

LinkSCEEM/Cy-Tera Production
2012[My Account](#) | [Logout](#)
Alan O'Cais

Applications

LinkSCEEM/Cy-Tera Production 2012 ▼

[Setup](#) | [Apply](#) | Applications & Reviews

Role: Scientific Reviewer ▼ Application Type: PRODUCTION ACCESS APPLICATION Initial submission ▼

[My Assignments](#)

Required fields are shown in red.

Review of: lspro107s1
Title: Trying out Linklings
Submission details: [in a pop-up window](#)
Reviewer: Alan O'Cais

This form provides for a (technical or scientific) review of a Production Access application.

For scientific review, all kinds of applications are encouraged and there are no hard criteria for rejection. Scientific reviewers will provide a report on the novelty and quality of the science proposed, its potential impact and on the applicant's ability to carry it out. The scientific reviewers are chosen from among researchers with expertise in the scientific field of the proposal.

For technical review, it is the reviewers' role to ensure that expectations of the user and the resources available on the system match. The technical review is not competitive and therefore forms a feedback mechanism between the HPC site and the intended user to inform them of what is, and what is not, possible/available at the site. Technical reviewers will provide a report on the technical quality (code, methodology, etc.) of proposals and on the suitability of the project for the system/architecture requested, and the extent of the request.

Please expand and read the reviewer guidelines below!

Compliance with data protection

The personal data provided on this form will be processed by LinkSCEEM-2 and may be held on computerised databases and/or manual files.

[Hide Reviewer Guidelines](#)

Scientific Review Guidelines

The proposals must address the following scientific criteria:

- Scientific excellence. The proposed research must demonstrate scientific excellence and a potential for high local and international impact.
- Novelty and transformative qualities. Proposals should be novel, develop an important scientific topic of major relevance to regional research, describe possible transformative aspects, and expected advances.
- Methodology. The methodology used should be described and appropriate to achieve the goals of the project.
- Dissemination. The planned channels and resources for dissemination and knowledge exchange should be described.
- Management. There must be a solid management structure which will ensure that the project will be successfully completed.

Technical Review Guidelines

The proposals must address the following technical criteria:

- The need to use a LinkSCEEM resource
- Software availability or compatibility on the requested resource. The codes necessary for the project must be available on the system requested and/or, in case of codes developed by the applicants and Project Access proposals sufficiently tested for efficiency, scalability, and suitability. For Project Access Proposals proof of successful tests must be submitted together with the proposal;
- Feasibility of the requested resource. The requested system must be suitable for the proposed project. The technical assessment may redirect projects to a more appropriate system.
- Reviewers are encouraged to provide as much feedback as possible.
- Further discussion of the questions and any additional input is to be placed in the comments section of this form. There is one comment section that can be seen by the applicant and another that can only be seen by the review committee
- Additional factors that can influence the decision to grant access (such as I/O issues, job sizes, etc.) can also be addressed in the comments section

Reviewer self assessment

Please indicate the areas of expertise that are relevant to your assessment of this proposal. If the proposal is multidisciplinary, please give details of which part of the proposal your assessment is directed towards. Take care not to reveal your identity to the applicant.

Reviewer self assessment

Level of confidence

What is your level of confidence in assessing this proposal?

In the scored review questions below you will be asked to select between
Low/Medium/High

High would mean a clear understanding of all aspects of the proposal; Medium, a clear understanding of some aspects of the proposal (please be explicit which areas you are able to comment on); Low, unable to comment with confidence on any part of the proposal (if this is the case please send the proposal back to the peer review office without completing the form).

Kindly **justify your response** in this text box.

Level of confidence

/

How well the proposal matches the call

Please comment on the relevance of the proposal to the context of the call:

- Projects should have a significant level of scientific and technical maturity.
- There should be the anticipated publication of results in one or more high-quality journals.
- Projects should focus on topics of major relevance for research in the Eastern Mediterranean.
- Project should demonstrate the need for the requested HPC resources.

How well the proposal matches the call

/

Review of the quality of the proposal

Please select a classification for what you consider to be the level of excellence of the project.

In the scored review questions below you will be asked to select between one of:

Low/Medium/High/Excellent

Please justify that selection here, making particular reference to:

- The novelty and timeliness of the science proposed;
- The ambition, adventure and transformative aspects that are presented in the proposal;
- The appropriateness of the proposed methodology

Review of the quality of the proposal

Potential impact

Please select a classification for the impact level for the project.

In the scored review questions below you will be asked to select between one of:

Low/Medium/High/Excellent

Please justify your selection here by commenting on the extent to which the proposal shows the potential impact of the project, making particular reference (where appropriate) to:

- The relevance of the research proposed for the development of the research area (in the context of the Eastern Mediterranean and worldwide);
- If there is likely to be any commercial or societal application and if the research would be transferable to other scientific disciplines;
- Whether appropriate routes and resources have been identified for dissemination and knowledge exchange. For example, dissemination through publications, presentations, establishing of new collaborations with other research groups, interaction with researchers from a different discipline or the General Public;
- The expected level of scientific publications resulting from the project: very high (Nature/Science), high, medium, low (conference proceedings).

Potential impact

Applicant/Team

Please select a classification for the ability of the applicant/team to complete the project.

In the scored review questions below you will be asked to select between one of:

Low/Medium/High/Excellent

Please justify your selection, making particular reference to:

- The appropriateness of the team's track;
- The skills of the team presented in the application

Applicant/Team

Resources and management

How well do you feel the team will work in order to deliver the project successfully (i.e. is the number of members of the team and their experience adequate to deliver the goals of the project)?

In the scored review questions below you will be asked to select between one of:
Low/Medium/High/Excellent

Please justify your selection here by commenting on

- How the planning of the project will ensure its success
- Whether the amount of human resources available sufficient to successfully complete the project

Resources and management

Scored Review Questions

The scored review questions below will assist the Resource Allocation Committee in ranking the proposals according to the various criteria of the review process.

Please evaluate the PRODUCTION ACCESS APPLICATION by selecting options in the drop-down boxes. Where you select numbers, low numbers indicate a low rating and high numbers indicate a high one. **You must make a selection for each drop down box.**

Reviewer level of confidence:

What is your level of confidence in assessing this proposal?



Quality of proposal:

Please select a classification for what you consider to be the level of excellence of the project.



Impact potential of proposal:

Please select a classification for the potential impact level for the project.



the project

Team

Please select a classification for the ability of the applicant/team to complete the project.

Resource management

How well do you feel the team will work in order to deliver the project successfully (i.e. is the number of members of the team and their experience adequate to deliver the goals of the project)?

Overall Judgment

Given your answers to the above questions, and in consideration of any further discussion in the comments section, how well-placed do you consider this project to with respect to the resources available through the call?

How much of the requested computing time do you feel should be awarded to the proposal?

If you feel the computer time awarded should be lower than the total amount requested, please fill in the amount of computer time you feel is appropriate for the project proposed.

Comments

Comments for Authors

Comments for Reviewers

These comments will NOT be provided to the authors.