

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.“*