DR2 Evaluation Criteria

Curriculum-professional experience

For the curriculum, the Evaluation Committee Members must indicate:
-   If the curriculum is linear or multidisciplinary (presence in laboratories with different themes or complementary technological approaches, etc.);
-   If the work in different laboratories is appreciated (publication as first author or other presentation of work);
-   The reputation of associated laboratories throughout the career: give your opinion on the laboratories with which the candidate was affiliated, specifying their recognition on the international level.

For past activities, specify the major conceptual or technological contributions.

Achievements

Publications: The Evaluation Committee Members must give their reasoned opinion on:

-   The quality, visibility and level of involvement of the candidate: original articles in peer-reviewed journals;
-   Other publications (reviews, publications at international meetings, journals without a review board, books, etc.)

Specify if:
-   Original contributions that are internationally highly;
-   The rank is consistent with the DR2 grade (highest position).

Valorisation: The Evaluation Committee Members must give their opinion on the candidate's development capabilities in terms of:

Economic development:
- Invention (patents, licenses, industrial contracts)
- Business creation
- Development of tools (software, databases, anthologies, etc.)

Clinical transfer:
- Proof of concept study, PHRC, CHRT, clinical study, etc.
- Involvement (promoter, coordinator, partner, etc.) in transversal structures: cohorts, surveys, referral centers, CIC, CRB, etc.

Societal valuation:
- Co-production of tools or devices in partnership with associations or other collectives;
- Implementation of registers, cohorts, questionnaires on the initiative and/or in consultation with associations or other collectives.
- Creation of associations and/or participation in their governance.

Project

The Evaluation Committee Members must specify:
- Whether the project is in line with previous work or introduces a conceptual and/or technological interruption;
- The expected impact on the advancement of knowledge in the principle field as well as in other disciplines.

Analyze and evaluate:

- Originality and relevance of the research question asked, taking of risk, clarity of objectives, positioning in the national and international contexts, methodological relevance;
- Adequacy of resources (human and financial) and environment (access to platforms, availability of tools);
- Ability to participate, develop or coordinate research collaborations internally or nationally and/or internationally;
- Potential for economic, clinical and societal development;
- Consideration of ethical rules and regulatory aspects: rigor and integrity (statistical methodology, conflicts of interest, reproducibility, etc.).

Leadership

The Evaluation Committee Members must give their opinion on the leadership capabilities, taking into account the actual experience of the candidate:

- From research group that established fruitful interactions between researchers in the group or between projects (co-productions);
- Within national, European or international scientific networks (coordination of projects or co-production with partners);
- Thesis supervision
- The relevance of the composition of the team (or group) as compared to the production and ambition of the project.

Comment on the candidate's abilities to:

- Finance his/her research, distinguishing between national and international funding, the nature of contracts (public contracts, industrial contracts, associative contracts, etc.) and the degree of their involvement (principal investigator or partner);
- Attract post-doctoral researchers;
- Be involved in guidance and follow-up with employees;
- Managerial skills

Animation and dissemination of knowledge

The Evaluation Committee Members must give comment on the following activities:
- The notoriety of the conferences at which the candidate presented his/her work;
- The level of involvement in the organization of conferences/symposia;
- Talks in institutes of international reputation;
- Oral presentations invited at conferences (national, European, international);
- National, European or international collaborations (subject, laboratories and/or programs,

countries);
- Participation in editorial boards of scientific journals;
- Participation in national, European or international expert committees or bodies (such as Anses);
- Activities as a consultant, member of councils…;
- Evaluation of scientific activity (manuscripts, calls for projects, commissions, juries…);
- Missions to analyze societal demand, prospective analysis…;
- Participation in the community life of the unit (seminars, management, hygiene and safety, good practices, quality, etc.);
- Participation in the organization of research (institutional responsibilities, member of scientific committee, member of learned society, etc.);
- Teaching activity and level of responsibility in teaching, (Master's supervision, Doctoral level module activities, etc.);
- Organization of events with patient associations or other groups (care professionals, caregivers, users, etc.);
- Popular science (articles for the general public, interviews, editions, videos, scientific mediation products, science and society debates, actions in partnership with associations…).

Oral presentation

The Evaluation Committee Members must comment on the quality of the oral presentation and evaluate the:

- Structured, rigorous and didactic character;
- Ability to convince, enthusiasm;
- Ability to be concise.

Discussion

The Evaluation Committee Members must comment on the relevance of the answers during the discussion by evaluating:

- Ability to analyze, imagination, critical thinking, ability to listen and debate, conciseness of answers;
- Autonomy of the candidate, team spirit, ability to lead a team, willingness to transmit and collaborate;
- Scientific and/or administrative literacy;
- Behavioral intelligence.

The Evaluation Committee Members give an assessment for each criteria evaluated:

o Remarkable   o Excellent   o Very Good   o Good   o Average   o Insufficient   o Out of Scope