Assessment of the Collaborative Research Centre (CRC) Proposal for the EASE Project

1 Assessment of Writing Style

1.1 Clarity

- **Rating**: 5/10
- **Strengths**:
  - Technical concepts, like Bayes theorem, are centrally located and define relationships clearly.
- **Weaknesses**:
  - Some sentences are overly complex and could be simplified for better understanding.
  - Acronyms are not consistently explained when first used.
- **Recommendations**:
  - Break down complex sentences for enhanced readability.
  - Ensure that all acronyms are defined at their first mention.

1.2 Precision

- **Rating**: 6/10
- **Strengths**:
  - Use of formal notation helps convey precise mathematical relationships.
- **Weaknesses**:
  - Some statements are vague, such as this assumption is also called without explicitly stating what the assumption is.
- **Recommendations**:
  - Avoid vague phrases; replace them with direct statements that specify definitions.
  - Ensure all components of equations are adequately described.

1.3 Coherence and Flow

- **Rating**: 4/10
- **Strengths**:
    - The proposal contains logical sections divided by topics.
- **Weaknesses**:
    - Transitions between ideas and sections are abrupt and could disrupt reading flow.
    - Repetition of ideas (e.g., posterior distribution) without clear elaboration.
- **Recommendations**:
    - Add transition sentences to link sections.
    - Aim to introduce each concept gradually to maintain narrative flow.

1.4 Professional Tone

- **Rating**: 7/10
- **Strengths**:
    - The language used aligns well with academic and scientific standards.
- **Weaknesses**:
    - Occasional use of informal phrasing like hopelessly infeasible detracts from the overall tone.
- **Recommendations**:
    - Ensure all language is formal; replace informal phrases with appropriate academic language.

1.5 Engagement and Persuasiveness

- **Rating**: 5/10
- **Strengths**:
    - Illustrates the significance of the research, such as applications of Bayesian networks.
- **Weaknesses**:
    - Fails to create a strong compelling narrative that gets the reader invested.
- **Recommendations**:
    - Use real-world examples to convey the societal and scientific impacts.
    - Highlight unique aspects that position the research as indispensable.

1.6 Grammar, Syntax, and Formatting

- **Rating**: 6/10
- **Strengths**:
  - Generally well-structured sentences that convey technical information.
- **Weaknesses**:
  - Typographical errors and alignment issues with mathematical expressions.
- **Recommendations**:
  - Thorough proofreading to catch any typographical errors.
  - Ensure all mathematical formatting aligns correctly.

2 Summary of Ratings and Key Findings

Criterion	Rating (1-10)	Key Findings
Clarity	5	Needs simplification and consistent acronym defini
Precision	6	Some vague statements need clarification.
Coherence and Flow	4	Abrupt transitions and repetitive ideas hinder flo
Professional Tone	7	Mostly formal but occasional informal phraseolo
Engagement and Persuasiveness	5	Lacks strong narrative; could benefit from exampl
Grammar, Syntax, and Formatting	6	Generally good, but needs proofreading and formatting

Table 1: Summary of Assessment Ratings