

Research Proposal Referee Feedback Form
Astronomy 3Y03
Winter 2017

Title of Research Proposal: **Characterizing the Photometric Variability and Accretion Disk**

Author of Research Proposal: Ian Fare

1. Does the proposal conform to the presentation standards (e.g. 3 pages in ApJ format/5 pages in single column format, no more than 1 page of references)? If not, please comment.

You wound up with a “recent progress” header at the top of your page. Watch out, this does not conform to the NSERC style guidelines. It looks like your proposal will be at a good length once you’ve added the missing content.

2. Is the abstract understandable to a non-expert audience and sufficiently informative? Provide details to support your assessment.

You still need to write your abstract. Remember that it should briefly outline your objective and methods. It should also sell the impact of your work (i.e. tell people why they should care at a glance). Keep in mind that this all needs to be communicated in language that is accessible to the public.

3. Do you understand what object(s) the author is describing, and what we understand about them so far? Provide suggestions to improve the sections on recent progress and the literature review. Have the authors made enough use of the primary literature?

Your introduction to FU Orionis stars in the introduction is great. You hit all the main points and your thoughts flow together very nicely. This shows that you’ve done a good review of recent literature.

4. Do you understand the objective of the proposed research (observation or calculation) and the methodology? Has the author been specific about what (s)he will do to answer the research question? Provide suggestions to improve these sections.

You’ve done a good job outlining methodology, including naming specific instruments that you could use to do your observations.

5. Has the author described the anticipated significance of the work in a convincing way? Provide suggestions to improve this section.

This is where you need some work. You still need to write an impact section. This is one of the most important parts of the proposal. As you write this keep in mind that, if this were a real NSERC proposal, the person reading it could be any type of scientist (probably not an astronomer, maybe not even a physicist).

6. Has the author clearly identified and appropriately cited work that is not their own? If not, provide clear examples where additional citations are warranted.

Yes, but since you haven't completed your literature review section you could use a few more recent papers (you have a couple from the 90's and earlier). You could think of the literature review as focusing on the literature which is pertinent specifically to what you intend to do. It should give the reader the knowledge base to understand why your work is going to be impactful in the field. Based on the length of your recent progress section I think it's alright if you migrate some of this information over to the literature review.