

**REVIEW FORM**

**University – Industry Joint Research Program**

(This form is available at [**http://www.fapesp.br/acordos/agilent**](http://www.fapesp.br/acordos/agilent)**)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **IDENTIFICATION** | **Process #** |  |
| **Principle Investigator:** | | |
| **This review form covers three aspects of the proposal: 1) The research project; 2) The requested budget; and 3) The academic credentials of the PI and of the research team.**  **The Review will be sent to the proponent verbatim, with the objective of helping him/her to understand the decision and eventually to provide him/her with information useful for improving the proposal.**  **The name of the reviewer is strictly confidential and will not be disclosed by FAPESP. Likewise, participation in the review process must not be disclosed by the reviewer. Thus, the reviewer is bound by a confidentiality agreement with FAPESP to never disclose the contents of the review and of the proposal.**  **The call for proposals is available at:** [**http://www.fapesp.br/en/6546**](http://www.fapesp.br/en/6546) | | |

1. **ANALYSIS OF THE RESEARCH PROJECT**
   1. Are the research objectives well defined and compatible with the proposed term? Yes No

|  |
| --- |
| Please comment. |

* 1. Is the methodology adequate to the proposed objectives? Yes No

|  |
| --- |
| Please comment. |

* 1. Please analyze the originality and boldness of the proposal regarding the state of the art in the field.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

* 1. Does the project have the potential to make a significant impact on the specified research domain if the objectives of the proposal are achieved?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

* 1. Does the proposal naturally fit in the research scope that has been developed by the research team?   
       
     Yes No

|  |
| --- |
| Please comment. |

* 1. Please evaluate the viability of the Project (considering economical/financial and commercial/marketing aspects). Practicable Impracticable

|  |
| --- |
| Please explain. |

* 1. Dissemination and Communication: in your opinion, are you confident in the research team's ability to communicate their results widely to relevant scientific communities (examples include: web, international conferences, refereed journals, regional workshops, graduate seminars, curriculum components)?

|  |
| --- |
| Not at all |
| Below average |
| Average |
| Above Average |
| Exceptional |
| The reviewer has intentionally left this question blank |

1. **ANALYSIS OF THE REQUESTED BUDGET**
   1. Is the requested budget justifiable considering the project’s needs?  Yes  Partially  No

|  |
| --- |
| Please comment. |

* 1. Is the relation between the costs of the project and the expected benefits adequate?

|  |
| --- |
| Yes  Partially  No |
| Please comment. |

* 1. Please analyze the specification and the configuration of the requested equipment considering the project’s needs.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

* 1. Are the other items requested (consumables and other expenses) justified by the project’s needs?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

* 1. Other comments on the requested funding.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Suggestion of alternative values for the budget.  **Important:** wages of any nature, third party services that are not technical or eventual, workmanship, acquisition of publications, trips (except for field research), administrative materials and administrative services are non-allowed items and should be excluded from the budget. | | |
|  | **National** | **Imported** |
| **1. Equipment** |  |  |
| **2. Supplies** |  |  |
| **3. Third Part Services** |  |  |
| **4. Transportation Costs** |  |  |
| **5. Per diems** |  |  |
| **6. Others** |  |  |
| **TOTAL** |  |  |

1. **ANALYSIS OF THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR AND RESEARCH TEAM**
   1. Do the academic credentials of the PI evidence ability and previous experience that guarantee the   
        
      success of the project? Yes No

|  |
| --- |
| Please justify. |

* 1. Please analyze the quality and regularity of the Principle Investigator’s scientific and/or technological production as demonstrated by the list of publications and/or patents.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

* 1. Please analyze the qualifications of the scientific team and its adequacy to the project.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

* 1. Does the proposal include relevant participation of graduate students and undergraduates?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**4 ) DEFICIENCIES OF THE PROPOSAL**

|  |
| --- |
| For any items designated, the reasons must be indicated in the corresponding fields of this review form. |
| **Regarding the project:** |
| Project with poorly defined objectives or excessive objectives for the proposed time frame. |
| Project’s viability is undemonstrated. |
| Inadequate or badly described methodology. |
| Project proposes objectives below of the state of the art in the area. |
| **Regarding innovation:** |
| There is no significant innovation resulting from the project. |
| The innovation does not have significant commercial or social value. |
| **Regarding the budget:** |
| Budget not justified considering the project’s needs. |
| High cost in relation to the expected benefits. |
| **Regarding the PI:** |
| Insufficient experience in the field of the project, to a level that can compromise its viability. |
| **Regarding the Research Team:** |
| Insufficient experience in the area of the project. |

**5) GENERAL EVALUATION**

|  |
| --- |
| Please summarize your review and include comments that you think are important (e.g. general evaluation, complementation of information, suggestions). |

**6) FINAL EVALUATION**

|  |
| --- |
| Excellent proposal. |
| Proposal well qualified in all items. |
| Average proposal. |
| Deficient proposal, to be approved only under exceptional conditions. |
| Proposal with serious deficiencies. |

**7) NONDISCLOSURE AGREEMENT AND SIGNATURE**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| I hereby declare that, to the best of my knowledge, there is no circumstance which might cause a potential conflict of interest regarding this review. I agree to keep this review confidential, as well as all the information about the proposal that has been disclosed to me regarding this review. | |
| Date:      /     / | Place: |
| Name: | |
| Institution: | |
| Signature: | |
| **Please initial all pages of the Review form and make sure that the fields Process #, and PI Name were filled in the first page.** | |

**FAPESP, JANUARY 2012**