

[Back to Submitted Projects](#)

Final
Report



General Information About this Project

Project Registration Code	PN-III-P4-ID-PCE-2016-0108
Project Title (English)	Direct interaction effects on the nuclear data evaluation for deuteron-induced reactions
Project Title (Romanian)	Efectele interactiilor directe asupra evaluarii datelor nucleare pentru reactii induse de deuteroni
Project Acronym	DIEDIR
Main Domain	Domain: PE. PHYSICAL SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING Subdomain: PE2. Fundamental Constituents of Matter: Particle, nuclear, plasma, atomic, molecular, gas, and optical physics Research Area: PE2_3. Nuclear physics
Secondary Domain	Domain: PE. PHYSICAL SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING Subdomain: PE6. Computer Science and Informatics: Informatics and information systems, computer science, scientific computing, intelligent systems Research Area: PE6_10. Web and information systems, database systems, information retrieval and digital libraries, data fusion
Keywords	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deuterons • Nuclear reactions • Reaction mechanisms • Breakup • Direct Reactions
Project leader	Marilena Avrigeanu
Project Duration (months)	30

Final Report

1 The Project leader (60%)

1.1 (50%) Please evaluate the excellency of the project leaders' research activity results as resulted from the publications and patents list, with emphasis on the contributions as main author. Please comment the originality of the project leaders' results, their impact on the state of the art of the results in this field, and also their relevance for this project.

<input type="radio"/> 5 - Excellent	The project leader has a lot of experience, but the quality of her activities is average. The impact of her papers is limited as demonstrated by a rather low h factor for such a senior scientist. However, her papers are published in leading international journals. The applicant has relevant expertise to address the deuteron-induced reactions at low and medium energies. This may indicate a strength of the applicant or perhaps a weakness, as it may signal the unlikelihood of a significant breakthrough to be expected from the same researcher applying the same method over more than a decade to the same problem. Her work is indeed not very creative and the proposal merely focusses on improving the deuteron data libraries.
<input type="radio"/> 4,5	
<input type="radio"/> 4 - Very Good	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> 3,5	
<input type="radio"/> 3 - Good	
<input type="radio"/> 2,5	
<input type="radio"/> 2 - Satisfying	
<input type="radio"/> 1,5	
<input type="radio"/> 1 - Poor	
<input type="radio"/> 0,5	
<input type="radio"/> 0 - Absent	
Score[1.1]=35.00	

1.2 (10%) Please evaluate the capacity of the project leader to manage autonomously scientific activities as researcher and/or research group leader, and also his/her visibility and prestige within the group he/she belong at international level. Please comment the performance in publications of the project leader (as main author), his/her leadership, the capacity to raise funds, his/her international visibility. Please consider only the results relevant for this project proposal.

<input type="radio"/> 5 - Excellent	The applicant does not seem to the level of of international connections expected from a leading scientist (There is no mention on active international collaborations). There is little indication of a high international standing. The impact of her papers is limited as demonstrated by a rather low h factor for such a senior scientist. However, her papers are published in leading international journals.
<input type="radio"/> 4,5	
<input type="radio"/> 4 - Very Good	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> 3,5	
<input type="radio"/> 3 - Good	
<input type="radio"/> 2,5	
<input type="radio"/> 2 - Satisfying	
<input type="radio"/> 1,5	
<input type="radio"/> 1 - Poor	
<input type="radio"/> 0,5	
<input type="radio"/> 0 - Absent	
Score[1.2]=7.00	

2 The project proposal (40%)

2.1 (20%) Please evaluate the general solution described in the project proposal in the current context and its potential impact in the future. Please comment the following aspects:

- (1) the significance and the degree of difficulty of the issue addressed;
- (2) the originality of the proposed solution according to the objectives;
- (3) the potential to move forward the knowledge in the field and to influence the direction of thinking and activity.

<input type="radio"/> 5 - Excellent	This is not groundbreaking science, or at least the proposer has not explained very convincingly why one should be excited about this project. The methodology does not appear to be very original. Indeed, the proposal fails to describe the real significant impact behind the state of the art in the field, and this limits originality of the project and lowers the novelty aspects. The proposed approach to describe deuteron interactions with nuclei is not based on a theoretical basis but rather on models. Without a sound theoretical approached it is not clear what progress can be made.
<input type="radio"/> 4,5	
<input type="radio"/> 4 - Very Good	
<input type="radio"/> 3,5	
<input type="radio"/> 3 - Good	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> 2,5	
<input type="radio"/> 2 - Satisfying	
<input type="radio"/> 1,5	
<input type="radio"/> 1 - Poor	
<input type="radio"/> 0,5	
<input type="radio"/> 0 - Absent	

Score[2.1]=10.00

2.2 (20%) Please evaluate the method and the work plan as defined in the project proposal as a concrete approach to reach the solution provided.

Please comment how well are chosen the methods, the tools for investigation, and the efficiency of the work plan related to the time and the resources proposed. Potential issues have been treated properly? There have been mentioned alternative approaches? There have been mentioned deliverables and what importance has been given to publication of the results in prestigious international journals? How do you assess the research project team structure, its functioning and what is the degree of complementarity of the team members?

5 - Excellent

4,5

4 - Very Good

3,5

3 - Good

2,5

2 - Satisfying

1,5

1 - Poor

0,5

0 - Absent

Score[2.2]=10.00

The proposal is very vague, and so is the work plan. It is difficult to gauge whether the objectives can be reached given the lack of technical details provided in the project description. The work plan and the deliverables linked to the objectives of the proposal is very generic discussed. The list of deliverables and milestones is not sufficiently specified.

2.3 Please evaluate the adequacy of the budget proposal and suggest possible rectifications. Please comment the correspondence between the work plan and the proposed budget, and also the adequacy of the mobilities (conferences, working visits) and the infrastructure procurements included into the budget. The evaluators comments associated to this subcriterion will be used only during the negotiation and contracting process.

The sums allocated in the budget seem quite generous for the proposed research and expected outcome. This proposal is much weaker than others and the budget is thus not justified. The manpower requested is on the high side for a rather weak proposal.

Project Score: 62.00