** | | | | | |
| The proposal is elaborated iin an insufficient way whereby it is unclear if the targeted goals are feasible within the project boundaries (timing, resources).<br>OR<br>Reaching the scientific project goals is evaluated as not feasible within the project goals (timing, resources)<br>OR<br>The project proposal contains too little research activities for a half-time period of 5 years. | The feasibility of the project within the project boundaries (budget, resources) is low.<br>OR<br>The proposed research activities are considered as low for a half-time period of 5 years. | The feasibility of the planned research activities within the project boundaries is reasonable.<br>OR<br>The proposed research activities are considered as minimal for a half-time period of 5 years. | The feasibility of the planned research activities within the project boundaries is good.<br>AND<br>The project consist of enough research activities for a half-time period of 5 years. | The proposal provides an optimal balans between the number of research activites and the proposed timing and resources. | |
| ***2.d Clinical impact*** | | | | | |
| It is unclear how the research goals will result in clinical applications. | The chance that the targeted scientific goals will result in clinical applications is considered as low | • The chance that the targeted scientific goals will result in clinical applications is considered as quite realistic.<br>AND<br>• The impact of these applications for the patient and/or healthcare is considered as limited. | • The chance that the targeted scientific goals will result in clinical applications is considered as quite realistic.<br>AND<br>• The impact of these applications for the patient and/or healthcare is considered as quite high. | • The chance that the targeted scientific goals will result in clinical applications is considered as very realistic. The impact of these applications for the patient and/or healthcare is considered as quite high.<br>OR<br>• The chance that the targeted scientific goals will result in clinical applications is considered as quite realistic. The impact of these applications for the patient and/or healthcare is considered as very high. | • The chance that the targeted scientific goals will result in clinical applications is considered as very realistic.<br>AND<br>• The impact of these applications for the patient and/or healthcare is considered as very high. |