

KOM_Ulam_2019

ULAM PROGRAMME

EVALUATION SHEET FOR REVIEWER

1.1 Number of proposal

PPN/U LM/2019/1/00177

1.2 First name

Volodimir

1.3 Last name

Sarabeev

Evaluation carried out by two External Reviewers. Reviewers evaluate applications according to all merit-based evaluation criteria, indicating the number of points and giving reasons for their scoring. The Reviewer presents the application's strengths and weaknesses in the summary section.

1.4 Criterion 1: Applicant's achievements and course of scientific and academic activity in relation to their career stage. Maximum score = 10 points

6

1.5 Justification:

OK, I understand generally that situation (political, economical etc) does not help scientific development. It is the main reason why I see the Applicant publication list quite positive. I also know that in parasitology number of citations, and other measurements are lower than in other field biology disciplines.

1.6 Criterion 2: Reasons for the Applicant's choice of a Host institution and benefits that the Applicant's stay may bring to the Host institution and the development of science in Poland. Maximum score = 5 points

3

1.7 Justification:

Host institution is not well known in this discipline. On the other hand, by localization close to Baltic Sea they have probably good access to fish, the main material for future studies. In my opinion, the applicant level is much higher than host institution.

1.8 Criterion 3: Scientific level of research or tasks to be implemented, including their scientific value and innovativeness, manner of presentation, impact on the development of a scientific discipline, research or didactic methods, planned results, adequacy of the Scholarship's duration with regard to the planned activities. Maximum score = 20 points

13

1.9 Justification:

The idea is presented in a very descriptive way, lack of strong hypotheses etc. I understand the limits, and that the first steps should be classical parasitological knowledge of the local area, but even that can be presented in a more general way. I also recognize, good fish - parasite specialist and it is definitely a nice point of the application. However, impact on the discipline will be rather limited (see already published good papers were co-authored by S. Morand - the researcher globally recognized as parasitology specialist!).

1.10 Criterion 4: Impact that visiting a Polish scientific institution will have on the Applicant's scientific career. Maximum score = 5 points

3

1.11 Justification:

It is seriously difficult to say, but I like to be honest. Even Slupsk offer much better possibilities than Ukrainian institutions in current time. So, we can "save": very good, although narrow parasitologists. I think, if he finds some other collaborators in Poland it can be a very fruitful stay.

1.12 Total

25

Justification of the overall evaluation

1.13 Strengths:

The most important think is the passion of the main applicant and his ideas, and already published papers. Not many, and only in very narrow, but good reconciled into parasitology, journals. His already established international contacts, what is kind of guarantee that even in weak institution he can do something good for science and his development. I also would like to add that we have to support this kind of research, maybe not very visible for international market, but useful.

1.14 Weaknesses:

The chosen host institution is not well recognized in parasitology, so I guess will be not additional support. Also, the publication list and already realized projects are rather very narrow. I think is probably strongly linked to political and economical situation in Ukraine.

I declare that:

- 1) I am not employed at a basic organizational unit of the university or at the scientific unit which is the Host Institution in the application;
- 2) I have not participated in the preparation of the application the evaluation of which I am undertaking;
- 3) the relations with the applicant do not make it impossible for me to remain impartial;
- 4) I do not remain married, in a relationship of kinship or affinity in a straight line, kinship or affinity in a sideline to the second degree, and I am not affiliated for adoption, custody or guardianship with the applicant;
- 5) I do not remain in such a legal or factual relationship with the applicant of the application the evaluation of which I am undertaking, which may raise reasonable doubts as to my impartiality;
- 6) I will not be involved in the implementation of the activities concerned by the application the evaluation of which I am undertaking;
- 7) I am not an applicant nor have I participated in the preparation of an application, competing with the application the evaluation of which I am undertaking, submitted in the same call;
- 8) there is no other reason affecting my reliability or impartiality.

In the event of a conflict of interest or a circumstance that prevents me from maintaining impartiality, I undertake to promptly inform about this fact in the form of a written request or electronically for exclusion from the evaluation procedure of the application and to withdraw its evaluation at the same time.

I declare

KOM_Ulam_2019

ULAM PROGRAMME

EVALUATION SHEET FOR REVIEWER

1.1 Number of proposal

PPN/U LM/2019/1/00177

1.2 First name

Volodimir

1.3 Last name

Sarabeev

Evaluation carried out by two External Reviewers. Reviewers evaluate applications according to all merit-based evaluation criteria, indicating the number of points and giving reasons for their scoring. The Reviewer presents the application's strengths and weaknesses in the summary section.

1.4 Criterion 1: Applicant's achievements and course of scientific and academic activity in relation to their career stage. Maximum score = 10 points

10

1.5 Justification:

In my humble opinion the Applicant quality of work is very high. He is very productive and journals he is publishing his work are well recognized international platforms. Although as it seems the Applicant has very heavy teaching load still he was able to produce lots of good science. Which is sign of great work organisation. I have read the attached selected papers which were extremely interesting to me and of great quality. I must say I learn something. Beside all the publications the Applicant has very good international network of co-operators which is always a great sign of quality of work.

1.6 Criterion 2: Reasons for the Applicant's choice of a Host institution and benefits that the Applicant's stay may bring to the Host institution and the development of science in Poland. Maximum score = 5 points

5

1.7 Justification:

I think the choice of the Host institution is appropriate and looking at the achievements of the Applicant and the knowledge he generates I have no doubt that Host institution will gain a lot from this interaction. Moreover I think the Host might actually gain more than the Applicant. There is a chance of synergy in this interaction. Applicant has slightly different set of skills to the Host which is indeed beneficial for the Host. Generally I think Polish science can gain a lot from this visit. Also the subject which Applicant is involved in - it is very important (parasites) not only locally but also on the broader global scale. All in all my feeling is it is win-win situation for both sides.

1.8 Criterion 3: Scientific level of research or tasks to be implemented, including their scientific value and innovativeness, manner of presentation, impact on the development of a scientific discipline, research or didactic methods, planned results, adequacy of the Scholarship's duration with regard to the planned activities. Maximum score = 20 points

20

1.9 Justification:

The subject of the proposed study is not only extremely interesting but as already mentioned very important from practical but also from scientific point of view. Unfortunately no one give a damn about practical side of such a study (influence of parasites, influence of biodiversity on parasites) in Poland still the quality of science is so high and interesting that I whole heartily hope this project will be funded. There is not that many people in Poland who deal with aquatic parasites therefore this is an extra benefit for Polish side to learn something about that side of life.

I think the study is very well design and structured. Nice English by the way. I like very much that it involves both morphological part and molecular side which makes the proposed idea kind of state of the art, another words modern. The area and model organisms selected are very appropriate.

The structure of the study is divided into clear work packages which makes lots of sense. The proposed output (4 papers in two years) is quite ambitious and hopefully Applicant can achieve it. And keeping in mind he will have no teaching load it is very much possible.

1.10 Criterion 4: Impact that visiting a Polish scientific institution will have on the Applicant's scientific career. Maximum score = 5 points

3

1.11 Justification:

The Host institution is not one of the best in the country however it is very well localized for the purpose of the proposed study. I hope it is well equipped and can host well the Applicant enabling him to achieve all the goals of the study. And indeed the Host claims, they are getting new equipment etc. Still the provinciality of the Host with low key overall achievements on the national level does not allow me to rate it very high.

1.12 Total

38

Justification of the overall evaluation

1.13 Strengths:

Applicant seems to be very good, ambitious and enthusiastic scientist. The scientific achievements so far are great prognosis for proposed study to be very successful. His papers are of high quality. This together with network of cooperation he build over years will be of great benefit to the Host institution, not mentioning the scientific community over all. The proposed project is very ambitious, indeed achievable and overall of high quality. Usage of methods combination has very modern approach. Clear goal and deliverables. I like it very much. I hope it will get funded.

1.14 Weaknesses:

I would say the Host institution is not the best quality possible. But still it is not that easy to judge from the proposal the truth quality of the place and hopefully it will provide the peace of mind the Applicant needs to generate his science but which is disturbed by heavy load of teaching at his home institution.

I declare that:

- 1) I am not employed at a basic organizational unit of the university or at the scientific unit which is the Host Institution in the application;
- 2) I have not participated in the preparation of the application the evaluation of which I am undertaking;
- 3) the relations with the applicant do not make it impossible for me to remain impartial;
- 4) I do not remain married, in a relationship of kinship or affinity in a straight line, kinship or affinity in a sideline to the second degree, and I am not affiliated for adoption, custody or guardianship with the applicant;
- 5) I do not remain in such a legal or factual relationship with the applicant of the application the evaluation of which I am undertaking, which may raise reasonable doubts as to my impartiality;
- 6) I will not be involved in the implementation of the activities concerned by the application the evaluation of which I am undertaking;
- 7) I am not an applicant nor have I participated in the preparation of an application, competing with the application the evaluation of which I am undertaking, submitted in the same call;
- 8) there is no other reason affecting my reliability or impartiality.

In the event of a conflict of interest or a circumstance that prevents me from maintaining impartiality, I undertake to promptly inform about this fact in the form of a written request or electronically for exclusion from the evaluation procedure of the application and to withdraw its evaluation at the same time.

 I declare



KARTA OCENY ZESPOŁU PROGRAM IM. ULAMA

**EVALUATION SHEET FOR EVALUATION TEAM
THE ULAM PROGRAMME**

APPLICANT

1.1 Number of proposal

PPN/ULM/2019/1/00177

1.2 First name

Volodimir

1.3 Last name

Sarabeev

EVALUATION SHEET FOR PRESELECTION UNDER THE ULAM PROGRAMME

Preselection by the Evaluation Team, based on the evaluation of the Applicant's achievements and course of their scientific or academic activity.

Criterion: Applicant's achievements and course of scientific and academic activity in relation to their career stage. Maximum score = 25 points

19

1.5 Justification:

The applicant is already quite experienced scientist, having good publication record with most papers as the 1st or corresponding author. It is noticed that within last years, amount of papers published increased, especially those in high-impact journals. The applicant was a fellow of many international foundations, thanks to that he was able to conduct research in scientific institutions of various countries. Additionally, he was a leader of many Ukrainian projects. He successfully link science and industry, as he has two patents. Therefore, the team of experts agreed that presented scientific achievements meet the expectations of Ulam's Programme, thus the team of experts recommend this proposal to be further evaluated by the reviewers.

1.6 Points after preselection

19

STATEMENT



I declare that:

- 1) I am not employed at a basic organizational unit of the university or at the scientific unit which is the Host Institution in the application;
- 2) I have not participated in the preparation of the application the evaluation of which I am undertaking;
- 3) the relations with the applicant do not make it impossible for me to remain impartial;
- 4) I do not remain married, in a relationship of kinship or affinity in a straight line, kinship or affinity in a sideline to the second degree, and I am not affiliated for adoption, custody or guardianship with the applicant;
- 5) I do not remain in such a legal or factual relationship with the applicant of the application the evaluation of which I am undertaking, which may raise reasonable doubts as to my impartiality;
- 6) I will not be involved in the implementation of the activities concerned by the application the evaluation of which I am undertaking;
- 7) I am not an applicant nor have I participated in the preparation of an application, competing with the application the evaluation of which I am undertaking, submitted in the same call;
- 8) there is no other reason affecting my reliability or impartiality.

In the event of a conflict of interest or a circumstance that prevents me from maintaining impartiality, I undertake to promptly inform about this fact in the form of a written request or electronically for exclusion from the evaluation procedure of the application and to withdraw its evaluation at the same time.

I declare

OUTPUT

19



KARTA OCENY ZESPOŁU PROGRAM IM. ULAMA

EVALUATION SHEET FOR EVALUATION TEAM THE ULAM PROGRAMME

APPLICANT

1.1 Number of proposal

PPN/ULM/2019/1/00177

1.2 First name

Volodimir

1.3 Last name

Sarabeev

EVALUATION SHEET FOR EVALUATION TEAM

The Evaluation Team's final evaluation that takes into account the opinions of two Reviewers and the Team's scoring in the other criteria of evaluation 2-4, which the Team did not evaluate during the preselection.

1.4 Criterion 2: Reasons for the Applicant's choice of a Host institution and benefits that the Applicant's stay may bring to the Host institution and the development of science in Poland. Maximum score = 15 points

14

1.5 Justification:

The selection of the host institution seems to be a natural choice and appropriate as the localization close to Baltic Sea would probably give good access to fish, the main material for proposed study. There is a great chance of synergy and interaction between the Applicant and Host, as the Applicant has a slightly different set of skills to the Host which is indeed beneficial for both.

1.6 Criterion 3: Scientific level of research or tasks to be implemented, including their scientific value and innovativeness, manner of presentation, impact on the development of a scientific discipline, research or didactic methods, planned results, adequacy of the Scholarship's duration with regard to the planned activities. Maximum score = 15 points

13

1.7 Justification:

The project concerns the influence of biodiversity on parasites what is not widely studied in Poland. The study is very well design and structured, written in good English. The structure of the study is divided into clear work packages which are clearly designed. However, the Applicant is a good fish – parasite specialist, the project impact on the discipline might be rather limited. The proposed output (4 papers in two years) is quite ambitious and there is a big chance that the Applicant, having no teaching lead, can achieve it.

1.8 Criterion 4: Impact that visiting a Polish scientific institution will have on the Applicant's scientific career. Maximum score = 5 points

3

1.9 Justification:

However, the choice of the Host institution is appropriate, the impact on the Applicant's scientific career is estimated as moderate, as there is not properly documented international level of research conducted by the Host. On the other side, new equipment, great locality and different set of skills between Applicant and Host, might be important for the future career of the Applicant.

1.10 Total

30



Justification of the overall evaluation

1.11 Strengths:

- Applicant is a very good, ambitious and enthusiastic scientist
- Applicant's publications are of high quality
- Applicant manage very well teaching duties together with publication in good international journals
- deliverables of the project are clear

1.12 Weaknesses:

- as there are not many institution in Poland working on parasites, the project might have a limited impact on the discipline
- international collaboration of the Applicant with the Host institution is not sufficiently documented in the proposal

1.13 Justification:

As there are not many scientists in Poland working on the proposed topic of parasites and the Applicant has set of skills different to the Host, conducting this is win-win situation for both sides and it may lead to the future collaboration between Applicant and the Host. Therefore, the team of experts recommend this application to be funded within a frame of the Ulam's Programme.

STATEMENT

I declare that:

- 1) I am not employed at a basic organizational unit of the university or at the scientific unit which is the Host Institution in the application;
- 2) I have not participated in the preparation of the application the evaluation of which I am undertaking;
- 3) the relations with the applicant do not make it impossible for me to remain impartial;
- 4) I do not remain married, in a relationship of kinship or affinity in a straight line, kinship or affinity in a sideline to the second degree, and I am not affiliated for adoption, custody or guardianship with the applicant;
- 5) I do not remain in such a legal or factual relationship with the applicant of the application the evaluation of which I am undertaking, which may raise reasonable doubts as to my impartiality;
- 6) I will not be involved in the implementation of the activities concerned by the application the evaluation of which I am undertaking;
- 7) I am not an applicant nor have I participated in the preparation of an application, competing with the application the evaluation of which I am undertaking, submitted in the same call;
- 8) there is no other reason affecting my reliability or impartiality.

In the event of a conflict of interest or a circumstance that prevents me from maintaining impartiality, I undertake to promptly inform about this fact in the form of a written request or electronically for exclusion from the evaluation procedure of the application and to withdraw its evaluation at the same time.

I declare

OUTPUT

30