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«prop\_titl\_txt»

**L: «prop\_id0» «last0»**, «frst0» «inst0» «rqst0»

**N: «prop\_id1» «last1»**, «frst1» «inst1» «rqst1»

**N: «prop\_id2» «last2»**, «frst2» «inst2» «rqst2»
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**N: «prop\_id4» «last4»**, «frst4» «inst4» «rqst4»

**N: «prop\_id5» «last5»**, «frst5» «inst5» «rqst5»

**«panl\_id0»** **«rec0»** «panl\_name0» («pnlst0» panelists; «confl0» decl confl),  
 on «panl\_end0», recommended as «RCOM\_TXT0» («revs0»)

Std competition rank «rank0» of «panlString0»

**«panl\_id1»** **«rec1»** «panl\_name1» («pnlst1» panelists; «confl1» decl confl),  
 on «panl\_end1», recommended as «RCOM\_TXT1» («revs1»)

Std competition rank «rank1» of «panlString1»

**«panl\_id2» «rec2»** «panl\_name2» («pnlst2» panelists; «confl2» decl confl),  
 on «panl\_end2»,recommended as «RCOM\_TXT2» («revs2»)

Std competition rank «rank2» of «panlString2»

**Ad hoc** reviews («AhNrev»): «AhRevs», with last on «AhLast»

«RApre\_note»

This standard review analysis is approved for proposals that were placed by a review panel in the LOW COMPETITIVE or NOT COMPETITIVE categories and to which no reviewer assigned an individual rating of EXCELLENT.   
  
All panelists and NSF staff, if any, who had a conflict of interest with this proposal left the room before the discussion of it began and did not participate in any way in the review and decision process.   
  
Reviews of this proposal addressed its intellectual merit and broader impacts and identified significant weaknesses. Weaknesses in intellectual merit may include a failure to advance knowledge significantly or poor organization of the proposed work. Weaknesses in broader impacts may include inadequate benefit to society or a failure to promote education significantly.   
  
The individual reviews, the panel recommendation, and the panel summary inform my recommendation. I have also taken into account the reviews of other proposals in this and other panels, the balance across subfields, the availability of funds, and general Foundation policies.   
  
Based on these factors, I recommend that this proposal be declined.

«RAsigner»

«RAsigner2»

Sunday, December 17, 2017
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