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Reviewer profile

• 3 reviewers per project

• Diversity balance is very strict
  • Professional profiles: end users / researchers / industry – public / private
  • Age: junior / senior / retired
  • Gender: male / female
  • Geography: from all SM countries
  • Knowledge areas related with project
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My case

• researcher / public
• senior
• female
• South
• drones

My experience as REA reviewer:
• Marie S Curie 2012 + 2013 + 2015
• SEC projects 2012 + 2016
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Process of revision

Roles: Evaluators / Chairpersons / Observer / REA staff

- Evaluators or reviewers
  - Evaluate proposals in a fair and independent way
  - Participate in Consensus Meetings and approve Consensus Reports
  - Act as Rapporteurs for a share of proposals
  - Lead Consensus Meetings
  - Submit Consensus Report

-(Vice-)Chairpersons (CVC)
  - Assist the REA in the evaluation management
  - Do not evaluate proposals
  - Perform quality checking of Consensus Reports
  - Attend consensus meetings when needed (resubmission cases etc)

- Observer
  - Observe the evaluation process
  - Provide advice / improvement suggestions to the REA

- REA Staff
  - Ensure evaluation rules are respected
  - Provide advice to experts for a quality and timely completion of evaluation
Process of revision

Workflow Overview

IER PHASE
-remote-

CR PHASE
-now also remote!!

ESR COMMENTS PHASE
For CVC and Panel Coordinator

30' meeting

For ALL Experts
Process of revision

IER PHASE  half day per 2/3 projects
Only 10+6 pages per project ...BUT... each reviewer has 15 – 20 projects to review !!
Each section, each subcriteria, is classified as strength / weakness
Individual grading –order of magnitude-

CR PHASE  30’ meeting
Previous work needed by rapouter: check coincidences, highlight discrepancies for discussion.
Agreement on list of weaknesses/strengths and on final score (not an average!!)
One reviewer might have 5 CR in one day => Priority is consensus!!

ESR COMMENTS PHASE
Select wording that corresponds with the given grading. Avoid claims!!
### Process of revision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criterion</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Priority if ex-aequo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellence</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above outlines the evaluation criteria, their thresholds, weights, and priority levels. The total weight of the criteria is 70%.
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Some hints

• Excellence
  • You shall engage the reader on this section
  • Perfect match:
    • You and your supervisor are done one to each other
    • Perfect timing for your career
  • Show ambition
  • Previous work together supports credibility

• Impact
  • Focus on one exploitation method

• Implementation
  • Very similar all. Focus on risk assessment and mitigation
  • Show the involvement of the supervisor in the proposal
Some hints

• Resubmissions
  • Do not be too confident with ESR: many reviewer’s weaknesses are dropped
  • Remember only 4.5 (very very good) + 5 (excellent) will pass. Good is not enough!
  • Provide evidences of research activity for the elapsed year

• Outgoing IF
  • Justify that in Europe there is not better option

• Writing
  • Direct to the point
  • Think on the reviewer: make him/her easy to evaluate each subcriteria
  • Correct language (ie. Chairperson)
Some hints

• Curriculum
  • Published papers are very important
  • But also dissemination activities and wining prizes
  • Good to show existing relations with destination

• Observations
  • UK universities have young research-hunters units which help in implementation section
  • European recent PhD from US who have returned to their country
Thank you!
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