

# Evaluation of a research proposal

**Title of proposal:** Simulation of Zero Thickness Metasurface Using Frequency Domain Methods

Author: Yousef Vahabzadeh Jamairan

## A. Content (answer each questions using a 1-5 scale, with 5 being the highest score)

	Score
<b>1. Title</b>	
The title is clear and concise	10
The title reveals the originality of the research	8
<b>2. Trigger</b>	
The motivation of the project is clearly explained	7
<b>3. Frontier of knowledge</b>	
The literature review is sufficiently detailed and clear to situate the project	7
The literature review shows that the writer is thoroughly familiar with his field of research	7
The literature review is a true synthesis, not just a compilation	8
<b>4. Question/hypothesis/objective</b>	
The question/hypothesis/objective is clearly and adequately formulated	7
<b>5. Strategy</b>	
The overall strategy is appropriate considering the scale of the proposed investigation	9
The research design (if applicable) is clearly explained	9
<b>6. Expected results, originality and impact</b>	
The proposed project is highly original	10
The potential contribution is significant and will advance the field	10
<b>7. Anticipated risks and approach to manage them</b>	
The researcher has considered potential problems and provided contingency plans	10
<b>8. Principal resources required</b>	
The proposed resources are appropriate and justified	7
<b>9. Proposed timeline</b>	
The proposed timeframe is realistic	-

Please explain you scores, pointing out to weaknesses and providing constructive suggestions for improvements (expected length: 15-30 lines). Conclude this section by proving three specific suggestions for improving the proposal.

On my opinion the research proposal presents a very good formating and writing. However the research proposal, not the research itself, needs to be improved some minor changes need to be done:

- Defining exactly the commercial software available today and their restrictions, this can be used as benchmarks for a paper or conference (*suggestion 1*).
- Defining a clear timeline is essential, because some minor delays can be stipulated and corrected also

can delimit where the progress and final result will be presented.

- This research proposal can solve more problems, as pointed by the writer, so write them down.

Generalize the solutions for more problems.

- Avoid using not defined grammatical structures on the text e.g. it will work fine. This can be done if some measurements are subsequently expressed, on the same example above: "this will work fine considering this and this measurement".

- "Thus, this work is original have great contribution" lacks of sense.

- "Questions and hypothesis" I couldn't understand very well mainly because there is not any hypothesis defined, or explicit questions. More than that, there is an affirmative stating that the simulation result (...) will not be correct. (*suggestion 2*)

- Very good idea by demonstrate the journals to publish, add more journals and conferences to publish and put it on the schedule (*suggestion 3*)

- As final comment, in my personal opinion of computer scientist, I don't think that coding FDFD technically is a challenge. As well as the numerical methods an good idea is apply small prototypes of several methods and find a good way to measure them, taking the best one. The third problem can be a huge problem.

## **B. Form (please answer each of the following questions in 3 to 5 lines)**

- Is the vocabulary clear and easy to understand?  
Some minor changes can be done, but overall it is clear and has good impact.
- Does the proposal generally exhibit good writing skills: spelling, grammar, syntax, clarity of thought?  
It shows that the researcher has knowledge of the questions however some sentences can be rephrased and some information can be added for the proposal e.g. timeframe.
- Does the proposal suggest good organizational skills?  
The researcher shows what he is planning to do in terms of research. However, as Phd more information need to be added about the time frame, not just for the good outcomes but to avoid problems and delays.
- Does the paper project professionalism?  
Yes, it does.