

Fund for the Promotion of Joint International Research
(Fostering Joint International Research)
Assessment Criteria for Document Review

Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (KAKENHI) aim to dramatically develop all academic research, from basics to applications, throughout all research fields. In the review for allotment of research funds, each reviewer is required to make appropriate and fair judgment as to whether the submitted research proposals could contribute greatly to this end.

For the review of Fostering Joint International Research, the review method will be a Comprehensive Review in which all reviewers will first conduct document review on all research proposals, then the same reviewers will conduct discussions from a broad perspective on each research proposal in the panel review.

With deep understanding and extensive discussions on the research proposals under this review method, you are asked to determine the originality, creativity, and feasibility of the proposal from multifaceted perspectives and conduct appropriate assessments so as to discover excellent research projects.

In the document review, each research proposal will be assigned a relative overall score on a scale of 1 to 4 based on the individual rating elements listed below. In the panel review, reviewers will conduct discussions, taking into consideration, as appropriate, the raw scores, etc. of the overall scores of the document review, and determine the adoption of research proposals and allocation of research funds.

In conducting the review, you do not necessarily have to give high scores to research proposals that marked high scores in all of the individual elements. You are asked to conduct appropriate assessments so as to discover significant research projects over a wide range and enable the progress of scientific research while giving consideration to the diversity of research such as characteristics of the fields.

Note that you must not conduct reviews of research proposals submitted by any research team consisting of researchers whom you have vested interests.

Fund for the Promotion of Joint International Research (Fostering Joint International Research) (hereafter referred to as “Fostering Joint International Research”) supports KAKENHI grant recipients who are currently carrying out KAKENHI research projects. Its purpose is to markedly advance those projects by implementing them through international joint research, thereby achieving enhanced research results. In so doing, the grant seeks to foster independent researchers who can play leading roles within the international scientific arena. For this purpose, this research category, Fostering Joint International Research, supports Principal Investigators (who are 45 years of age or under as of April 1 of the year of application) of adopted projects under “Scientific Research”, “Grant-in-Aid for Early-Career Scientists” or “Grant-in-aid for JSPS Fellows” as of July 1 of the year of application who are conducting the research projects at the time of application and helps them to carry out their research plans on their own with overseas joint researchers for a set period of time at one or more overseas universities or research institutions. This research category does not intend to promote simple overseas dispatches such as for studying abroad.

Therefore, in the document review, you are asked to take into consideration whether research projects are appropriate as Fostering Joint International Research and evaluate the significance, necessity, etc. of the Fostering Joint International Research proposals, centered on the elements described below, from a wide range of perspectives not limited to areas of expertise.

i Assessment Criteria

[Rating Elements]

A. Consistency between the Purpose and Subject of the Category and the Research Plan

- Does the research plan clearly state how the dispatch of the Principal Investigator directly to one or more overseas universities or research institutions for a set period of time and his/her implementation of joint international research will advance his/her ongoing KAKENHI-funded projects?
- Could we expect enhanced research results through smooth collaboration with overseas joint researchers? And as a result, could we expect the Principal Investigator to play a leading role as an independent researcher within the international scientific arena?

Scoring Classification	Assessment Criteria
○	Consistent or Generally consistent
△	Generally inconsistent
×	Inconsistent

In the document review, if you have found that the research plan is “Generally inconsistent” or “Inconsistent” with the purpose and subject of the category and assigned △ or ×, please state the reason in the “Reason leading to the judgment” column. The applicable research proposals will be checked once again on this point in the panel review.

B. Rating Elements regarding the Content of the Research Plan

(1) Significance and Necessity of Joint International Research Proposal

- Given the research trends in Japan and abroad, etc., is the proposed research project necessary or significant enough to justify the implementation of research with overseas joint researchers in an international environment?
- By conducting the proposed research project, could we expect positive effects on broader fields, science and technology, the society, or other areas?

(2) Validity of the Research Method

- Is the research method, etc. specific and appropriate to achieve the research objective?
- Are the role of overseas joint researchers and the research content clearly stated? Is the state of preparation appropriate for conducting the proposed joint international research project?
- Are the research expenditures consistent with the research plan? Also, are costs properly budgeted necessary for the Principal Investigator to carry out his/her research plan with overseas joint researchers for a set period of time at one or more overseas universities or research institutions?

(3) Appropriateness of Ability and Research Environment to Conduct Research

- Judging from the research activities, etc. conducted over the years, does the applicant possess sufficient ability to carry out the research plan?
- Has the applicant secured a research environment that he/she needs to conduct the research plan including research facilities, equipment, and research materials?

[Overall Scores]

【Document Review】

To determine the adoption of each research proposal, make a comprehensive judgment focusing on the rating elements, “A. Consistency between the Purpose and Subject of the Category and the Research Plan” and “B. Rating Elements to Assess the Content of the Research Plan”, (1) through (3) above, and assign an overall score on a scale of 1 to 4 in accordance with the scoring distribution shown in the right column in the table below. (This may not be the case if you are asked to review a small number of research proposals.)

However, assign “C” as the overall scores for the research project assigned \triangle or \times regarding “A. Consistency between the Purpose and Subject of the Category and the Research Plan”

If you have “vested interests” in a research proposal, enter the reason in the “Reason for Vested Interests” column.

Also note that “The Status of Application and Acquisition of Research Grants” and “Issues Relevant to Human Rights Protection and Legal Compliance” columns in the research proposal document are not to be considered for the overall score given in the document review. As such, you should assign the overall score based on each of the other columns, etc. Please check the section iii “Points to be Noted” on how to handle “The Status of Application and Acquisition of Research Grants” and “Issues Relevant to Human Rights Protection and Legal Compliance” columns in the review process.

Scoring Classification	Assessment Criteria	Rough Indication of Scoring Distribution
S	Should be adopted with highest priority	10%
A	Should be adopted with priority	10%
B	Should be adopted with priority	10%
C	None of the above (S through B)	70%
-	Cannot evaluate this proposal due to vested interests	-

[Entering the Review Comments]

Although the document review and panel review will be conducted by the same reviewers for “Fostering Joint International Research”, the review comments given in the document review will be presented along with the name of the reviewer as review materials in order to deepen the discussions in the panel review.

In the “Review Comments” column, you must give your review comments for every research proposal, focusing on the strengths and weaknesses as this proposed research project.

ii Other Evaluation Items

Validity of Research Expenditure

In an aim to distribute KAKENHI grant effectively and efficiently, in document review, consider the following points in terms of the validity and necessity of research expenditure and assign a rating according to the following rating categories. (Rating categories other than (Blank) should be assigned only if you can determine that the proposed research expenditure clearly falls under the content of each such assessment criteria.) Note that JSPS plans to respect the proposed budgets to the maximum extent possible in allocating the grants for Challenging Research, JSPS plans to allocate the amounts of research expenditure requested in the application to the maximum extent possible to achieve a sufficiency rate close to 100%.

Note that if you are assigning \triangle or \times , please describe the specific reasons for such judgment in the “Reason leading to the judgment” column.

- Is the content of research expenditure reasonable and can we expect that the research expenditure will be used effectively?
- Are items genuinely necessary for the implementation of the research plan properly budgeted, such as costs for purchasing equipment?

Rating Category	Assessment Criteria
(Blank)	This research can be implemented with an average sufficiency rate
\triangle	Judging from the content of the research plan, it is desirable to decrease the sufficiency rate
\times	The content of research expenditure is questionable

iii Points to be Noted

(1) Handling of “The Status of Application and Acquisition of Research Grants” Column

The status of applications of other research proposals and acquisition of other research grants are to be referenced in the panel review to judge “whether or not the research project can be fully implemented without unreasonable duplication and/or excessive concentration in the grant allocation.” Therefore, do not consider this information in the overall scores to be assigned in the review.

In the document review, if you find that a research proposal obviously “falls under unreasonable duplication and/or excessive concentration in the grant allocation and cannot be carried out sufficiently,” please state the reason in the “Reason leading to the judgment” column.

Note that this column may be left blank in case “This item is not applicable” or if you find “No particular problem (including cases where you cannot make a judgment).”

(2) Handling of “Issues Relevant to Human Rights Protection and Legal Compliance” column

Research proposals that require the protection of human rights and legal compliances in implementing the research plan must be conducted after following necessary procedures and taking necessary measures such as obtaining the approval of the ethics committee, etc. inside and outside the research institution based on relevant laws and regulations. For this reason, you do not need to consider them as evaluation items for the review.

If you find it necessary to inform the research institution in advance, for example, of any inadequacy in the prescribed procedures or measures, etc. in implementing the research, please describe the specific reasons for such judgment in the “Reason leading to the judgment” column. If the research proposal is adopted, JSPS will notify the applicant’s affiliated research institution to carry out such prescribed procedures or measures, etc. Even if the research proposal is not adopted, JSPS will disclose in the review results that there was inadequacy in the prescribed procedures or measures, etc.

Note also that the “Reason leading to the judgment” column may be left blank in case “This item is not applicable” or if you find “No particular problem (including cases that cannot be judged).”