

## Screening Guidelines (Doctoral Students)

June, 2024

### 1. Screening Method

- (1) In the document-based screening process, applications will be reviewed by faculty members associated with the Kyushu University Platform of Inter/Transdisciplinary Energy Research (hereinafter referred to as Q-PIT).
- (2) The reviewers will review “Research Application Overview” and “Application Form” based on the rating factors described in section 2 below and decide on the candidate proposals for adoption.  
If there are a large number of applications, the first review may be carried out using only the 'Research Application Overview' to select the proposals for the second (final) review. In the second review, the 'Application Form' are reviewed and the shortlisted proposals are selected.
- (3) The candidate proposals for adoption will be the Q-PIT Planning and Steering Committee will discuss and decide.

### 2. Screening Criteria

The 'Research Application Overview' and 'Application Form' are reviewed and comprehensively evaluated based on the following perspectives. Based on the results of the overall evaluation, the candidate proposals for adoption are decided by consensus. If a proposal is assessed as not suitable as a candidate for adoption in the overall evaluation, the reasons for this will be given.

#### **(1) Perspective of the research proposal, originality of the idea and ripple effects in the doctoral course**

- Is the research proposal highly innovative and original, based on flexible ideas, methods, etc.?
- Is the research project expected to make a broader contribution to society, including scientific, technological, industrial, and cultural impact?

#### **(2) Academic background and relevance of the research proposal in the doctoral course**

- Is the academic significance of the background to the research proposal described in a clear way to be understood by reviewers from other fields?
- Is the research project relevant to energy?

#### **(3) Relevance of the research project and research plan in the doctoral course**

- Are the research plan and method feasible and appropriate?
- Is the research plan well-developed to achieve the research objectives?

#### **(4) Clarity of the research project in the doctoral course**

- Are the research project and its specific research plans clearly described and easy to understand by the reviewers outside of the applicant's area of expertise?
- Is the description of the research project organized well enough to be read by reviewers, using simple expressions in the whole, effectively uses figures, new lines, and blank space?

**<Rating Criteria>**

5	4	3	2	1
Outstanding	Excellent	Fair	Includes slightly insufficient points	Not up to standards

**< Criteria for Overall Evaluation>**

Gold (5)	~ 1
Silver (4)	~ 2
Bronze (3)	~ 3
Encouragement (1)	~ 14
Not worthy of award	Other than above

However, if there are a large number of applications, the following shall be carried out. Based on the second review's results of the overall evaluation, the candidate proposals for adoption are decided by consensus.

**A. 1<sup>st</sup> Screening**

Only the 'Research Application Overview' will be reviewed and comprehensively evaluated based on the following aspects.

The proposals for the second screening are selected by consensus.

If a proposal is assessed as not suitable as a candidate for a second screening in the overall evaluation, the reasons for this will be given.

**(1) Perspective of the research proposal, originality of the idea and ripple effects in the doctoral course**

- Is the research proposal highly innovative and original, based on flexible ideas, methods, etc.?
- Is the research project expected to make a broader contribution to society, including scientific, technological, industrial, and cultural impact?

**(2) Academic background and relevance of the research proposal in the doctoral course**

- Is the academic significance of the background to the research proposal described in a clear way to be understood by reviewers from other fields?
- Is the research project relevant to energy?

**(3) Relevance of the Research Project and Research Plan in the doctoral course**

- Are the research plan and method feasible and appropriate?
- Is the research plan well-developed to achieve the research objectives?

#### (4) Clarity of the Research Project

- Are the research project and its specific research plans clearly described and easy to understand by the reviewers outside of the principle investigator's area of expertise?
- Is the description of the research project organized well enough to be read by reviewers, using simple expressions in the whole, effectively uses figures, new lines, and blank space?

#### <Criteria for Overall Score>

Overall Score	Number
Excellent and should be subject to a second screening.	20~25
Not satisfactory and not suitable for a second screening.	Other than above

#### B. 2<sup>nd</sup> Screening

The "Research Proposals" will be reviewed based on the same criteria as those used for the first round of judging, and the Gold, Silver, Bronze and Encouragement Award candidate proposals will be decided by consensus.

If a proposal is assessed as not suitable as a candidate for awardees in the overall evaluation, the reasons for this will be given.

#### <Rating Criteria>

5	4	3	2	1
Outstanding	Excellent	Fair	Includes slightly insufficient points	Not up to standards

#### < Criteria for Overall Evaluation>

Gold (5)	~1
Silver (4)	~2
Bronze (3)	~3
Encouragement (1)	~14
Not worthy of award	Other than above

---

### 3. Confidentiality

The reviewers should not disclose the information that he/she knew at the time of screening, such as written report, to a third party.