

Show: All tick box groups

Tick Box Group: Tick Box Group	Tick Box: Tick Box Name	Description
Application Form	Text outside the box	Your text does not fit within the space provided in the boxes. This means that some of your text cannot be seen by the reviewers and so your application cannot be properly evaluated.
Background/Justification	Justification weak	The background justification to the project is weak. It does not sufficiently well describe the context of the project, i.e. why you are proposing this research, why it is important/necessary, or who will benefit from this research and how.
Background/Justification	Problem/Justification unconvincing or incomplete	Your project justification is unconvincing or incomplete. It needs more references, facts or figures to support your problem statement(s). The reader needs to be convinced of the problem you are describing.
Background/Justification	Too speculative	Your project seems speculative. You have not provided sufficient information or references to show that the project has a reasonable chance of achieving the stated objectives. You may have to carry out some preliminary work before support for this project
Budget	Budget figures not estimated correctly	Not all individual budget items seem to have been realistically estimated. More accurate estimates are required. If you are unsure, you can always get an idea from suppliers on the internet.
Budget	Exceeds maximum	The budget exceeds the maximum of an IFS grant which is no more than USD 12,000.
Budget	Budget over-/under-estimated	Individual budget items seem to be costed unrealistically.
Budget	Budget items not explained/justified	Your budget justification is not sufficiently elaborated. All items requested should be justified and explained in box "Budget justification". This is an essential requirement, and is particularly important for the description of the travel costs and the
Budget	Not sufficiently related to the proposed work	Several of the requested items are not obviously related to the workplan.
Budget	Conference/workshop not permitted	At this stage of the project planning, costs for participation in a conference or workshop and/or costs for publication of your research results are not permitted in your application form budget. Support for travel to conferences, seminars, workshops etc,
Budget	Overheads not permitted	Overhead costs are not permitted. Your home institution is expected to pay for the costs of administering your grant if awarded.
Budget	Co-funding not well explained	Your budget is not balanced, which suggests that additional funding is available. It should be clearly explained what the funds requested from IFS shall be used for in relation to any other funding available for the project. More details should have been
Budget	Salaries not supported by IFS	Salaries for scientists and technicians employed by the host institute cannot be supported by IFS, even though payments may be permitted for help with e.g. field trials (e.g. manual labour).
Budget	Budget insufficiently elaborated	Your budget is not sufficiently elaborated. You should provide more detail. Please consult the guidelines for the application form.
Hypothesis/Objectives	Unclear objectives	Your objectives are not clear.
Hypothesis/Objectives	Not all objectives covered in methodology	Not all objectives are addressed in methodology section.
Hypothesis/Objectives	Not all objectives relate to hypothesis	The hypothesis does not clearly link to the research objective(s).
Hypothesis/Objectives	Hypothesis predictable	The hypothesis is simplistic and/or predictable. Consequently, it does not contribute to a useful conceptualisation of an experimental strategy.
Hypothesis/Objectives	No new scientific questions asked	Your project does not ask new scientific questions.
Hypothesis/Objectives	Hypothesis non-testable	Your hypothesis appears unrealistic or untestable.
Hypothesis/Objectives	Not research	Not all objectives are research oriented.
Hypothesis/Objectives	Too general	The objectives are described in too general terms.
Hypothesis/Objectives	Activities instead of objectives	You have described a list of activities rather than the research objectives of your project.
In House Administration	Main Area incorrect	Application should be processed in a main area, different from the one identified by the applicant.
In House Administration	Scientific Area incorrect	It is suggested that application be dealt with in different research area.
In House Administration	Discussion needed	For several reasons, it is suggested that this application will be discussed by several staff responsible for other main or scientific areas. It may need assessment in more than one research area.
Literature Survey	Literature survey missing or poorly developed	The literature survey is missing or scant and/or the review of the key literature is incomplete/poorly developed. This means that your research may already have been done by someone else. By building on the results of others, your research must ask new sc

Literature Survey	Literature survey out-dated	Your literature survey seems to be out-dated. This means that your research may already have been done by someone else. By building on the results of others, your research must ask new scientific questions.
Literature Survey	Literature survey too narrow/limited	The literature survey is too narrow/limited. Although there may be little literature focusing on your subject in the locality/country where you are going to do the research, or on the problem/community/stakeholder, the organism/compound/ecosystem or the m
Literature Survey	Literature survey too specific	If very little research has been done in your area of interest, you should nevertheless include other researchers' references on, e.g. similar species/ecosystems or similar to whatever your research is focusing on.
Literature Survey	Literature survey suggestions	Your project would benefit from a more extensive literature survey. You may wish to contact your librarian who should be able to give you information how to access scientific literature databases like Agora, Hinari, Oare (managed by FAO, WHO and UNEP, res
Literature Survey	Literature survey unbalanced	The literature review is incomplete and unbalanced in that it does not sufficiently cover the most relevant aspects of your project.
Ongoing Research at Institute	Relevant activities incomplete	There is insufficient information provided on the research activities that are ongoing at your institute. You have left Box 8.3 blank or have entered too little information. If there is indeed no research related to the theme of your project at your insti
Project	Outside of IFS	The subject matter of your project does not fall within the research areas supported by IFS (see <a href="http://www.ifs.se">www.ifs.se</a> ).
Project	Not research	The proposed project falls outside the IFS granting programme since it is not sufficiently research-orientated. IFS does not support projects focussing largely on monitoring, simple inventories, developmental or extension work in the absence of new scient
Project	Not innovative	The proposed project falls outside the IFS granting programme since it is not sufficiently innovative. IFS does not support projects which do not ask new scientific questions and which therefore are unlikely to generate new scientific knowledge.
Project	Simple inventory	Your project is essentially an inventory study which does not provide a springboard for further research which is innovative.
Project	Too speculative	Your project seems speculative. You have not provided sufficient information or references to show that the project has a reasonable chance of achieving the stated objectives.
Project	Lacking information	The proposal is too general in its description and essential information is lacking, making it difficult to assess its feasibility.
Project	Lacking applicability	Although the project may be scientifically sound, it seems to lack applicability. IFS does not support highly fundamental or basic research. You may wish to apply for funding from an organisation such as TWAS, at <a href="http://twas.ictp.it">http://twas.ictp.it</a> , which supports basic
Project	Seek funding from private industry instead of IFS	The type of research you are proposing is highly commercially- and/or commodity-orientated and therefore not a priority for IFS support. You may wish to approach private companies for funding.
Project	Over-simplified	Your project seems to be over-simplified. It is asking questions which are so simple that it cannot constitute a competitive project worthy of funding.
Project	Lacking focus	Your project is lacking focus in that it seeks to address too many issues and/or is described in too general terms.
Project	Too ambitious/unrealistic	Your project is unrealistic since it seems to be over-ambitious in scope. It seems you will not be able to complete the research objectives in the time- and/or budget-frame you suggest. You need to focus more on important specific elements of your proposa
Project	Relevance not well described	The expected relevance of your project is not well described. Although your project may not have immediate practical applicability, you are expected to describe what the long term relevance of your project might be.
Project	Project already ongoing	Project seems to be on-going already. It is not clear what has been done and what remains to be done.
Research Plan	List of activities	Instead of providing a detailed workplan, you have simply listed the project activities or provided a very general description of the different steps that will be undertaken. It is not possible for the reviewer to know exactly what you are going to do and
Research Plan	Plan lacks details	More detail is required in the section describing your research plan. It is not possible for the reviewer to know exactly what you are going to do and how you are going to approach key questions and/or experiments. In theory, there should be sufficient in
Research Plan	Research plan does not correspond with objectives	The research plan describes elements that are not reflected in the research objectives.
Research Plan	Details missing on organisms and/or compounds	Details missing on the organism(s) or chemical compounds to be studied, i.e. correct Latin names, provenance of species, etc.

Research Plan	Details missing on site/sample selection and methods	More detail is required on the criteria for choosing sites and samples, sampling methods, sample treatments, etc.
Research Plan	Clarification needed on expertise requirements	You mention certain critical activities/methodologies/experiments in which, according to information in the rest of your application, you might not have had much experience. If this is so, how will you ensure that you will be able to undertake these activ
Research Plan	Details missing on chemical, physical and biological analytical methods.	More detail is required on the chemical, physical and/or biological analytical methods; conservation, storage and pre-treatment of samples prior to analysis and detailed analytical procedures. In theory, there should be sufficient information for the revi
Research Plan	References missing	You should provide full details of the references from which you developed your methodologies, and/or experimental design. If standard well-known methods are employed, these need not be described in detail, but references and/or the names to the methods m
Summary	Summary too short/incomplete	Your summary is too short/incomplete. It does not cover the most important elements of your project. It should contain at least the following: problem/justification, objectives, procedure/methods, any special resource needs, likely outputs and expected be
Time-frame	Unclear time-frame	It is not clear from the time chart what you are going to do and when. The chart is meant to show the reviewer the sequence and duration of your main research activities during your project.
Time-frame	Time-frame too short	The time-frame of the project is too short. The minimum duration for an IFS-supported project is 12 months' research.
Time-frame	Time-frame too long	The time-frame of the project is too long. The maximum duration of an IFS-supported project is 36 months.
Address Queries	Foreign university	How long will you be at the foreign university where you are presently situated? When will you return to your home country?
Address Queries	Time in country-abroad during project	You seem to be spending some time during project planning and/or implementation stages at a foreign academic institution. Please provide details of how much time (and when) you will spend in your home country/ and how much time you will spend abroad while
Address Queries	Unclear organisation	We are unable to ascertain exactly to what kind of organisation you are attached. Applicants must be attached to a national research institute (e.g. university, national research institute, or not-for-profit research-oriented national NGO) in a developing
Address Queries	Non-eligible institution	Your home institution is not eligible. Applicants must be attached to a national research institute (e.g. university, non-profit making research centre, or research-oriented national NGO) in a developing country. Researchers employed at international rese
Applicant	Too established	The policy of IFS is to help young scientists who are still at the beginning of their science career. Your application indicates that you already are, or well on your way to become, a rather well-established scientist and, therefore, do not belong to the
Applicant	Lack of experience	You seem to have limited relevant research training and experience in one or more of the topics of your application. If this gap is planned to be covered by other experts at your institute, you should provide more background information about the resea
Applicant	Too low degree	Only under exceptional circumstances IFS considers applications from applicants who have not yet obtained their MSc degree. A completed MSc degree or equivalent academic degree is the minimum requirement for an IFS grant.
Applicant	Who will do work?	It is not clear who will do the work, i.e. it seems that the project will be undertaken by several people and it is not clear what your specific role in the project will be.
Applicant	Details missing in publication list	Your publication list in Box 8.1 does not contain the necessary detail for the publication(s) to be retrieved by others.
Applicant	Details missing on experience	You provided too little detail when describing your scientific background and experience, making it difficult to assess whether you are likely to successfully complete the project.
Applicant	Limited scientific contacts	As it is recommended that you improve your proposal, you are advised to widen your network of scientific contacts with persons who, if necessary, could help you with the revision and maybe during the execution of your project.
Application Form	Careless application	Too little time and/or attention seems to have been put in the preparation of the application, with essential information lacking, spelling mistakes, etc.
Application Form	Incomplete application	The overall quality of the application is weak, and too much essential information is missing so that the application cannot be properly evaluated.
Application Form	Weak English	The English is very difficult to understand. It is suggested that you seek help with this before you re-apply.

Application Form	Use of past tense	Sections of the application form are written in the past tense, suggesting that the work, or parts thereof, have been carried out already, or, alternatively have been cut and pasted from already existing publications. You cannot request funds for projects
Statistics/Experimental Design	Statistical methods not clear/absent	The statistical methods for sampling and/or analysis are not clear or they are absent. Your project evidently requires careful thought being given to experimental design and data analysis. You may benefit from consultation with a statistician.
<b>Total</b>		<b>74</b>