

**Expert Viewpoint: Tips for writing a successful  
Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions Postdoctoral Fellowships  
(MSCA-PF) Proposal**

**DÖNÜŞ TUNCEL**

## **GENERAL REMARKS**

- **Make sure to address all major and sub-criteria using the proposal template provided.**
- **Use simple, plain language that can be understood by experts on first reading.**
- **Avoid jargon, long sentences, and repetitive explanations as much as possible.**
- **Make sure that the fonts used in the tables/charts/figures are not too small and are easily readable.**
- **Explain any abbreviation where you first used it.**
- **Be consistent with the terms and the abbreviation used and use them throughout the proposal.**

# Evaluation and award criteria

Excellence	Impact	Quality and efficiency of the implementation
Quality and pertinence of <b>the project’s research and innovation objectives</b> (and the extent to which they are ambitious, and go beyond the state of the art)	Credibility of the measures to <b>enhance the career perspectives and employability</b> of the researcher and contribution to his/her skills development	Quality and effectiveness <b>of the work plan</b> , assessment of risks and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages
<b>Soundness of the proposed methodology</b> (including <i>interdisciplinary</i> approaches, consideration of the <i>gender</i> dimension and other <i>diversity</i> aspects if relevant for the research project, and the quality of <i>open science</i> practices)	Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise <b>expected outcomes and impacts</b> , as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities	Quality and capacity of <b>the host institutions and participating organisations</b> , including hosting arrangements
Quality of the <b>supervision, training and of the two-way transfer of knowledge</b> between the researcher and the host	The magnitude and importance of the project’s contribution to the <b>expected scientific, societal and economic impacts</b>	
Quality and appropriateness of the <b>researcher’s professional experience</b> , competences and skills		
50%	30%	20%

# CRITERION 1: EXCELLENCE

## Sub-criterion 1.1 :

Quality and pertinence of the project's research and innovation objectives (and the extent to which they are ambitious, and go beyond the state of the art)

- How are the quality and pertinence of the research and innovation objectives?
- To what extent is the proposed work ambitious and goes beyond the current state-of-the-art in the field?
- Are the research and innovation objectives realistically achievable? Are they measurable and verifiable?

## **Sub-criterion 1.2 :**

### **Soundness of the proposed methodology (including interdisciplinary approaches, consideration of the gender dimension and other diversity aspects if relevant for the research project, and the quality of open science practices)**

- How sound is the proposed methodology, including concepts, models and assumptions that underpin the project? Are important methodological challenges identified and measures to tackle them proposed?
- Is an interdisciplinary approach relevant for the research? If relevant, how will expertise and methods from different disciplines be brought together and integrated?
- Are the gender dimension and other diversity aspects relevant for the proposal's research and innovation content? If relevant, how well are they taken into account?
- How are appropriate open science practices implemented as an integral part of the proposed methodology?

### **Sub-criterion 1.3 : Quality of the supervision, training and of the two-way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host**

- How is the quality of the supervision considering the qualifications and experience of the supervisor(s), their level of experience on the research topic proposed and their track record of work, including main international collaborations, as well as the level of experience in supervising/training especially at advanced level?
- How is the quality of the planned training activities for the researcher (scientific aspects, management/organisation, horizontal and key transferrable skills...)?
- For European Fellowships : how is the two-way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and host organization addressed?
- For Global Fellowships : how is the three-way transfer of knowledge between the researcher, host organisation, and associated partner organisation for outgoing phase addressed?

[If applicable] : What is the rationale of the non-academic placement? Does it bring added value to the proposal?

## **Sub-criterion 1.4 :**

### **Quality and appropriateness of the researcher's professional experience, competences and skills**

- How would you consider the curriculum vitae of the researcher, their professional experience, competences and skills?
- How are the quality and appropriateness of the researcher's existing professional experience in relation to the research proposal?

## CRITERION 2: IMPACT

### Sub-criterion 2.1:

#### Credibility of the measures to enhance the career perspectives and employability of the researcher and contribution to his/her skills development

- How will the proposed research and training activities enhance the researcher's career perspectives and employability inside and/or outside academia?
- How will the proposed measures contribute to enhance the researcher's expected skills development?



## **Sub-criterion 2.2:**

**Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities**

- How suitable are the planned dissemination and exploitation measures? Are the target group(s) addressed?

If relevant, how suitable are the strategy for the management of intellectual property and foreseen protection measures?

- How is the planning of communication and public engagement activities (their objectives, main messages, tools and channels)?

## CRITERION 3: QUALITY AND EFFICIENCY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION

### Sub-criterion 3.1 :

#### Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages

- How is the quality and effectiveness of the work plan (including deliverables and milestones)?
- Are the efforts assigned to work packages (including the timing and duration of the different work packages) appropriate?
- Are research and/or administrative risks, that might endanger reaching the objectives, duly considered and the contingency plans put in place should such risks occur?
- Is a Gantt Chart included (mandatory), consistent and complete in relation to the whole work plan (taking into account WPs, scientific deliverables, milestones, secondments and placements, if applicable)?

### **Sub-criterion 3.2 :**

#### **Quality and capacity of the host institutions and participating organisations, including hosting arrangements**

- How is the quality of the hosting arrangements, including integration in the team/institution and support services available to the researcher?
- How is the quality and capacity of all participating organisations, including infrastructure, logistics, and facilities?

[If applicable]: How are the quality of the host arrangements and the capacity of infrastructures/facilities of the organisation where the non-academic placement is planned to take place?