NRC Associateship Programs - May Review 2010
Scores and Comments

Applicant Reviews

E-mail Support

Logout

The following is a summary of your scores and reviewer comments for this application. Three reviewers provided scores in each of the categories specified and the average score is reported here. Category scores were multiplied by a weighted factor and then summed to calculate your composite score.

Your scores are followed by comments provided by the reviewers. Reviewer comments are made available *to applicants only* and are not shared with prospective Advisers or the sponsoring agency.

Your composite score, along with the composite scores of all others applicants who applied to the same agency in this review cycle, have been forwarded to the sponsoring agency for their consideration. Awards will be made, by the agency, to the highest scoring applicants. It is not possible for the NRC to predict, in advance, the number of awards that will be made. We ask that sponsoring agencies expedite the awards process and we will notify you as soon as a final decision has been made.

Cavagnolo, Kenneth - February Review 2010 - NRL
Scoring: Poor = 1.00, Fair = 2.00, Good = 3.00, Excellent = 4.00, Outstanding = 5.00

Category	Score	Weight	Category Score
Academic and Research Record			
Educational background (degrees, transcripts, honor and awards)	3.73	x3	11.19
Previous research experience (including thesis research)	4.33	x2	8.66
Publications and presentations	3.67	x2	7.34
Letters of Reference	3.77	x3	11.31
Scientific Merit of the Proposed Research			
Clarity of objectives and methodology	3.7	x2	7.4
Technical/innovative quality of the work plan	3.57	x2	7.14
Feasibility of success in the proposed timeframe	3.57	x1	3.57
Qualifications of the applicant relative to the proposed research	4.4	x2	8.8
Lab/Center Review			
Importance of the proposed research to the mission of the laboratory and capacity of the laboratory to support the research	4	x1	4
Overall assessment of the project	3.9	x2	7.8
Composite Score:			**77.21**

Reviewers' specific comments to applicant

- Regular applicants: academic preparation, research experience, and references
- Senior applicants: research experience, scholarly productivity, publications and references

Reviewer #1

This is apparently a well-prepared candidate whose education and previous experiance has prepared him well for the proposed work. His letters of reference are positive if not overwhelming,although his dissertation work is described as very impressive and important. One issue appears to be his publication list, which although quite substantial is not complete or up to date. Publications from as long ago as 2006 are listed as accepted. Were they published?

Reviewer #2

The applicant has had a solid preparation with his coursework at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, maintaining a B+ average throughout his school years, though he does not seem to have received any competitive awards for his education and research. He has a good publication list, with several first-author papers, either already in the literature, or in preparation. His postdoctoral experience has given him an advantage over other applicants straight out of their Ph.D. The applicant has carried out extensive work on the physics of plasma in the ICM, which is highly relevant to the work proposed here. He appears to be one of the stronger observers of his generation in this field.

Reviewer #3

Hard working and dedicated team member. Academic preparation is good. The research experience has led to the applicant gaing expertise in a wide range of analysis and computational tools that will be helpful to any project. An important result in the role of AGN feedback on the inhibition of star fromation.

Reviewers' specific comments to applicant on proposal

Discussion of the quality, relevance,and feasibility of the proposed research program; evidence of relevance to laboratory center

Reviewer #1

The proposal is reasonably well-written, but seems a bit unfocussed - many topics are mentioned which use the same type of observations, but seem somewhat unrelated. The work addresses important problems in the astrophysics of galaxy clusters, using recent X-ray data. Fore this reason, it is not clear that the work can be accomplished in the available time. This area is relevant to the remote sensing lab at NRL.

Reviewer #2

The proposal to measure the magnetic field in the ICM using low-frequency radio observations is interesting and possibly useful in helping us understand the evolution of clusters, the impact of feedback from the formation of compact objects and the interplay between star

formation and overall mass loss. The combination of observations with radio and X-ray instruments would be crucial to the success of this project. The proposal refers to Simbol-X as an invaluable instrument to have for this study, but unfortunately ESA has cancelled it completely. In addition, although the VLA and EVLA will be very useful for this project, the use of LOFAR and LWA would be critical. It is not yet clear whether these resources will be available to the PI during the tenure of this fellowship.

Reviewer #3

The questions of the origin of radio halos, the nature of AGN activity with respect to environment and the state of AGN as it corresponds to feedback and growth are all important. However the proposal reads more like a list of important questions and possible ideas rather than a clear presentation of how the proposer is going to tackle these questions in a way that makes the review convinced that progress would be imminent. The proposal makes the reader feel that the proposer does not have a clear set of goals from which to "hit the ground" running. Also the proposal does not make clear what specific questions the proposer is the ideal person to tackle. More experience in writing proposals will help some of these deficiencies. Also Im not seeing clear innovative specific ideas here.

↑ Top of Page