

COMPLIANCE WITH THE DATA PROTECTION ACT 1998

In accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998, the personal data provided on this form will be processed by EPSRC, and may be held on computerised database and/or manual files. Further details may be found in the **guidance notes**

New Investigator Award Peer Review

EPSRC Reference:

Document Status:

New Investigator Award

Applicant Details

Applicant		Organisation	
-----------	--	--------------	--

Title of Research Project

Review Information

Response Due Date		Reviewer Reference:	
-------------------	--	---------------------	--

Quality

The way that EPSRC assesses impact has evolved and we no longer require a Pathways to Impact (Ptl) to be submitted with applications. We are currently in a transition period: Proposals submitted BEFORE THE CHANGE will be assessed under the OLD criteria; those submitted AFTER THE REMOVAL OF Ptl will be assessed under the NEW criteria. OLD – Before the change: Proposal has a separate Ptl or Ptl is included as additional 2 pages in the case for support. Use the following criterion: Primary criterion. Please comment on the degree of research excellence of the proposal, making reference to: (1) The novelty, relationship to the context, and timeliness; (2) The ambition, adventure, and transformative aspects identified; (3) The appropriateness of the proposed methodology. (For multi-disciplinary proposals please state which aspects of the proposal you feel qualified to assess) NEW – After the removal of Pathways to Impact: No Ptl/extended case for support. Use the following criterion:

Primary criterion. Please comment on the degree of research excellence of the proposal, making reference to: (1) The novelty, relationship to the context, timeliness and relevance to identified stakeholders; (2) The ambition, adventure, transformative aspects or potential outcomes; (3) The suitability of the proposed methodology and the appropriateness of the approach to achieving impact. (For multi-disciplinary proposals please state which aspects of the proposal you feel qualified to assess.)

Importance

Secondary major criterion. Comment on the national importance of the research. How the research:(1) Contributes to, or helps maintain the health of other disciplines, contributes to addressing key UK societal challenges and/or contributes to future UK economic success and development of emerging industry(s); (2) Meets national needs by establishing/maintaining a unique world leading activity; (3) Complements other UK research funded in the area, including

any relationship to the EPSRC portfolio.

Impact

The way that EPSRC assesses impact has evolved and we no longer require a Pathways to Impact (Ptl) to be submitted with applications. We are currently in a transition period: Proposals submitted BEFORE THE CHANGE will be assessed under the OLD criteria; those submitted AFTER THE REMOVAL OF Ptl will be assessed under the NEW criteria.

OLD – Before the change: Proposal has a separate Ptl or Ptl is included as additional 2 pages in the case for support. Use the following criterion:

Secondary criterion. Please comment on the pathway to impact identified for this work, particularly:

- (1) How complete and realistic are the impacts identified for this work;
- (2) The effectiveness of the activities identified to help realise these impacts, including the resources requested for this purpose;
- (3) The relevance and appropriateness of any beneficiaries or collaborators.

NEW – After the removal of Pathways to Impact: No Ptl or extended case for support. Use the following criterion:

Please write 'NOT REQUIRED' in the impact box, impact has now been embedded as part of the other assessment criteria.

Ability to deliver

Secondary criterion. Please comment on the applicant's ability to deliver the proposed project, making reference to: (1) Appropriateness of the track record of the applicant(s); (2) Balance of skills of the project team, including collaborators.

Research independence

Secondary criterion. Based on the proposal, comment on the applicant's ability to lead original and independent research.

Resources and Management

The way that EPSRC assesses impact has evolved and we no longer require a Pathways to Impact (Ptl) to be submitted with applications. We are currently in a transition period: Proposals submitted BEFORE THE CHANGE will be assessed under the OLD criteria; those submitted AFTER THE REMOVAL OF Ptl will be assessed under the NEW criteria.

OLD – Before the change: Proposal has a separate Ptl or Ptl is included as additional 2 pages in the case for support. Use the following criterion:

Secondary criterion. Please comment on the effectiveness of the proposed planning and management and on whether the requested resources are appropriate and have been fully justified. Please comment explicitly on the viability of the arrangements described to access equipment needed for this project, and particularly on any university or third-party contribution.

NEW – After the removal of Pathways to Impact: No Ptl or extended case for support. Use the following criterion:

Please comment on the effectiveness of the proposed planning and management and on whether the requested resources are appropriate and have been fully justified, making reference to: (1) Any equipment requested, or the viability of the

arrangements described to access equipment needed for this project, and particularly on any university or third-party contribution; (2) Any resources requested for activities to either increase impact, for public engagement or to support responsible innovation.

Host Organisation Support

Please comment on whether the training and development needs of the applicant and the route to meeting these needs are suitably identified in the host organisation statement and if it is clear that the support offered has been tailored to the aspirations of the applicant. Please also comment on the suitability of the mentoring arrangements proposed and the suitability of support mechanisms to ensure that all students/research associates supervised by the applicant have a good quality experience.

Overall Assessment

Please summarise your view of this proposal

My judgement is that:

- 1) This proposal is scientifically or technically flawed
- 2) This proposal does not meet one or more of the assessment criteria
- 3) This proposal meets all assessment criteria but with clear weaknesses
- 4) This is a good proposal that meets all assessment criteria but with minor weaknesses
- 5) This is a strong proposal that broadly meets all assessment criteria
- 6) This is a very strong proposal that fully meets all assessment criteria

My confidence level in assessing this is:

1	2	3	4	5	6
---	---	---	---	---	---

Low	Medium	High
-----	--------	------

Reviewer Expertise

Please indicate your areas of expertise that are relevant to your assessment. Take care not to reveal your identity to the applicant.