

# An Introduction to Radio Interferometry

6-2 How proposals will be reviewed



You can find relevant material  
on my personal webpage

NSYSU EMI Online Lecture Series Haiyu Baobab Liu (吕浩宇),  
Department of Physics

# Dealing with the proposal review committee

***The proposal can be doomed by receiving just one bad grade from the 10 reviewers.***

***You have to make **EVERYONE** happy.***

***That is the difficulty.***

Non-experts have to be able to understand proposal.

Experts have to be able to appreciate your proposal.

# Start Early

*Usually, you need to polish your important proposals many times. And sometimes, you need to sit on your draft for days or weeks before coming back to polish it with refreshed eyes/mind.*

*When you are junior, **be REALLY EARLY!***

Your supervisor(s)/collaborator(s) need to take care of their own proposals and other collaborations when the deadline is approaching.

Help your supervisor(s)/collaborators.

Use Grammarly or ChatGPT to clean up the typos and grammatical errors before sending them.

# Use a positive tone

*Do not say something like, “Our previous observations suck, and therefore we need new data.”*

*Say, “The new observations will make an improvement over the previous ones in this and that sense.” And be quantitative as far as possible (e.g., you are making the observations deeper by a factor of X).*

# Avoid Jargon

*If you do not have a sense of what jargon is, ask your friends who are not in the same research field to proofread your proposal.*

*Also, do not use too many acronyms (e.g., FRVF of SBUHzMSMBHs for Faraday-Rotation variational frequency of submillimeter bright ultra high redshift merging supermassive black holes... this is too much for me. Do some thinking to help your reader by simplifying the writing).*

*For people who cannot remember or do not want to memorize the actual meanings of the acronyms, your proposal will become **unreadable**.*

# Spend time preparing nice figures

1. Anything appearing on your figure should be readable and understandable. The best is that people can pick up most of the ideas without reading into the caption.
2. Use proper font sizes in the labels.
3. One figure should convey only one or two ideas at most. If you have many points to make, create more figures.
4. If you are making a contour plot, do not entangle the contours of multiple images. Usually, I would not consider presenting more than 2 images in a contour plot.
5. Do not have a big blank space in your figure. Take advantage of all of the space you can use.
6. Try various color-codings or color-maps until your figure appears as a nicely designed work. Avoid using the saturated default RGB if possible.

# Make it smooth

Test your friend: after reading your proposal for 5-10 mins, what do they remember? In the distributed ALMA review, the reviewers are not too different from them.

The text and figures are not a stack of information. They should not just be there. Make your **design**.

The information should be displayed in a way that people can pick up and **remember the most important points smoothly**.

Place figures on the right page such that people will naturally see them when you are referring to them. Avoid letting people check back and forth between your paragraphs.

The logic should be one-way instead of a loop or loops.

A member of the review panel may have 30~50 proposals to read, grade, and compose feedback comments. Many people I know try to accomplish this task in 2 working days (i.e., 16 working hours) since it is very painful. In the initial screening, you only have their **5~10 minutes** to read your 2 pages of text plus 2 pages of figures and tables.

# Do not assign homework to your reviewers

A proposal needs to be self-contained. If it requires checking some specific references to understand your proposal, your proposal is doomed. This is not what ideally should happen. But this is the reality, unfortunately.

**Nobody will ever read into any reference you provide.**

To some extent, the references are to show that you are familiar with the recent development.

You should not attempt to educate the reviewers with the references.



# Tailor Your Proposal for the Prospective Readers

For example, if you know people in a certain big consortium are going to review your proposal (e.g., the staff internal to the observatory you are proposing to), then do not attack their work in a bad way (e.g., The XX consortium makes an unbiased, direct imaging survey for exoplanets. Unfortunately, they detected nothing or nothing new).

The deficiency of a previous project is often our motivation to propose a new one. But rephrase (e.g., The XX LP has provided a stringent upper limit to OO. In this work, we change the survey strategy to specifically improve the constraint(s) on WW).

# Make a balance between humbleness and confidence

Do not over-advertise your work. If you say your experiment will win a Nobel prize, the reaction of most of the readers will be, “Oh yeah?” and then start to challenge every single point you made.

But also do not say something like, “Our previous experiments suck.” Everybody knows that Asians tend to say so, but they never actually calibrate this cultural difference.

# Be honest

Do not propose what you are not going to do.

**When you already know that a specific assumption is unrealistic, or when you do not know whether or not a specific assumption is unrealistic, do not make that assumption.** You should be able to justify your assumption based on some physical principles or observational evidence, even if you do not have space to explicitly justify them. “It is the best we can do” is not a good excuse for making an unrealistic assumption. It sounds bad to some of us.

Do not propose the analyses that you already know are unfeasible. It can happen that you only know your experiment is unfeasible during the preparation of your proposal. In this case, terminate the project. Be very careful when you are proposing an experiment that you are not certain about whether or not they are feasible or relevant. Sometimes you do not actually know the feasibility before you receive the data (e.g., when you try to propose the first blind search for exoplanets). Some of such experiments are in the high-risk, high-reward category. But you should at least have some justifiable ideas in mind why it might be feasible. It is OK to try it, perhaps, starting from a de-scoped pilot study.

Be honest with yourself. Do not pretend that you do not yet know whether or not it will work out when you are already convinced that it is not going to work.

# What I usually do

1. Pretend that I am composing the introduction section of a proto-paper. I usually really copy-paste my proposal to a paper.
2. Take proposal-writing as an opportunity to prepare your publication-level figures for the ongoing work, as far as possible.
3. Take proposal preparation as an opportunity to make deep communication with colleagues around the world. It often kick-off some studies that can base on existing data, or kick-off some theoretical studies.
4. Read papers to extend my knowledge base and skill sets.

1. Be early.
2. Use a positive tone.
3. Avoid jargon.
4. Prepare nice figures.
5. Make it smooth.
6. Make it self-contained.
7. Tailor it for your prospective readers.
8. Be confident yet humble.
9. Be honest.

1. Be early.
2. Use a positive tone.
3. Avoid jargon.
4. Prepare nice figures.
5. Make it smooth.
6. Make it self-contained.
7. Tailor it for your prospective readers.
8. Be confident yet humble.
9. Be honest.
10. **Good luck. Now you are ready to be a proto-radio-astronomer.**