RESEARCH SCHOOL
Ruhr-Universität Bochum

Application PR.INT EVENT

Template for a non-subject-specific review

Application number	
Applicant	

Thank you for preparing a **non-subject-specific review**. Your review will be presented to the Early Career Researchers (ECR) Board together with a subject-specific evaluation by another doctoral researcher and the complete application. The ECR Board will make a recommendation to the Executive Board on the basis of both reviews. The Executive Board will finally decide which applications are granted.

The non-subject specific review focuses on general, formal and strategic aspects. The following questions can be answered in English or German. **We kindly ask you to point out strengths as well as weaknesses of the application**.

Use of AI tools in the review process
The Research School has guidelines on the use of AI tools in the application and review process for its funding programmes. These guidelines contain the following information for reviewers and for the decision-making process:

1. The use of AI tools by applicants in the preparation of applications is not an evaluation criterion and is not taken into account in the review process.
2. The use of AI is not permitted for the review process.

(1) How comprehensible was the doctoral project's general description in the application?
[Has the applicant made the relevance of his/her research clear to you? Has the applicant used unclear subject-specific terms and abbreviations unnecessarily frequently for you?]

(2) How do you evaluate the impact of the planned project on the international network of the applicant's chair/institute/faculty, or even of Ruhr-Universität as a whole?
[Do you think that the contact will be sustained? Will other members of the applicant's chair/institute/faculty (or even RUB) benefit from the cooperation in the future?]

(3) Please rate spelling and grammar of the application with the following scale

Excellent, (almost) no mistakes	◯
Good, very few mistakes	◯
Average, some mistakes	◯
Poor, many mistakes	◯
Very poor, the application is barely understandable due to a lot of mistakes	◯

(4) How do you evaluate the budget plan and cost explanation?
*[Is the budget plan transparent and reasonable for you? Has the applicant calculated the budget too high or too low for the planned activities? Has the applicant applied for any costs that RS does not cover in principle (Information **Link**)? In your opinion, are there any costs that RS should not cover?]*

(5) What is your general impression of the application?

[Has the application been written with care? Is the application clearly structured? Is the overall reasoning of the application convincing to you? Has the volume of text permitted been used sensibly?]

(6a) Final conclusion & assessment

[Please use the following space to draw a final conclusion. List the most important strengths and weaknesses of the application and please indicate how you rate these points to reach your final conclusion.]

RESEARCH SCHOOL
Ruhr-Universität Bochum

(6b) Please conclude with one of the given statements. Make sure that your final recommendation is in line with your overall reasoning.

- **An excellent application in every respect (5)** ◯
- **A good application with minor shortcomings (4)** ◯
- **An average application with some shortcomings (3)** ◯
- **A rather poor application with serious shortcomings (2)** ◯
- **A very poor application with major shortcomings (1)** ◯

How many reviews have you already prepared for Research School?

Subject-specific ☐

Non subject-specific ☐

Location _____ **Date** _____

Informationen about submitting process:

Please send your review to:

sarah.gemicioglu@rs.rub.de

Version: 10/2026