

Criteria		Evaluation items	Points
Scientific-technical aspects of the proposal	Quality, novelty and originality	-Hypothesis and Objectives are properly aligned. 5 points -Novelty of the proposal, originality in the conceptual and/or experimental approach. 5 points -The proposal contributes to extend the state-of-the-art, providing new insights and widening the scientific knowledge in the research field. 5 points	15
	Viability and workplan	-The methodology is clearly described and it is appropriate for the suitable development of the project. 3 points -Adequation of milestones and equipment to the pipeline of the project. 3 points -Adequation of tasks distribution along participants and budget allocation. 2 points -The risks are identified, and mitigation plans are included. 2 points	10
	Impact	-Foreseen applicability and implementation of the solution. 5 points -Expected economic and social impact. 5 points	10
Curriculum of the PI		Evaluation of the principal investigator profile and adequation of the research production to the scientific field of the project. This evaluation will consider: -Scientific production and the impact on scientific community. 10 points. * -Leadership in competitive projects, specially to those which are related with scientific field of the proposal. 10 points -Intellectual and industrial property protection. 5 points	25
Curriculum of the co-PI		Holistic evaluation of the co-principal investigator profile and complementarity for the proposal development. 5 points	5
Transversal collaborative project		Applicable to all transversal collaborative projects (according to the definition of this call; see section 2):	15

	Is this project entailing a collaboration between an IP (or co-IP) affiliated to a healthcare centre and an IP (or co-IP) affiliated to a non-healthcare centre? Yes: 15 points No: 0 points	
Others	Adaptation of the proposal to the strategic lines of the Diputació de Lleida and the IRBLleida (Annex III): Is the proposal addressing one, or more than one, of the following scientific fields? • Health of children, young people, and women. • Nutrition, obesity, and sedentary lifestyle. • Aging. • Mental health. • Chronic diseases, frailty, alternatives to hospitalization and institutionalisation. • Territorial equity (accessibility, emergencies, technology) • Healthy territories, exposure to pesticide, insecticide, and fungicide contaminants. • Cardiovascular • Neurology and neurosciences. • Cancer. Yes: 5 points No: 0 points	5
	Implementation of RRI policies (Annex IV):	5

	-Gender equality in the teams and in their decision-making bodies. Gender perspective addressed along the proposal. 0-2 points -Citizen participation considering various actors who can participate throughout the process to align the results with the values, needs and expectations of society. 0-1 points -Scientific education: Improving the educational process to equip citizens with the skills and knowledge necessary to understand and participate in research and innovation debates. 0-1 points -Accessibility to the information generated, both at the beginning of the research and at the end (publications in open access). 0-1 points	
	One of the two co-PIs is the head of an emerging group or under the age of 45 (born 1980 or later). Yes: 5 points No: 0 points	5
	Possibility of transfer to the SNS. 0-5 points	5
Maximum	Total sum	100



***SCIENTIFIC PRODUCTION EVALUATION:**

5 publications, 2 points max./publication

For each publication, the narrative justification of the following items will be evaluated in accordance with DORA criteria:

- Relevance of the article in the field of knowledge: the relative position of the journal and the narrative justifying citations (standardised citation, position indicators, contextualization of the citation with respect to interaction between disciplines, prestige of the international or national institutions that cite it, in accordance with the guide and video 'Indicators for Defending Scientific Impact in ISCI Calls') and open science contributions will be assessed (full text open access, in its final version or preliminary versions, preprints and postprints, as well as publication in diamond journals or the use of copyleft licences (Creative Commons, etc.)), indicating the date of consultation.

Publication in journals that do not adhere to proven quality editorial practices will be viewed negatively in the evaluation.

- Impact, potential or actual, of the results on innovation or basic, translational or clinical application.
- Place occupied by the candidate in the publication (the first, last and corresponding author positions will be especially valued) and role played in the manuscript.
- Coherence between the selected publication and the research career and in relation to the submitted proposal.

Special consideration will be given to those publications that are among the 10% of the most cited worldwide in their area.

Main author: signs as 1st, seniors or corresponding author. A maximum of three co-first, co-senior or co-corresponding author will be taken into account for consideration.