



Applicant:

Title of the project:

Dear evaluator, please evaluate the application following the questions on the first page of this form.

Please score the following five items with a score of 1=poor, 2=average, 3=good, 4=very good, or 5=excellent. A short motivation of your opinion is appreciated.

Part 1: Question	Your evaluation	Score (1-5)
<p>1. The expertise of the applicant: <i>Is the applicant among the best within his / her stage of career, in the relevant field of study? Evidence for this can be sought in the CV (Form 3). (25%)</i></p>		
<p>2. The quality of the research proposal: <i>Is the proposed research of high quality and innovative? Is the proposed research feasible and cost-effective (the length of the proposed period of research must be in proportion to the work to be done)? (25%)</i></p>		
<p>3. Added value for the HBCx consortium: <i>Is there a strong link with the central hypothesis: hemodynamic changes are an important and potentially reversible cause of vascular cognitive impairment? (25%)</i></p>		
<p>4. Knowledge exchange, impact, and towards the future: <i>Are the results and /or new insights relevant for problems in the cardio- / cerebrovascular field? Is there an impact on clinical care or other current economic, societal, cultural, policy-related or technological problems? Will the applicant play a relevant role in the future of the HBC theme and consortium? See field 5 and 6 of the proposal on Form 2. (15%)</i></p>		
<p>5. Suitability of the host institute: <i>The host institute, including the research group and direct supervisor should offer the applicant a stimulating research environment and possess good facilities for academic research. The quality of the host institute will be considered in relation to the proposed research. (Form 3) (10%)</i></p>		

Please indicate if the proposal meets the following two criteria. A short motivation of your opinion is appreciated.

Part 2: Points to be earned for topics/themes	Your evaluation	Score*
1. Does the proposal strengthen the cardiac perspective within HBCx?		Yes / No
2. Does the proposal involve implementation of the HBCx concept in clinical practice?		Yes / No

* yes = 0,5 points; no = 0 points



The items below are scored by the project manager

Eligibility check by project manager:

Eligibility	Score*
<i>For postdocs: is the final submission date (August 23rd 2021) within 5 years after obtaining the doctoral degree?</i>	Yes / No
<i>For PhD students: is the final submission date (August 23rd 2021) within the final year of the final contract period of the PhD project?</i>	Yes / No
<i>Has the applicant submitted a statement of support by an HBCx PI listed in ADD II?</i>	Yes / No
<i>Does the topic of the proposal fall within the heart-brain connection theme?</i>	Yes / No

Part 2 items, checked by project manager:

Part 2: Points to be earned for topics/themes	Score*
<i>3. Does the proposal strengthen the cohesion within the consortium (i.e. involve collaboration with multiple consortium partners)? Form 2, item 8.</i>	Yes / No
<i>4. Is the proposal submitted by an applicant who has already been actively involved in the HBCx consortium as a junior scientist (as proven by at least 1 first author paper of the HBCx consortium, or having contributed extensively to the measurements of HBC1 data)? Form 1, final item.</i>	Yes / No

* yes = 0,5 points; no = 0 points

Calculation of scores

Eligibility check: needs to be yes on all relevant items

Part 1: maximum 8 points

Scored by two independent reviewers.

Score for reviewer 1 and 2: Σ (subscore * weight)

Score Part 1: (Score of reviewer 1 + score of reviewer 2) / 10 * 8

Part 2: maximum 2 points

Items 1 and 2: scored by two independent reviewers.

Score for reviewer 1 and 2: Σ (subscore)

Score items 1 and 2: Σ (Score of reviewer 1 + score of reviewer 2) / 2

Items 3 and 4: checked by project manager.

Score items 3 and 4: Σ (subscore)

Score Part 2: Σ (score items 1-2 + score items 3+4)

Total score: score part 1 + score part 2. Maximum 10 points