

# Guidelines

## General Guidelines for the Written Review

Your review serves as an important basis for the DFG's decision-making process. We will notify you of the review outcome.

The DFG will **anonymise** your statement and share it with the applicants and other reviewers involved in assessing the proposal.

**Please treat the proposal documents confidentially.**

The main **review criteria** include:

- **Quality of the project**
- **Objectives and work programme**
- **Applicants' qualifications**
- **Work and research environment**

These criteria generally apply to all proposals; note, however, that individual programmes may have additional criteria and considerations. Therefore, please use the relevant template when writing your review.

Please provide a **clear recommendation** as to whether the proposal should be approved and, if so, whether the requested funds are appropriate.

**Important Information:**

**The rules of good scientific practice** must also be observed during the review process. Detailed information can be found in the white paper “Safeguarding Good Scientific Practice”.

[www.dfg.de/good\\_scientific\\_practice](http://www.dfg.de/good_scientific_practice)

Please examine whether there are any circumstances that might give rise to an appearance of **bias, favouritism or conflict of interest** on your part. For more information, please refer to the Guidelines for Avoiding Conflicts of Interest (DFG form 10.201)

[www.dfg.de/formulare/10\\_201](http://www.dfg.de/formulare/10_201)

The proposal includes two **lists of publications**. The DFG provides clear guidelines regarding the structure of publication lists in a proposal. To find out more, see our Guidelines for Publication Lists (DFG form 1.91). Please include both publication lists in your evaluation.

[www.dfg.de/formulare/1\\_91](http://www.dfg.de/formulare/1_91)

The review process must not disadvantage applicants based on non-scientific criteria such as age, gender, ethnic background or health restrictions. Appropriate allowance must be made for unavoidable delays in an individual’s research career to the advantage of the applicant. For more information about diversity in the research system and **equal opportunity**, please refer to

[www.dfg.de/diversity/en](http://www.dfg.de/diversity/en)

The individual steps of the review process are summarised under

[Quo vadis, proposal?](#)