Magyar Tudományos Akadémia és a Nemzeti Innovációs Hivatal

NEMZETI ERC INFORMÁCIÓS NAP

2012. augusztus 27.

Kulcsemberek

Szendrák Erika
Kroó Norbert
Katona István (KOKI)
Pál Csaba (SZBK)

Szakács Gergely
MTA Enzimológiai Intézet
szakacs@biomembrane.hu

2010-12 nyertesek, döntősök

Szempontok

1. **Pályázz!!!! Lottó-analógia (Katona István)**

Jaj Istenem, csak most segíts meg, hogy enyém legyen a főnyeremény!
Csak most az egyszer segíts, hogy én nyerjek!
Egy idő után elunja a Teremtő az imádkozást és így szól:
Szívesen segítek, jóember! De legalább vegyél egy szelvényt!

Szempontok: kiválóság (kutató, szakmai terv)

1. Kutató

Saját történet: „kiválósági” paramétereim a pályázat beadásakor

- **5 év postdoc az USA-ban**
- **Néhány nagyobb nemzetközi pályázat (NIH, EMBO, EU)**
- **Cancer Cell, Nature Reviews DD cikk**
- **39 publikáció (11-ben első szerző), kb 1200 citáció, h-index: 17**
- **5 utolsó szerzős cikk (saját csoport)**
- **Nemzetközi elismertség (konferenciák, stb.)**

Szempontok

2. Szakmai terv

- Ötlet
- High risk- high gain
- Előzmények, kapcsolódás a korábbi eredményekhez
- Saját kontribúció

Ötletek a kiválósági szempontok kidomborításához

1. CV (quality of the PI):

- **őszinte**
- **nem túlzó**
- **szerénytelen**
- **részletes (**awards, press, highly cited papers, invitations (talks, reviews), PI's work is mentioned in reviews/homepages, students, establishing a lab focusing on the PI's research ideas, funding, reviewing activity (grants, journals), etc.)

2. Abstract

- **nagyon fontos első szűrő**
- **szakszerű**
- **érthető**

Stratégiák

3. Szinopszis (B1)

- **Világos (lay audience)**
- **nem kell sok részlet: IDEA!!!**
- **risk-GAIN**
- **jól definiált célok, megvalósíthatóság**
- **tudomány jelenlegi állása, megoldásra váró probléma, egyéni megoldási javaslat a korábbi eredmények tükrében**

4. Részletes kifejtés (B2)

- **szokásos pályázat, B1 rész kifejtése**
- **előzetes eredmények részletesebben**
- **alternatívák**

Stratégiák

5. Interjú

- **Időkorlát**
- **Világos, átütő (IDEA)**
- handouts, research panel members

- **Felkészítés (MTA, ERC, korábbi nyertesek…)**

Részletek a pályázatomra adott (egymásnak némileg ellentmondó) bírálatokról (pirossal a kiemelt szempont)

THE PI

Quality of research output / track-record; Publications and achievements; Establishment or consolidation of independence.

Reviewer 1.

"…a valuable expertise in different fields…" **multidisciplinarity**

"…5 years as posdoctoral fellow in a very well-recognized group at the NCI and he has recently become group leader in a prestigious Hungarian Institute." **quality-continuity**

"The P.I. is at the origin of a new concept…very importantly the P.I. is the last author in a recent paper …demonstrating his capacity to conduct autonomously ambitious research projects"

publications-independence

Reviewer 2.

"…heavily involved in the initial results founding the current project."

individual contribution

THE PI

Quality of research output / track-record; Publications and achievements; Establishment or consolidation of independence.

Reviewer 3.

"The PI (an MD-PhD) is definitely well qualified and very sure of himself…he has **his own group** of a good size in Hungary and has demonstrated that he could **obtain funds**….it is not easy yet to evaluate his **specific contribution** in front of that of other well-known people with whom he has signed most of his papers"

funding

Reviewer 4.

"..published in very respective journals, mainly from the field of oncology. The applicant was the first or the last author on many of these papers. The publication record proves his creativity and independence in thinking."

publications (last author, without PhD supervisor, own group, etc)

The Research Project

Ground breaking nature of research; Potential impact; High-gain/High-risk balance; Methodology.

Reviewer 1.

"…This project is very **ambitious and risky**."

"A big challenge for a small team even if the **collaboration** with his former team will be very helpful."

"Obviously, the **potential impact** on the research environment is very high."

Reviewer 2.

"the project is thus more a continuation and expansion of existing research and thus not a big jump forward."

collaboration vs individual contribution

"Some parts of the projects has a character of fishing … highly uncertain outcome. Some parts involve setting up novel assays (at least novel in the PIs lab) which are only generically described in the application and thus might involve risks…"

The Research Project

Reviewer 2.

Overall there is a good balance between the potential gain and the risk involved."

"..the PI underestimates the effort … Furthermore, some of the methods have a character of a "fishing expedition" which might not provide a clear answer."

Reviewer 3.

"The methodology proposed is adequate and in line with the PI experience in the field…This is not a very high risk project. It is the pursuit of a program started several years ago…The methodology is explained in a convincing way. The program is certainly feasible particularly if it is carried out in collaboration with groups in the US and elsewhere."

The Research Project

Ground breaking nature of research; Potential impact; High-gain/High-risk balance; Methodology.

Reviewer 4.

"The objectives of this grant are ambitious…The applicant has developed a few years ago his own hypothesis … the potential impact is large. If successful, this research may change the clinical practice in oncology. There are some risks associated with this proposal…Nevertheless, the potential benefits overweight the risks."

The Research Environment

Reviewer 1.
"…provides the infrastuctures necessary for carrying out the project. The P.I. has established a series of collaborations with academic groups…"

Reviewer 2.
"The research environment is not particularly well suited for the discovery effort described here. In addition certain critical parts of the project will be done in other institutions which is not ideal... However, given the relatively large sum set aside in the budget for equipment the research environment is sufficient ..."

Overall assessment

•The presentation given by the applicant during the **interview** and the answers to the questions that were addressed greatly contributed to build the panel's view about the proposal's strengths and weaknesses.
panel members – questions are predictable
•**qualified** to lead this project: good/very good publication record including publications as a last author. He has written **reviews** in top journals and is **regularly invited to speak** in meetings.
•He has already built a good size team in Hungary.
•He presented it to the panel in an excellent way.