



**Engineering and
Physical Sciences
Research Council**

Introducer 1:

Introducer 2:

Introducer 3:

Standard Introducer Form

Grant Reference:

Principal Investigator

Organisation

Title

Value

This form should be completed and brought to the meeting; it will be collected afterwards to help feedback to applicants. Please refer to the meeting guidance notes for details of the assessment criteria that this application should be considered against.

Brief summary of application as aide-memoire for meeting:

1. Summary of reviewers' assessments and the applicant's response

Summarise the key strengths of the application made by the reviewers based on the assessment criteria below. Please comment on all the criteria	Is this a minor or major strength?	Did all reviewers highlight this? (Yes / No)

Summarise the key concerns of the application made by the reviewers based on the assessment criteria below. Please comment on all the criteria	Is this a minor or major concern?	Did all reviewers highlight this? (Yes / No)	Have the applicant(s) responded to this? (Yes / No)

2. Additional call specific criteria

<p>There are no additional criteria for this call.</p>	
--	--

3. Proposal scores

Standard Criteria	Score (1-10)
Quality (Primary)	
Importance (Secondary Major)	
Resources and Management (Secondary)	

Additional Criteria	Score (1-10)
Research Independence (Secondary)	
Host Organisation Support	
Ability to Deliver (Secondary)	

Overall Score	
---------------	--

Note; We require scores for all Standard and Additional assessment criteria that are relevant to the application unless the meeting guidance has specified that an Overall Score only is required. Scores for Call Specific criteria can also be given. Scores are not conveyed to applicants.

4. Overall assessment

Please add any particular comments you would like fed back to the applicant.

5. Quality of the reviewers

For each reviewer, please indicate whether they were an **appropriate choice for the application** and the overall **quality** of their responses. (See below for reviewer scoring scale)

Reviewer	Confidence level	Was this reviewer appropriate? (see below)	The advice from the reviewer was: (see scoring scale below)	Generally, did the tick box mark match the comments?

Appropriate scoring scale – 1. inappropriate, 2. marginal, 3. appropriate, 4. highly appropriate.

Advice scoring scale – 1. disregarded, 2. adequate, 3. useful, 4. thorough and helpful.

Do you have any other comments regarding the quality of the reviewers?