Evaluation of a research proposal

Title of proposal: Simultaneus two-photon imaging of cerebral oxygenation and capillary blod flo in atherosclerotic (ATX) mice module

Author: Xuecong Lu

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

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

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, writing and references. However, the research proposal, not the research itself, needs to be done mainly relating it with publications and conferences, as well as citations and the innovative part.

In other words, in the proposed timeline we can see this properly, there is no space for publication and conferences, and in fact this part is very important for a PhD research, since the proposal does not describes a Post-Doc proposal or permanent position (*suggestion 1, therefore, add some journals/conferences to apply*)

*Maybe the title is too long, it will depend on the other similar researchs. If it is common for this kind of rearch, the score is 10.

In Frontier of Knowledge some articles can pointed to delimit where the frontier of knowledge is currently (*suggestoin 2*)

In Trigger I think it is very well descripted but, the part was done with an idea of summary instead.

 In Hypothesis part, n research sometimes we write a null hypothesis and a major hypothesis. I don't know until when those three hypothesis (and minor) can be totally clarified in a PhD proposal (*suggestion 3 – add more*)

- Timeline part, as described above, putting the publication in the last part perhaps doesnt give time for feedback and improvements from the research community.

- The references were very well cited all over the text.

B. Form (please answer each of the following questions in 3 to 5 lines)
- Is the vocabulary clear and easy to understand?
  It is very clever, the research actually is very specific and require some knowledge.
- Does the proposal generally exhibit good writing skills: spelling, grammar, syntax, clarity of thought?
  Not at all, very well written.
- Does the proposal suggest good organizational skills?
  In terms of research is good, however from a PhD perspective (time frame) for publications, conferences and time frame I don't know.
- Does the paper project professionalism?
  Yes, it does.