



## **Proposal Evaluation Criteria and Scoring Guidelines**

All proposals passing the desk review will proceed to further evaluation. The evaluation for technical quality and research funding will be conducted in three steps:

- **Independent Review:** 70%
- **Oral Presentation:** 15%
- **Publication Track Record:** 15%

Section	Criterion	Max Marks / Points	Weight
<b>A. Publication (last 5 yrs, Principal Applicant only)</b>	First / Corresponding Author	Varies (see journal table)	
	Co-author	Varies (see journal table)	
<b>Journal Scoring (Points)</b>	Nature indexed	7 / 3.5	
	Scimago Q1	6 / 3	
	Scimago Q2	5 / 2.5	15%
	Scimago Q3	4 / 2	
	Scimago Q4	3 / 1.5	
	Peer-reviewed, intl indexed	2 / 1	
	Professional journals (ISSN)	1 / 0.5	
<b>B. Proposal Evaluation (Independent Review)</b>	Title	2	
	Abstract	3	
	Background	5	
	Literature review	10	
	Research gap / Problem / Rationale	5	
	Hypothesis	2	
	Objectives	3	70%
	Methodology	16	
	Expected outcome	4	
	Application	4	
	Relevance to UN SDGs	2	
	English quality	4	
	Originality	3	
	Feasibility	2	

	Deliverables	2
	Planning & milestones	2
	Budget plan	1
<b>C. Proposal Presentation</b>		
	Clarity of concept & content	7
	Fluency & timing	3
	Response to questions	5
<b>Total Score (A + B + C)</b>	100	100%

**Pass Criteria** **Section B ≥35/70 & Aggregate ≥50/100**

**Note:**

All proposals will be evaluated anonymously, with any plagiarism leading to immediate disqualification. The evaluation criteria have been established in accordance with the university's PURC guidelines.