

Annex 4: PURC Research Grant Proposal Evaluation Criteria

| A | Publication (Principal applicant only, Full marks 15) | First / Corresponding author score (a) | | | Coauthor score (b) | | | Total score |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|-------|-------|-----------------------|-------|-------|----------------|
| | | Points | Units | Score | Points | Units | Score | |
| 1 | Nature indexed | 7 | | | 3.5 | | | |
| 2 | Scimago Q1 | 6 | | | 3 | | | |
| 3 | Scimago Q2 | 5 | | | 2.5 | | | |
| 4 | Scimago Q3 | 4 | | | 3 | | | |
| 5 | Scimago Q4 | 3 | | | 1.5 | | | |
| 6 | Peer reviewed and internationally indexed | 2 | | | 1 | | | |
| 7 | Professional journals with ISSN | 1 | | | 0.5 | | | |
| | | Total (a) | | | Total (b) | | | |
| Publication score A (A= a+b) | | (The maximum allowable score is 15) | | | | | | |
| B | Proposal (Full marks 70) | Full marks | | | Marks obtained | | | |
| 1 | Title | 2 | | | | | | |
| 2 | Abstract | 3 | | | | | | |
| 3 | Background of the study | 5 | | | | | | |
| 4 | Literature review (Appropriateness and sufficiency of references) | 10 | | | | | | |
| 5 | Research gap / Problem / Rationale | 5 | | | | | | |
| 6 | Hypothesis | 2 | | | | | | |
| 7 | Objectives | 3 | | | | | | |
| 8 | Methodology (Research design, Study area, Tools & Techniques, and Data analysis strategy) | 16 | | | | | | |
| 9 | Expected outcome of the Research | 4 | | | | | | |
| 10 | Application of the proposed research | 4 | | | | | | |
| 11 | Relevance to the UN Sustainable Development Goals | 2 | | | | | | |
| 12 | English language quality: grammar, structure, coherence, & clarity | 4 | | | | | | |

| | | | |
|--|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 13 | Originality of the concept and content | 3 | |
| 14 | Feasibility of the project | 2 | |
| 15 | Deliverables of the research project | 2 | |
| 16 | Project planning and milestones | 2 | |
| 17 | Budget distribution plan | 1 | |
| Proposal score (B) | | 70 (full marks) | |
| C | Proposal presentation (Full marks 15) | Full marks | Marks obtained |
| 1 | Clarity of concept and content | 7 | |
| 2 | Fluency and timing of presentation | 3 | |
| 3 | Response to questions | 5 | |
| Presentation score (C) | | 15 (full marks) | |
| Full Mark (A+B+C) | | 100 (15+70+15) | |
| Pass Mark | | 50 (aggregate A+B+C) | |
| Total score (A+B+C) | | | |
| Result | | Qualified: | Disqualified: |
| Note: | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Research Evaluation Committee (REC) will evaluate the publications and assign scores according to the respective journal category. ii) The grant proposals will be evaluated anonymously by at least one independent expert. iii) The proposal evaluation weightage will be 15%, 70%, and 15% for publications (A), independent review (B), and proposal presentation (C) respectively. iv) The proposals shall secure threshold score of 50% (35 out of 70) in independent review (B) to be eligible for further processing. v) Independent reviewer shall provide substantial justification where the proposal scores below 50% and above 90%. REC can appoint second independent reviewer where necessary if the evaluation of the first examiner seems unsatisfactory. vi) Publications published within the last five years will be considered for the evaluation purpose (Example: for the grants of 2023, publication from January 2019 to 2023 will be considered). vii) Applicants securing passing score of 50% in aggregate will be qualified (Q) to be considered to receive the grant. Applicants obtaining total scores below 50% will be disqualified (DQ) and rejected. viii) Applicants obtaining the passing scores will be ranked on the basis of the total scores and the required number of grantees will be selected on the basis of the order of merit. | | | |