

Review of Heuristic Pruning

October 4, 2019

Five Review Elements:

The following elements should be considered in the review for both criteria:

1. What is the potential for the proposed activity to:
 - (a) advance knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields (Intellectual Merit); and
 - (b) benefit society or advance desired societal outcomes (Broader Impacts)?
2. To what extent do the proposed activities suggest and explore creative, original, or potentially transformative concepts?
3. Is the plan for carrying out the proposed activities well-reasoned, well-organized, and based on a sound rationale? Does the plan incorporate a mechanism to assess success?
4. How well qualified is the individual, team, or institution to conduct the proposed activities?
5. Are there adequate resources available to the PI (either at the home institution or through collaborations) to carry out the proposed activities?

Rating:

Make a subjective call from the following list:

- Poor
- Fair X
- Good
- Very Good
- Excellent

Summary

Intellectual Merit

In the context of the five review points given above, please provide a paragraph summary of the intellectual merit of the proposal, as you see it.

The author proposes an alteration of the dynamic programming matrix that would improve its speed, but not reduce accuracy. No mention of how the improvements are made, or how current implementations function are given.

Broader Impacts

In the context of the five review points given above, please provide a paragraph summary of the broader impacts of the proposal, as you see it.

The author does not necessarily point the reader towards an understanding of how the work being done will make a broader impact. Reader's are left wondering why existing methods could stand improvement in the first place, more so how the suggested improvements would be implemented.

Summary Statement

Please provide a one or two sentence statement of the key strengths and issues of this proposal.

Heuristic pruning seems like there is some good, but the author needs to provide stronger details so a panel can determine its merits.