**3.9 Format for evaluation of the research proposals (to be given to DAC members; 4 pages)**

**BIRLA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY AND SCIENCE PILANI, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ CAMPUS**

**DEPARTMENT OF** {department\_name}

Dated: {date}

To: Prof./Dr. {dac\_member\_name}

Sub: Review of Doctoral Research Proposal.

Dear Sir/Madam,

I request you to kindly review the enclosed Doctoral Research Proposal submitted by the following candidate and return the completed proforma within one week along with specific suggestions, if any.

Name of Candidate {student\_name} ID No. {student\_id}

Name of Proposed Supervisor {supervisor\_name}

{%drc\_signature}

(DRC Convener)

Proforma for Review of Doctoral Research Proposal.

Please tick ( ) the appropriate box(es)

# 1. Proposed Topic of Research

1. Is the proposed topic in one of the research areas of the Institute? [You may refer to our Bulletin for Areas of Research].

{@q1a\_yes\_xml} yes

{@q1a\_no\_xml} no

1. Does the proposed topic reflect the theme propounded in the proposal write up?

{@q1a\_yes\_xml} yes

{@q1a\_no\_xml} no

1. Is the proposed topic relevant to the needs of the immediate environment?

{@q1a\_yes\_xml} yes

{@q1a\_no\_xml} no

1. Does the proposed topic aim at

{@q1d\_product\_xml} designing an innovative product

{@q1d\_process\_xml}designing a new process or a system

{@q1d\_frontier\_xml}taking up research in an advanced frontier area

**2. Objective of the proposed research**

1. Are objectives clearly spelt out?

{@q1a\_yes\_xml} yes

{@q1a\_no\_xml} no

If your answer is no, could you please write under item No.7 as to what needs to be done.

1. Are objectives derived based on the literature survey?

{@q1a\_yes\_xml} yes

{@q1a\_no\_xml} no

1. Is the outcome of the work clearly visualized?

{@q1a\_yes\_xml} yes

{@q1a\_no\_xml} no

1. The outcome of the work

{@q2d\_improve\_xml} will improve the present state of art

{@q2d\_academic\_xml} will only be of an academic interest

{@q2d\_industry\_xml} will be useful for the industries

# 3. Background of the Proposed Research

1. Is the literature survey up-to-date and adequately done to finalize the research topic?

{@q1a\_yes\_xml} yes

{@q1a\_no\_xml} no

1. Is a broad summary of the present status given in the proposal?

{@q1a\_yes\_xml} yes

{@q1a\_no\_xml} no

1. Are unsolved academic issues in the area highlighted?

{@q1a\_yes\_xml} yes

{@q1a\_no\_xml} no

**4. Methodology**

1. Is the methodology to be adopted for exhaustive literature survey given?

{@q1a\_yes\_xml} yes

{@q1a\_no\_xml} no

1. Are data sources identified?

{@q1a\_yes\_xml} yes

{@q1a\_no\_xml} no

1. Are experimental facilities for research work envisaged clearly?

{@q1a\_yes\_xml} yes

{@q1a\_no\_xml} no

1. If yes in (c), are envisaged experimental set-ups available at the place of work?

{@q1a\_yes\_xml} yes

{@q1a\_no\_xml} no

1. If yes in (c) and no in (d), is it explained how the work will be carried out?

{@q1a\_yes\_xml} yes

{@q1a\_no\_xml} no

1. Are required computing facilities available at the place of work

{@q1a\_yes\_xml} yes

{@q1a\_no\_xml} no

1. Is methodology clearly spelt out for the completion of research work?

{@q1a\_yes\_xml} yes

{@q1a\_no\_xml} no

# 5. Literature References

1. Is citation of literature done in a standard format?

{@q1a\_yes\_xml} yes

{@q1a\_no\_xml} no

1. Is cited literature referred in the text?

{@q1a\_yes\_xml} yes

{@q1a\_no\_xml} no

1. Is cited literature relevant to the proposed work?

{@q1a\_yes\_xml} yes

{@q1a\_no\_xml} no

# 6. Overall Comments

{@q6\_accepted\_xml} proposal may be accepted

{@q6\_minor\_xml} proposal needs minor modifications

{@q6\_revision\_xml} proposal needs revision

1. **Reasons for recommendation at item No. 6**

{q7\_reasons}

1. **Any other comments:**

{q8\_comments}

Dated: {dated} {%dac\_signature}

Signature

{dac\_member\_name}

Name of faculty member