



**EVALUATION CRITERIA
FOR THE APPLICATIONS OF THE LENDÜLET “MOMENTUM” CALLS
SCORES AND EXPLANATIONS**

A) A comprehensive evaluation of the research project in terms of importance, novelty and international competitiveness of the topic, and in terms of the criteria of envisaged output and feasibility.

Maximum score: 10 points

1-2 points: Inaccurate data or missing information. Poorly composed and presented research plan. The scientific value of the research project is well below the relevant international standards. Results can be published in low-prestige international journals only, with no significant impact on the research field concerned. (The project should be rejected.)

Please give a detailed explanation of why you propose that the research project should be rejected. Identify specific points along which the research plan could be extended or improved.

3 points: A research project of mediocre importance in international comparison, it contains conceptual weaknesses or its basic concept is wrong. The research may yield mediocre papers in mid-range journals of the given scientific field.

Why do you think the research project cannot reach the above-average output? What are the wrong hypotheses / conceptual weaknesses in the research plan?

4-5 points: The significance of the research project is somewhat above the global average, however, the project contains several conceptual weaknesses. It may yield publications in the higher-prestige journals (top 40% range) of its field.

What do you think makes the research project stand above the average?

6-7 points: A good research project in international comparison, but comes with a couple of weaknesses. The project may yield publications in fairly high-prestige journals (top 25% range) of its field.

Why does this project fall short of a scientific breakthrough? Please list specific weaknesses.

8-9 points: A significant research project in international comparison, with more than one excellent hypothesis. The research project may have a substantial impact on the global scientific community of the field and may yield publications in the most prestigious journals (top 10% range) of its field.

What are the most outstanding parts of the research plan? What are the added scientific values? What justifies that it can have a substantial impact and in what specific field can this impact occur?

10 points: Outstanding, innovative research project. The research project can lead to breakthrough results in its field. Results can be published in the top journals of the field and/or in prestigious multidisciplinary journals.

Why do you think the research project can lead to breakthrough results in its field? What are the added scientific values?

(Please note that 10 points should be given only to truly outstanding projects and should be thoroughly explained.)

B) An evaluation of the prospective Principal Investigator's scientific performance in the light of the data in the narrative CV, the received grants, scientific results and scientific publications, especially regarding the last five active years.

Maximum score: 10 points

1-2 points: Inaccurate or missing data, poorly compiled and presented narrative CV. Due to serious structural, content-related, or linguistic problems in the narrative CV, the applicant's professional career path is not interpretable. Well-below-average results/performance in international comparison. (Should be rejected.)

3 points: In terms of content the narrative CV is very general and irrelevant. The appropriate presentation of the applicant's experience, achievements, and their significance is missing. The applicant's research activity is underdeveloped by international standards, and the publication record is of a low level. Overall evaluation: weak performance.

4-5 points: The narrative CV is unfocused and difficult to follow. The experiences and achievements are not clearly presented, and their relevance is only limitedly evident. Research activity is in line with the international average, both in terms of grant applications and publications. The overall impression is uncertain.

6-7 points: The narrative CV is comprehensible and mostly coherent. The presentation of experience and achievements is partly general. Good scientific performance in international comparison. Applicant regularly publishes first or last author or lead author papers in well-above-average journals (top 25% range) of the field. The performance is moderately convincing.

8-9 points: Overall, the narrative CV is well-structured, though some sections are underdeveloped or less specific. The experiences and achievements are clearly presented and adequately highlighted. Very good scientific performance in international comparison. The applicant clearly has international reputation. Regular publications in the top journals (at least top 10% range) of the field. High number of citations (concerning the publications in the last five active years as well), significant recent first/last/lead author publication activity (depending on the research field concerned). The overall impression is positive.

10 points: The narrative CV is extremely coherent and well-structured. The experiences are relevant, and the achievements and objectives are clearly presented. Considerable international reputation. Outstanding grant activity and publication profile including first/last author or lead author papers in top journals. Very high number of citations (relative to age). The performance is convincing. (Please note that 10 points should be given only to truly outstanding applicants and should be thoroughly explained.)

C) An overall evaluation of the application in terms of basic research character, scientific importance, social benefits, applicability, the Principal Investigator's and the group members' suitability to implement the research project, whether the budget plan is realistic, expected efficiency (ratio of envisaged results to dedicated efforts and costs), suitability of the host research entity to host the project.

Maximum score: 5 points

1 point: Below-average application in international terms, with significant shortcomings and unclear wording.

2 points: Average application with some shortcomings.

3 points: Average application in international comparison with limited novelty.
Please balance the strengths and weaknesses of the application against each other.

4 points: Very good application by international standards. Results may have a substantial impact on the scientific community.
Please clearly list the strengths of the application and comment on the sections that could be still improved.

5 points: An outstanding application in all evaluated aspects.

(Please note that 5 points should be given only to truly outstanding applications and should be thoroughly explained.)