

Welcome,
ANDREICA Daniel

[Sign Out]

Home

User Information

Account Information

Change Password

Evaluators Section

Evaluate Projects

Useful Docs PD 2016

Useful Docs TE 2016

Programmes

SUBMITTED PROJECTS

ANCSI

Technical Scientific Literature 2016

CNFIS

FDI 2017

FLAG-ERA

FLAG-ERA JTC 2016

PNCDI III - Programme 1

1.1 Human Resources PD-2016

1.1 Human Resources TE-2016

1.1. Human Resources MCT-2017

1.1. Human Resources MCD-2017

1.1. Human Resources MC-2017

1.1. Human Resources PRECBVT-2017

1.1 PRECISI-2017

1.2 PCCDI-2017

PNCDI III - Programme 2

2.1 SOLUTII - CBRNE

2.1 CI 2017

PNCDI III - Programme 3

3.6 Support H2020 2016

3.5 EUREKA 2017

3.5 RO-IL 2017

PNCDI III - Programme 4

ERC-like 2016

PCE 2016

PCCF 2016

Calls Statistics

Submission Guidelines

Terms and Conditions

:: Programmes :: **PNCDI III - Programme 4** :: **PCE 2016** :: Phase II - Final Report ::

[Back to Submitted Projects](#)

**Final
Report**

General Information About this Project

Project Registration Code	PN-III-P4-ID-PCE-2016-0534
Project Title (English)	Investigation of magnetic properties of selected materials using muSR and muSR under pressure.
Project Title (Romanian)	Investigarea proprietatilor maagnetice ale materialelor prin muSR si si muSR sub presiune.
Project Acronym	muSR-P-MAG
Main Domain	Domain: PE. PHYSICAL SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING Subdomain: PE3. Condensed Matter Physics: Structure, electronic properties, fluids, nanosciences, biophysics Research Area: PE3_8. Magnetism and strongly correlated systems
Secondary Domain	Domain: PE. PHYSICAL SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING Subdomain: PE5. Synthetic Chemistry and Materials: Materials synthesis, structure-properties relations, functional and advanced materials, molecular architecture, organic chemistry Research Area: PE5_2. Solid state materials
Keywords	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • muSR • magnetism • pressure • phase diagram • strongly correlated electron systems
Project leader	Daniel ANDREICA
Project Duration (months)	30

Final Report

1 The Project leader (60%)

1.1 (50%) Please evaluate the **excellency of the project leaders` research activity results** as resulted from the publications and patents list, with emphasis on the contributions as main author. Please comment the originality of the project leaders` results, their impact on the state of the art of the results in this field, and also their relevance for this project.

<input type="checkbox"/> 5 - Excellent	The research activity of the project leader (PL) is certainly representative of the aim of the proposed project. The contribution of the project leader has been significant for the field.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4,5	
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 - Very Good	
<input type="checkbox"/> 3,5	
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 - Good	
<input type="checkbox"/> 2,5	
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 - Satisfying	
<input type="checkbox"/> 1,5	
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 - Poor	
<input type="checkbox"/> 0,5	
<input type="checkbox"/> 0 - Absent	
Score[1..1]=45.00	

1.2 (10%) Please evaluate the capacity of the project leader to manage autonomously scientific activities as researcher and/or research group leader, and also his/her visibility and prestige within the group he/she belong at international level. Please comment the performance in publications of the project leader (as main author), his/her leadership, the capacity to raise funds, his/her international visibility. Please consider only the results relevant for this project proposal.

<input type="radio"/> 5 - Excellent	The PL shows an ample record of leadership qualities, with experience in national and international projects. Apparently, the PL was successful at raising funds via government-funded research grants, however it is unclear if the PL took their reigns.
<input checked="" type="radio"/> 4,5	
<input type="radio"/> 4 - Very Good	
<input type="radio"/> 3,5	
<input type="radio"/> 3 - Good	
<input type="radio"/> 2,5	
<input type="radio"/> 2 - Satisfying	
<input type="radio"/> 1,5	
<input type="radio"/> 1 - Poor	
<input type="radio"/> 0,5	
<input type="radio"/> 0 - Absent	
Score[1.2]=9.00	

2 The project proposal (40%)

2.1 (20%) Please evaluate the general solution described in the project proposal in the current context and its potential impact in the future. Please comment the following aspects:

- (1) the significance and the degree of difficulty of the issue addressed;
- (2) the originality of the proposed solution according to the objectives;
- (3) the potential to move forward the knowledge in the field and to influence the direction of thinking and activity.

<input type="radio"/> 5 - Excellent	This is a very well written proposal with good motivation and description of the background. The approach to the problems proposed to investigate appears sound.
<input checked="" type="radio"/> 4,5	
<input type="radio"/> 4 - Very Good	
<input type="radio"/> 3,5	
<input type="radio"/> 3 - Good	
<input type="radio"/> 2,5	
<input type="radio"/> 2 - Satisfying	
<input type="radio"/> 1,5	
<input type="radio"/> 1 - Poor	
<input type="radio"/> 0,5	
<input type="radio"/> 0 - Absent	
Score[2.1]=18.00	

2.2 (20%) Please evaluate the method and the work plan as defined in the project proposal as a concrete approach to reach the solution provided.

Please comment how well are chosen the methods, the tools for investigation, and the efficiency of the work plan related to the time and the resources proposed. Potential issues have been treated properly? There have been mentioned alternative approaches? There have been mentioned deliverables and what importance has been given to publication of the results in prestigious international journals? How do you assess the research project team structure, its functioning and what is the degree of complementarity of the team members?

<input type="radio"/> 5 - Excellent	The work plan is very well explained, and realistic taking into account the processing of scheduled experiments. Collaborations are outstanding and publications in high impact factor journals can be anticipated.
<input checked="" type="radio"/> 4,5	
<input type="radio"/> 4 - Very Good	
<input type="radio"/> 3,5	
<input type="radio"/> 3 - Good	
<input type="radio"/> 2,5	
<input type="radio"/> 2 - Satisfying	
<input type="radio"/> 1,5	
<input type="radio"/> 1 - Poor	
<input type="radio"/> 0,5	
<input type="radio"/> 0 - Absent	

Score[2.2]=18.00

2.3 Please evaluate the adequacy of the budget proposal and suggest possible rectifications. Please comment the correspondence between the work plan and the proposed budget, and also the adequacy of the mobilities (conferences, working visits) and the infrastructure procurements included into the budget. The evaluators comments associated to this subcriterion will be used only during the negotiation and contracting process.

It seems that the budget is reasonable. Of course one cannot always meet the original expectations, and the final decision is not in our hands. However, once again, it looks a decent one.

Project Score: 90.00

User name: Daniel ANDREICA, User email: daniel.andreica@phys.ubbcluj.ro, IP: 193.231.19.53