

Senior clinical investigator: *Score grid for first application*

1. Expertise of the candidate

Please take into account the candidate's scientific seniority and, where appropriate, allow for mentioned career breaks.

The assessment should be based on a range of scientifically relevant activities, skills, experiences and achievements, such as the quality and impact (rather than quantity) of the publication record, as well as other meaningful scientific output. Consider also other impact (societal/economical/...) beyond publications and obtained research funding.

Unacceptable	Weak (-2)	Reasonable (-1)	Good (0)	Very good (+1)	Excellent (+2)
1a. Scientific background and independence					
There is no evidence of a scientific track record or scientific independence that is sufficient to carry out the fellowship in a high-quality way. Indicators for scientific independence are: scientific background, supervision/mentoring of projects, promotorship, collaborations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is little or limited evidence of a scientific track record or scientific independence that is sufficient to carry out the fellowship in a qualitatively way AND there is no evidence of developing a scientific reputation or suggesting an upward trajectory. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scientific track record and independence are average AND there is some evidence of a starting upward trajectory or scientific reputation OR the starting upward trajectory is not continuing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scientific track record and independence are good AND there is clear evidence of a starting upward trajectory or scientific reputation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scientific track record and independence are very good/impressive. There is clear evidence of a starting upward trajectory or scientific reputation. AND the track record was built up within the last years. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as 'very good' AND the research is ground-breaking OR 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The clinical expertise of the candidate is good AND in line with the proposed research; evidence for cross-fertilisation is starting up. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The clinical expertise of the candidate is good AND is in line with the proposed research; there is clear evidence of cross-fertilisation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as 'very good' AND the clinical track record of the candidate is outstanding. 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 active collaboration(s) with fundamental or basic research groups in the area of the proposed research programme.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as 'good' AND the collaboration is clearly contributing to the translational gap between the lab and the bed.
1d. Substitution of the clinical tasks					
No evidence was given for the substitution (at least 40% or alternatively 20%) of the clinical tasks of the candidate. <i>As an alternative for the 50% substitution, in exceptional cases the candidate can opt for a 20% substitution combined with the aid of a PhD fellow or other scientific/ technical staff.</i>	A possible substitution is mentioned in the proposal, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> but without clear indications of name and profile, nor indication of the proportion of the substitution (the substitution should be at least 40% or alternatively 20%) OR the proportion of substitution is less than 40% or alternatively less than 20%. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is clear evidence for a substitution (name, profile of the substitute) of the clinical tasks AND the share of substitution is minimum 40% or alternatively 20%. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is clear evidence for a substitution (name, profile of the substitute) of the clinical tasks AND the share of substitution is 40-50% OR in case of the alternative 20% option: the share of the substitution is min. 20% AND the scientific/technical aid is already known. 	

Unacceptable	Weak (-2)	Reasonable (-1)	Good (0)	Very good (+1)	Excellent (+2)
1e. Mobility					
	The candidate has developed no international cooperations.	The candidate has attended (nearly) no scientific or clinical stays (abroad). OR During their 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 fellowship. OR During their PhD study the candidate has cooperated internationally in a sufficient way.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as 'good' • 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)
2a. 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. There will be a very limited contribution to the international state-of-the-art.	The research proposal is moderately original. There will be a contribution to the international state-of-the-art, but rather limited.	The targeted research results are innovative and original. There will be clear added value to the international state-of-the-art.	The targeted research results are innovative and original. 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					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The targeted scientific objectives will not be realised with the proposed research approach OR • The targeted scientific objectives are intrinsically not feasible OR • 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research approach is well elaborated and justified, and well matched to the realisation of the scientific objectives. There are no shortcomings. AND • The research approach also includes a precise identification of the potential risks with alternative strategies and fall-back research options. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as 'very good' AND • 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). AND • The approach is cost-efficient.

Unacceptable	Weak (-2)	Reasonable (-1)	Good (0)	Very good (+1)	Excellent (+2)
2c. Feasibility					
<p>The proposal is elaborated in an insufficient way, whereby it is unclear if the targeted goals are feasible within the project boundaries (timing, resources).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Reaching the scientific project goals is evaluated as not feasible within the project goals (timing, resources).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The project proposal contains too little research activities for a half-time period of 5 years.</p>	<p>The feasibility of the project within the project boundaries (budget, resources) is low.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The proposed research activities are considered as low for a half-time period of 5 years.</p>	<p>The feasibility of the planned research activities within the project boundaries is reasonable.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The proposed research activities are considered as minimal for a half-time period of 5 years.</p>	<p>The feasibility of the planned research activities within the project boundaries is good.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The project consist of enough research activities for a half-time period of 5 years.</p>	<p>The proposal provides an optimal balans between the number of research activities and the proposed timing and resources.</p>	
2d. Clinical impact					
<p>It is unclear how the research goals will result in clinical applications.</p>	<p>The chance that the targeted scientific goals will result in clinical applications is considered as low.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The chance that the targeted scientific goals will result in clinical applications is considered as quite realistic. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact of these applications for the patient or healthcare is considered as limited. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The chance that the targeted scientific goals will result in clinical applications is considered as quite realistic. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact of these applications for the patient or healthcare is considered as quite high. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 or healthcare is considered as quite high. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 or healthcare is considered as very high. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The chance that the targeted scientific goals will result in clinical applications is considered as very realistic. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact of these applications for the patient or healthcare is considered as very high.