

VIEW COMMENTS FROM EXTERNAL REVIEWER

Project Number : 16603621

Project Title : Academic Freedom at the Hong Kong University of Science & Technology

PI Name : Prof Holz, Carsten A.

Section A : Detailed Comments**1. Please comment on the objective(s) of the proposal, and whether the research agenda adequately addresses the objective(s)?**

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

The proposal addresses four objectives well, but the proposal does not link to the objectives well. The PI has his personal motivation (Dean's expectation to apply for grant) of develop this project, but it seems to me that the objectives are vogue and need further development.

2. Please comment on the Research Design and Methodology.

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

I also think the methodology could be explained in more detail. The main method is said to be survey study. That is fine, but is there anything else to say? As said above, a bit of a literature review of methods would be useful. There certainly is a method and it is a useful one, but I think a bit more explanation would be useful. The research design and methodology are very weak.

3. Please comment on the feasibility of the proposed research.

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments:

The PI is doing an internal project. He has publication on this area, so I have confident for him to complete the project.

4. What do you consider to be the most original or innovative aspect of the proposed research? What advances would the research result bring about to the related field if the proposed research is successful?**Comments:**

He has chosen an interesting topic and shown some originality in dealing with it. The project does not demonstrate a significant and original contribution to knowledge.

5. Please comment on the reasonableness of the proposed budget and manpower planning and project duration.**Comments:**

The budget is reasonable.

6. Overall Comments

Overall Comment :

There is clear evidence of scholarship and originality. He demonstrates the capacity to undertake this project. However, PI's project does not make a contribution to the understanding of the topic during a time of conflict in Hong Kong.

Strength:

none

Weaknesses:

The author needs a bit more justification for choosing his methods, approaches, rather than others.

Suggested improvements:

A bit more explanation of the methodology chosen and the reasons for it.

Section B : Summary of Assessment**The project :**

Scientific/scholarly merit	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Duration Proposed	Too Long	Appropriate	Too Short		
	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>		
Impact of Research	High	Moderate	Low	None	
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	

The principal investigator :

Ability to undertake the proposal	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Track record in field	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Return](#)