

Evaluation criteria for the Danish Diabetes and Endocrine Academy's fellowship programme

This document includes evaluation criteria for the Danish Diabetes and Endocrine Academy's (DDEA) fellowship programme:

- [PhD scholarships](#)
- [Postdoctoral Fellowships](#)
- [Clinical Postdoctoral Fellowships](#)
- [Visiting Researcher Grants](#)

The evaluation criteria are applicable for all grant schemes within the DDEA fellowship programme.

Introduction

Each reviewer must provide a complete review of each application assigned to her/him according to the four evaluation criteria: 1) the applicant; 2) the project; 3) the research environment; and 4) the three DDEA funding focus areas (*not for clinical postdoctoral fellowships, [see below](#)*); and 5) overall.

The reviewers must give separate scores for each of the four evaluation criteria (applicant, project, research environment and the DDEA funding focus areas, see below) and an overall impact score on a scale from 1 to 5 (5 being highest), as shown in the table below. The reviewers must also describe strengths and weaknesses for each criterion and overall.

Score	Descriptor
5	Excellent
4	Very good
3	Good
2	Satisfactory
1	Unsatisfactory

Note: Applications are submitted by candidates from different fields of research (e.g. clinical research, basal research, epidemiology), and medical candidates may apply for part-time clinical positions allocating time to research and time to clinical work/specialisation simultaneously. The evaluation of the applications should therefore take into consideration the different backgrounds of the candidate (e.g. the applicant's prior research experience may vary for clinical researchers in particular), the position applied for and the nature of the project described in the application.

In particular, please note the specific evaluation criteria for [clinical postdoctoral fellowships](#) (2nd round 2023).

Evaluation criteria for PhD scholarships

The following evaluation criteria are applicable for the following DDEA PhD scholarships: 2/3-financed (with and without specific themes); PhD scholarships with co-financing from industry; cross-academy PhD scholarships; Strategic partnership PhD scholarships.

1: Applicant

The ideal candidate has relevant research experience from her/his master studies including the following:

- Publication (accepted or published) of research results in peer-reviewed journals (in relation to the candidate's research area and years of experience with diabetes or other endocrine research)
- Participation in national or international conferences and research meetings
- Exposure to an international research environment (locally and/or through a research stay abroad)
- Demonstrated technical or clinical skills with relevance to the PhD project.

Furthermore, the ideal candidate expresses high motivation and commitment, has received high grades during her/his Master's studies and has followed extracurricular activities or obtained other relevant qualifications improving her/his skills with relevance to the PhD project.

2: Project: PhD plan, scientific quality, approach and innovation

The ideal project plan includes a well-reasoned description of the overall strategy, methodology and analyses. The strategy should be appropriate for accomplishing the specific aims of the project and should ensure a robust and unbiased approach.

Furthermore, the project plan should challenge, seek to shift or improve current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilising up-to-date theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation or interventions.

Finally, the project plan should have sufficient scientific weight and research training for the PhD study and should describe any potential problems, alternative strategies and milestones for success.

3: Research environment: Investigator(s), supervisors and collaborators

The ideal research environment includes supervisors and collaborators that have demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s) (recent publications, international standing).

The supervisors and collaborators have complementary and integrated expertise (i.e. affiliation of collaborators from other research disciplines (e.g. basic science, clinical science, epidemiology, psychology), from abroad or from other sectors).

The supervisors and collaborators can sufficiently contribute to the completion of the PhD study (experience with supervision of PhD students) and offer a substantially international network for the applicant.

The leadership approach and governance and organisational structure of the involved PhD student, supervisors and collaborators are appropriate and transparent.

4: DDEA funding focus areas: Internationalisation, interdisciplinarity and collaboration across sectors

The DDEA grants must promote the three funding focus areas of the DDEA: 1) internationalisation; 2) interdisciplinarity; and 3) collaboration across sectors.

The ideal application includes at least one of the three funding focus areas, as described below.

1. **Internationalisation:** The application includes affiliation of collaborators from abroad and/or a planned research stay abroad during the PhD study (<six months) (accepted by the host).
2. **Interdisciplinarity:** The application includes affiliation of collaborators from other research disciplines (e.g. basic science, clinical science, epidemiology, psychology) (mandatory) with a clear description of how the synergy of research disciplines contributes to achieving the research goals of the project. The application describes a planned change of research/work environment (<six months) (accepted by the host).
3. **Collaboration across sectors:** The application includes affiliation of collaborators from other sectors e.g. industry, general practice, university hospitals or formalised agreements with collaborators from other sectors. The application describes a planned change of research/work environment (<six months) (accepted by the host).

Collaborations can be documented by collaboration agreements or an e-mail from the collaborators describing the nature of the collaboration, including e.g. joint publications based on affiliation and educational background of authors, joint and funded applications, patent applications or spin-off companies.

5: Overall impact

The overall impact score should reflect the reviewer's overall assessment of the application in consideration of the four scored evaluation criteria, including strengths and weakness of the application overall.

However, this score does not need to be an average score of the four other scores, as a total average score of all five scores will be calculated automatically (*total average score*).

An application does not need to be strong in all four evaluation criteria to be judged likely to have major scientific impact. For example, a project that by its nature is not innovative may be essential to advance a field.

Evaluation criteria for postdoctoral fellowships

The following evaluation criteria are applicable for the following DDEA Postdoctoral Fellowships: Two-year Postdoctoral Fellowships without specific themes; Postdoctoral Fellowships with co-financing from industry; Strategic partnership Postdoctoral Fellowships.

1: Applicant

The ideal candidate has relevant research experience from her/his PhD studies or from previous postdoc studies including:

- Publication (accepted or published) of research results in peer-reviewed journals, including publication in high impact journals and first authorships (in relation to the candidate's research area and years of experience with diabetes or other endocrine research)
- Oral and poster presentations at important and relevant national or international conferences
- Assessment and review activities
- External funding record and receipt of awards
- Demonstrated technical or clinical skills with relevance to the postdoc project
- Research stay abroad
- Research stay in another institution and/or demonstrated mobility from PhD study to postdoc studies, i.e. the applicant carries out her/his postdoc studies in another institution than the institution where the applicant carried out her/his PhD studies.

Furthermore, the ideal candidate has shown progress in her/his academic career path, expresses high motivation and commitment, has received high grades during her/his PhD studies and has followed extracurricular activities or obtained other relevant qualifications improving her/his skills with relevance to the postdoc project.

2: Project: Scientific quality, approach and innovation

The ideal project plan includes a well-reasoned description of the overall strategy, methodology and analyses. The strategy should be appropriate for accomplishing the specific aims of the project and should ensure a robust and unbiased approach.

Furthermore, the project plan should challenge, seek to shift or improve current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilising up-to-date theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation or interventions.

Finally, the project plan should describe any potential problems, alternative strategies and milestones for success.

3: Research environment: Investigator(s) and collaborators

The ideal research environment includes supervisors and collaborators that have demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s) (recent publications, international standing).

The supervisors and collaborators have complementary and integrated expertise (i.e. affiliation of collaborators from other research disciplines (e.g. basic science, clinical science, epidemiology, psychology), from abroad or from other sectors) and they offer a substantially international network for the applicant.

The leadership approach and governance and organisational structure of the involved postdoc fellow, supervisors and collaborators are appropriate and transparent.

Finally, the ideal research environment offers a clear plan for career development for the postdoc fellow.

4: DDEA funding focus areas: Internationalisation, interdisciplinarity and collaboration across sectors

The DDEA grants must promote the three funding focus areas of the DDEA: 1) internationalisation; 2) interdisciplinarity; and 3) collaboration across sectors.

The ideal application includes at least one of the three funding focus areas, as described below.

In particular, a planned research stay abroad or in another institution of <six months should be prioritised.

1. **Internationalisation:** The application includes affiliation of collaborators from abroad and/or a planned research stay abroad during the postdoc study (<six months) (accepted by the host).
2. **Interdisciplinarity:** The application includes affiliation of collaborators from other research disciplines (e.g. basic science, clinical science, epidemiology, psychology) with a clear description of how the synergy of research disciplines contributes to achieving the goals of the project. The application describes a planned change of research/work environment at another institution (<six months) (accepted by the host).
3. **Collaboration across sectors:** The application includes affiliation of collaborators from other sectors e.g. industry, general practice, university hospitals or formalised agreements with collaborators from other sectors. The application describes a planned change of research/work environment in other sectors (<six months) (accepted by the host).

Collaborations can be documented by collaboration agreements or an e-mail from the collaborators describing the nature of the collaboration, including e.g. joint publications based on affiliation and educational background of authors, joint and funded applications, patent applications or spin-off companies.

5: Overall impact

The overall impact score should reflect the reviewer's overall assessment of the application in consideration of the four scored evaluation criteria, including strengths and weakness of the application overall.

However, this score does not need to be an average score of the four other scores, as a total average score of all five scores will be calculated automatically (*total average score*).

An application does not need to be strong in all four evaluation criteria to be judged likely to have major scientific impact. For example, a project that by its nature is not innovative may be essential to advance a field.

Evaluation criteria for clinical postdoctoral fellowships

The following evaluation criteria are applicable for the DDEA Clinical Postdoctoral Fellowships.

The criteria are the same as for other postdoctoral fellowships (as described above), but criteria no 4 (DDEA funding focus areas) should not be considered for this grant scheme.

1: Applicant

The ideal candidate has relevant research experience from her/his PhD studies or from previous postdoc studies including:

- Publication (accepted or published) of research results in peer-reviewed journals, including publication in high impact journals and first authorships (in relation to the candidate's research area and years of experience with diabetes or other endocrine research)
- Oral and poster presentations at important and relevant national or international conferences
- Assessment and review activities
- External funding record and receipt of awards
- Demonstrated technical or clinical skills with relevance to the postdoc project
- Research stay abroad
- Research stay in another institution and/or demonstrated mobility from PhD study to postdoc studies, i.e. the applicant carries out her/his postdoc studies in another institution than the institution where the applicant carried out her/his PhD studies.

Furthermore, the ideal candidate has shown progress in her/his academic career path, expresses high motivation and commitment, has received high grades during her/his PhD studies and has followed extracurricular activities or obtained other relevant qualifications improving her/his skills with relevance to the postdoc project.

2: Project: Scientific quality, approach and innovation

The ideal project plan includes a well-reasoned description of the overall strategy, methodology and analyses. The strategy should be appropriate for accomplishing the specific aims of the project and should ensure a robust and unbiased approach.

Furthermore, the project plan should challenge, seek to shift or improve current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilising up-to-date theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation or interventions.

Finally, the project plan should describe any potential problems, alternative strategies and milestones for success.

The project plan and time schedule must take into account that the project time is only 20% for two years and that the project can be carried out within this timeframe.

3: Research environment: Investigator(s) and collaborators

The ideal research environment includes supervisors and collaborators that have demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s) (recent publications, international standing).

The supervisors and collaborators have complementary and integrated expertise (i.e. affiliation of collaborators from other research disciplines (e.g. basic science, clinical science, epidemiology, psychology), from abroad or from other sectors) and they offer a substantially international network for the applicant.

The leadership approach and governance and organisational structure of the involved postdoc fellow, supervisors and collaborators are appropriate and transparent.

Finally, the ideal research environment offers a clear plan for career development for the postdoc fellow.

4: Not relevant for this grant scheme.

5: Overall impact

The overall impact score should reflect the reviewer's overall assessment of the application in consideration of the three scored evaluation criteria (1-3), including strengths and weakness of the application overall.

However, this score does not need to be an average score of the three other scores, as a total average score of all four (1-3, 5) scores will be calculated automatically (*total average score*).

An application does not need to be strong in all three evaluation criteria to be judged likely to have major scientific impact. For example, a project that by its nature is not innovative may be essential to advance a field.

Evaluation criteria for Visiting Researcher Grants

The following evaluation criteria are applicable for all DDEA Visiting Researcher Grants.

1: Applicant

The ideal candidate has relevant research experience including:

- Publication (accepted or published) of research results in peer-reviewed journals, including publication in high impact journals and first/last authorships (in relation to the candidate's research area and years of experience with diabetes or other endocrine research)
- Oral and poster presentations at important and relevant conferences
- Assessment and review activities
- External funding record and receipt of large awards
- Demonstrated mobility including research stay abroad and/or other visiting researcher stays abroad with relevant outputs.

Furthermore, the ideal candidate has shown progress in her/his academic career path.

2: Project: Scientific quality, approach and innovation

The ideal project plan includes a well-reasoned description of the overall strategy, methodology and analyses. The strategy should be appropriate for accomplishing the specific aims of the project and should ensure a robust and unbiased approach.

Furthermore, the project plan should describe any potential problems, alternative strategies and milestones for success, and the project plan should challenge, seek to shift or improve current research or clinical practice paradigms by utilising up-to-date theoretical concepts, approaches or methodologies, instrumentation or interventions.

Finally, the project plan includes a description of the extent to which the visit will strengthen the scientific research capacity in Denmark.

3: Research environment: Investigator(s), supervisors and collaborators

The ideal research environment at the host institution includes a principal investigator and collaborators that have demonstrated an ongoing record of accomplishments that have advanced their field(s) (recent publications, international standing).

The host principal investigator and collaborators have complementary and integrated expertise (i.e. affiliation of collaborators from other research disciplines (e.g. basic science, clinical science, epidemiology, psychology), from abroad or from other sectors).

The leadership approach and governance and organisational structure of the involved visiting researcher, principal investigators and collaborators are appropriate and transparent.

4: DDEA funding focus areas: Internationalisation, interdisciplinarity and collaboration across sectors

The DDEA grants must promote the three funding focus areas of the DDEA: 1) internationalisation; 2) interdisciplinarity; and 3) collaboration across sectors.

The ideal application includes at least one of the three funding focus areas, as described below.

1. **Internationalisation:** The application contributes to knowledge exchange between the host institution and the applicant's home institution, i.e. agreements of change of research environment for PhD students or postdoctoral students, joint publications, joint applications for funding.
2. **Interdisciplinarity:** The application includes affiliation of collaborators from other research disciplines (e.g. basic science, clinical science, epidemiology, psychology) with a clear description of how the synergy of research disciplines contributes to achieving the goals of the project.
3. **Collaboration across sectors:** The application includes affiliation of collaborators from other sectors e.g. industry, general practice, university hospitals or formalised agreements with collaborators from other sectors.

Collaborations can be documented by collaboration agreements or an e-mail from the collaborators describing the nature of the collaboration, including e.g. joint publications based on affiliation and educational background of authors, joint and funded applications, patent applications or spin-off companies.

5: Overall impact

The overall impact score should reflect the reviewer's overall assessment of the application in consideration of the four scored evaluation criteria, including strengths and weakness of the application overall.

However, this score does not need to be an average score of the four other scores, as a total average score of all five scores will be calculated automatically (*total average score*).

An application does not need to be strong in all four evaluation criteria to be judged likely to have major scientific impact. For example, a project that by its nature is not innovative may be essential to advance a field.