

User Proposal Review Criteria

CNMS proposals are evaluated on scientific merit, the quality and feasibility of the proposed research, the need for CNMS capabilities, and the potential for meaningful scientific outcomes. The criteria and relative weights below are used in the proposal review process.

01	Scientific or technological significance Is the scientific or technological problem important and of current interest? Would successful research lead to notable advances in fundamental understanding or nanotechnology?	25%
02	Overall technical approach Is the proposed approach clearly described, well focused, and sufficiently comprehensive to achieve the stated research objectives?	10%
03	Adequacy of tasks and capabilities outside CNMS Are the research tasks and/or capabilities to be carried out outside CNMS adequate and sufficiently described to support project success?	10%
04	Planning of research tasks at CNMS Are the tasks to be carried out at CNMS well planned, with expected outcomes clearly described?	15%
05	Need for specialized CNMS capabilities and expertise To what extent does successful completion of the research require the specialized capabilities and/or expertise available at CNMS?	15%
06	Appropriateness of the CNMS timeline and resources Are the proposed timeline and resource requests appropriate for the CNMS tasks, including sample quantities, instrument time, and CPU time?	10%
07	Potential for important publications How likely is the proposed work to produce important publications, considering the research plan and the proposal team's publication record?	15%

Additional consideration for partner proposals

For proposals designated as **PARTNER**, reviewers also consider whether the project is likely to enhance CNMS capabilities and/or operations and deliver significant value to future CNMS users. This is a separate question on the reviewer form; no numerical weight is specified.