

2023 INCITE Renewal: Peer-Review Panel Questionnaire

First year projects will have only completed a partial year of access. Unless the project has significantly changed scope or is unlikely to successfully make use of the leadership computing resources within the time frame originally proposed, renewals for a second year are typically granted.

Please include detailed comments, especially if the overall assessment is that the project may not be meeting the expectations of the INCITE program.

1. Project Achievements

Has the project shown a reasonable attempt to meet its proposal milestones? Describe in detail the accomplishments to date and their significance in context of the state-of-the-art in this field. If the milestones have not been met, should the project continue? Why or why not?

2. Project Plans for Next Year

Are the project plans for next year reasonable and are the milestones clearly articulated? Compare them with the original submittal.

Has the project significantly changed in scope, approach, or personnel? If "yes," please comment on the following:

- Scientific and/or technical merit of the project
- Appropriateness of the proposed method or approach
- Competency of proposer's personnel and adequacy of proposed resources.

3. Computational Request for Next Year

Please assess the reasonableness of the estimates of the required computational resources to achieve the scientific/technical objectives. If the resource requirements differ from previous requests, have the authors clearly articulated reasons for the change?

4. Summary Rating

For the purpose of evaluating the overall impact and qualification of renewal requests versus new proposals of research, please provide a summary rating for the renewal request.

Excellent

The proposed research answers a high-impact, key scientific/technical question and/or points to a new area of research. The proposed method is very appropriate and well developed for answering these key questions. Milestones are clearly defined. The application team is comprised of the top experts in this field. The applicant(s) have demonstrated a very clear understanding of petascale computing and can optimally use these resources to accomplish the stated scientific/technical goals.

Very Good

The proposed research has the potential for significant impact on or progress toward answering a key scientific/technical question. The proposed method is appropriate and sufficiently developed: further modification or exploration of new techniques may be required. Milestones are clearly defined. The application team is comprised of individuals very knowledgeable in this field. The applicant(s) have demonstrated that the proposed work is appropriate for petascale computing.

Good

The proposed research has moderate impact on or progress toward answering a key scientific/technical question. The proposed method and milestones are adequate but not ideal for addressing these questions. The application team is comprised of individuals who are knowledgeable in the field. The applicant(s) will need to continue to scale their simulations to effectively utilize the petascale systems.

Poor

The proposed research has minimal or incremental impact on or progress toward answering a key scientific/technical question. The proposed method and milestones are insufficiently or incompletely described. The application team is incomplete or comprised of individuals who do not have adequate expertise to carry out the proposed research. The proposed work is better suited for another system.