Comments from reviewers in selection committee meeting

1. General overview and research area
   - „The applicant does not make it clear how his work will differ from what is already known ...“
   - „There is a whole suite of literature the candidate has ignored.“

2. Key Research Questions and Objectives
   - „Project is a continuation of the PhD thesis, i.e. a broadening of the field is missing.“
   - „The hypotheses are too vague to be tested experimentally.“
   - „... continuation of PhD work, not hypothesis driven research plan.“
   - „The researcher proposes to achieve many things in this proposal rather than concentrating in one aspect or technique ... thus downgrading the qualitative outcome from the approach.“

3. Methodology
   - „The project description does not mention the specific new methodical skills that the candidate will obtain ..., and how these relate to the project.“
   - „... the methodology part does not describe the workpackages in detail. This is important to assess the expenditure and its justification of this study.“
   - „The research plan, in particular the experimental design, is not (yet) developed to a sufficient degree to clearly assess the likelihood of success.“
   - „Very unclear design of the experiments“

4. Tentative timetable
   - „The timescale for the project strikes me as unrealistic..“

5. Publications
   - „Relatively little first author publications.“
   - „The applicant needs to try very hard to get one or two publications in really high impact journals. This will make all the difference to his future career success.“