

PANEL SUMMARY EVALUATION

PROPOSAL TITLE: QUANTIFYING THE INSTRUMENTAL EFFECTS AND SYSTEMATIC UNCERTAINTIES IN THE DURATIONS OF SWIFT/BAT GAMMA-RAY BURSTS

BRIEF SUMMARY OF RESEARCH OBJECTIVES:

The proposal plans to quantify the uncertainty of duration of gamma-ray bursts.

DETAILED FINDINGS:

Major Strengths:

1. It is important to know the systematic uncertainty of duration measurement in BAT.
2. This research has a wider impact on the astrophysics field.
3. It clearly describes the science and methods. Easy to understand for non-expert.
4. Demonstrate their technique and clearly show what they would do.

Minor Strengths:

5. The text is easy to navigate. The italic goal make it clear as well.
6. Based on an accepted paper/work.

Major Weaknesses:

1. They don't state their time scale for the project.
2. They haven't shown their code work.

Minor Weaknesses:

3. Define terminology.

ADJECTIVAL RATING FOR INTRINSIC MERIT:

(Rating from 1 to 5 -- 5: Excellent; 1:Poor)

$(4+4+3.9+3.5+3.9+4.0+4.5+4.0+3.7+4.5+4.1)/11 = 4.0$

Reviewer signatures:

Milan Warner

Justin Harrell

Kevin Hall

Sehin Mesfin

Matthew Kingsland

Quinn Kelly

Vivian Carvajal

Ernesto Benitez

Quinten Williams

Ben Flaggs

Edward Williams

PANEL SUMMARY EVALUATION

PROPOSAL TITLE: EXPLORING THE CONNECTION OF SWIFT LONG GRB POPULATIONS TO THE STAR FORMATION RATE

BRIEF SUMMARY OF RESEARCH OBJECTIVES:

- Get the more precise SFR measurement based on rate of long GRBs using Bayesian analysis.

DETAILED FINDINGS:

Major Strengths:

- The group has good knowledge of what has been done before.
- The group shows that they are knowledgeable on the subject and thus has a good chance to finish this project.

Minor Strengths:

- Pretty graphs
- The proposal shows that they have an effective team.
- It's relevant to Swift.
- Ultimate science goal of studying the relation between the SFR and GRB is interesting.

Major Weaknesses:

- It is unclear what they want to do. It does not clearly explain the scientific method.
- It does not explain what Bayesian despite using it frequently.
- The logical flow of the proposal is unclear.
- Most of the text is about what they (or others) have already done, and not about what the proposal is going to do.

Minor Weaknesses:

- Lots of grammar errors and typos.
- Complicated math equation that the author derived, but without clear explanation.

ADJECTIVAL RATING FOR INTRINSIC MERIT:

(Rating from 1 to 5 -- 5: Excellent; 1:Poor)

$$(2.6+3.14+2.72+1.6+2.0+2.0+1.8+1.2+3.0+2.8+2.2)/11 = 2.3$$

Reviewer signatures:

Quinn Kelly

Sehin Mesfin

Ernesto Benitez

Matthew Kingsland

Milan Warner

Justin Harrell

Vivian Carvajal

Quinten Williams

Ben Flaggs

Edward Williams