



Enrique Quiroga González <pesitrama@gmail.com>

Evaluation of Proposal #4654 correct

Enrique Quiroga González <pesitrama@gmail.com>

6 de julio de 2016, 11:43

Responder a: equiroga@ieee.org

Para: "Knotts, Cathy J." <knotts@slac.stanford.edu>

Dear Cathy,

here you have my evaluation of proposal 4654 (Insight into the cation migration and surface structural evolution of spinel $\text{LiNi}_0.5\text{Mn}_{1.5}\text{O}_4$ material):

1) Your rating for the overall scientific merit of this proposal.

***2.3**

2) Your comments related to this proposal (Your comments aid the PRP in evaluating the proposal and beam time requested. Your comments will be shared anonymously with the proposal spokesperson to aid them in understanding your review, better addressing issues for future proposals.).

***The proposal is of interest for basic science. The requested measuring time is just too long for this research, even when it may be needed to complete it in the best possible way. The project does not deserve this amount of time.**

Is it correct 100 shifts? in the manuscript it is stated 72h? if this last number is correct, then the project should be accepted.

Nevertheless, it is really not clear how TXM will help answering the questions stated in the "specific aims"

3) Let us know if there you have technical questions or safety concerns that you feel need to be answered by the proposal spokesperson before this proposal could be evaluated.

***None**

If you need further information, do not hesitate in contacting me.

Kind regards!

Enrique

2016-07-05 15:01 GMT-05:00 Knotts, Cathy J. <knotts@slac.stanford.edu>:

Thank you Enrique. Can you also review proposal 4654 which is attached.

Best regards,
Cathy

-----Original Message-----

From: Enrique Quiroga González [mailto:pesitrama@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, July 04, 2016 10:59 AM

To: Knotts, Cathy J.

Subject: Correction: Evaluation of Proposal #4654

Dear Cathy,

my evaluation was for proposal 4653: Photoemission study of the electronic structure of superconducting tetragonal FeS.

Do you still need an evaluation for proposal 4654?

Best!

Enrique

2016-07-04 12:52 GMT-05:00 Enrique Quiroga González <pesitrama@gmail.com>:

Dear Cathy,

sorry for my belated review.

Here you have it:

1) Your rating for the overall scientific merit of this proposal.

*3.0

2) Your comments related to this proposal (Your comments aid the PRP in evaluating the proposal and beam time requested. Your comments will be shared anonymously with the proposal spokesperson to aid them in understanding your review, better addressing issues for future proposals.).

*The proposal is of interest for basic science. The requested measuring time is too long for this research, even when it is needed to complete it in the best possible way.

The authors may consider re-structuring the proposal to ask for less time. Additionally, they should indicate why this research deserves more attention, to measure in a national lab.

3) Let us know if there you have technical questions or safety concerns that you feel need to be answered by the proposal spokesperson before this proposal could be evaluated.

*None

If you need further information, do not hesitate in contacting me.

Kind regards!

Enrique

.....

Dr. Enrique Quiroga-Gonzalez

Professor-Researcher

Institute of Physics

Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla (BUAP)

Puebla, Mexico

Phone: [+52\(222\)2295610](tel:+52(222)2295610) <tel:%2B52%28222%292295610> , [+52\(222\)2295500](tel:+52(222)2295500) Ext.2061

<tel:%2B52%28222%292295500%20Ext.2061>

www.ifuap.buap.mx/~equiroga/en/

2016-06-08 15:28 GMT-05:00 <knotts@slac.stanford.edu>:

Dear Dr. Quiroga-Gonzalez:

We would very much appreciate your review of the attached ~3 page proposal which was submitted to use the Stanford Synchrotron Radiation Lightsource (SSRL).

4654 - Insight into the cation migration and surface structural evolution of spinel $\text{LiNi}_{0.5}\text{Mn}_{1.5}\text{O}_4$ material. At your earliest convenience, please reply to confirm if you will be able to review this proposal by July 1.

Your review is a crucial part of the peer review process utilized to allocate beam time that is in high demand at SSRL. It is acceptable to solicit assistance from colleagues within your research group, providing there is no conflict of interest. However, if there is a potential conflict of interest or if you feel it would be inappropriate for you to provide a review, please inform me immediately. If you find that the proposal is not sufficient to allow a quality review, if you do not feel qualified to respond to all or particular areas of the proposal, or if you are unable to assist us

at this time, please reply and suggest other reviewers in this field.

We would appreciate your review of this proposal based on its scientific merit, particularly the intellectual impact of the work on the field and the value of using synchrotron radiation to accomplish this work. To ensure consistency in the review process, please use the following rating criteria:

1.0-1.9 Excellent: A well-chosen problem or important research that has a good chance of producing a major contribution to fundamental knowledge or an important technological development. Should be given highest priority for beam time. (The most compelling proposals with the greatest likelihood of a high profile publication should be rated 1.0-1.4. A rating of ~1.5 or better is generally needed to access the most oversubscribed SSRL beam lines.)

2.0-2.9 Very Good: A worthwhile problem or research that may lead to advances in fundamental knowledge or technology. Should receive beam time if at all possible.

3.0-3.9 Good: A reasonable problem, but less than forefront. Beam time should be considered only after the above two categories have received time.

4.0-4.9 Fair: Significant deficiencies appear in the proposal. Successful completion of the research is doubtful. Should probably not receive time.

5.0 Poor: Poorly written proposal or major scientific issues that should not receive beam time.

Please reply to this message before July 1, using the criteria and rating scale above to provide the following:

- 1) Your rating for the overall scientific merit of this proposal.
- 2) Your comments related to this proposal (Your comments aid the PRP in evaluating the proposal and beam time requested. Your comments will be shared anonymously with the proposal spokesperson to aid them in understanding your review, better addressing issues for future proposals.).
- 3) Let us know if there you have technical questions or safety concerns that you feel need to be answered by the proposal spokesperson before this proposal could be evaluated.

Scientific proposals are confidential, so please delete this file after you have reviewed it. The proposal document may be a multi-file PDF. When you open it, it should display a directory of the various documents contained in a separate pane either at one side or at the bottom of the window. If your email client doesn't display this separate pane (and we know the MAC mail preview function doesn't display it), please let us know or save the attached file and open it with a dedicated PDF reader like Adobe Acrobat.

Here's a link for more information on viewing the PDFs:

https://www-ssrl.slac.stanford.edu?urawi_internals/pdf.trouble.html

We are conscious of the demands on your time, and we very much appreciate your review which is a key element in appropriately allocating a scarce resource here at SSRL. If you have any questions or require assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Cathy Knotts
Manager, User Research Administration
Stanford Synchrotron Radiation Lightsource