ISERD Synergy Info day 15.6.23

-Criterion 1 - RESEARCH PROJECT

Ground-breaking nature and potential impact of the research project

To what extent does the proposed research address important challenges?
To what extent are the objectives ambitious and beyond the state of the art (e.g. novel concepts and approaches or development between or across disciplines)?
To what extent is the proposed research high risk/high gain (i.e. if successful the payoffs will be very significant, but there is a high risk that the research project does not entirely fulfil its aims)?

Scientific Approach

To what extent is the outlined scientific approach feasible bearing in mind the extent that the proposed research is high risk/high gain?
To what extent does the proposal go beyond what the individual Principal Investigators could achieve alone?
To what extent do the Principal Investigators succeed in proposing a combination of scientific approaches that are crucial to address the scope and complexity of the research question to be tackled?
To what extent are the proposed research methodology and working arrangements appropriate to achieve the goals of the project?
To what extent does the proposal involve the development of novel methodology?
To what extent are the proposed timescales, resources and PI commitment adequate and properly justified?

-Criterion 2 - PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS

1.0 - Non-competitive 1.5 2.0 - Good 2.5 3.0 - Very Good 3.5 4 - Excellent 4.5 5 - Exceptional

To what extent have the PIs demonstrated the ability to conduct ground-breaking research? *

To what extent do the PIs have the required scientific expertise and capacity to successfully execute the project?
To what extent does the Synergy Grant Group successfully demonstrate in the proposal that it brings together the know-how - such as skills, experience, expertise, disciplines, teams - necessary to address the proposed research question? *

Tips

Remember: this are Synergy grants. The Committee has to be convinced that there is true need for synergy and that there will be true synergy between the members of the team.

- Proposals do not **have to be** multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary. But it can help…
- If all PI's are from the same discipline, it is important to convince the Committee that the expertise of the PI's is complementary, not overlapping. In other words, none of the PI's could carry out the entire project alone if just given enough money.
- If there are less than 4 applicants in the team, it is important to be sure that a critical expertise required for the successful execution of the project is not left out. Examples: a clinician in a highly clinically relevant project, a bioinformatician/computation expert/AI expert in a big data-driven project. Collaboration letters from experts are welcome and valuable, but not sufficient if the relevant expertise is key to to execution of the project.
- In the interview, most of the questions are usually inspired by the comments of the remote reviewers (experts who are not part of the Committee). These comments are not shared in advance with the applicants. Therefore, the applicants should try to figure out what might be the main weaknesses or bottleneck of the proposal, and prepare good answers in advance.
- In the interview, the presentation should be divided equally (more or less) between all applicants. Dominance of a single applicant does not go well.
- The aim of the ERC is to fund **basic** research. A project can have an applied goal (such as development of a new medical device*), but in such case it is important to explain convincingly how this can advance basic knowledge in the field and how such knowledge will be generated and distributed.

**individual Committee members may have different views on this*