

**Subject:** Request to Review DOE (BES) Proposal [REDACTED]  
**From:** PAMS <PAMS.Autoreply@science.doe.gov>  
**Date:** 12/14/2018, 10:36 AM  
**To:** Cedomir Petrovic <petrovic@bnl.gov>

Dear Dr. Cedomir Petrovic:

The Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) within the Department of Energy Office of Science requests that you review the proposal listed below. To access the proposal and submit your review, please use the DOE Office of Science [Portfolio Analysis and Management System \(PAMS\)](#).

**Task:** Mail In Review ([Link](#))

**Due Date:** 01/16/2019 11:59 PM ET

**Proposal Number:** xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

**Principal Investigator:** [REDACTED]

**Institution:** Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA

**Proposal Title:** [REDACTED]

**Solicitation:** DE-FOA-0001820, FY 2018 Continuation of Solicitation for the Office of Science Financial Assistance Program

To access the proposal and enter the review, you must have a PAMS account. Our records indicate that you already have a PAMS account. Please log into your PAMS account and click on the Tasks tab to get started with the review. If you have any trouble using PAMS, please contact the PAMS Helpdesk at (855) 818-1846 (toll-free number) or (301) 903-9610 or [sc.pams-helpdesk@science.doe.gov](mailto:sc.pams-helpdesk@science.doe.gov).

NOTE: When entering a review, please save your work every 15 minutes by using the "Save" button or by clicking the blue diskette icon on the floating toolbar along the bottom of each page.

If you have any questions about this proposal or review, please contact the program manager, Dr. Pappannan Thiyagarajan, at (301) 903-9706 or [p.thiyagarajan@science.doe.gov](mailto:p.thiyagarajan@science.doe.gov). If you cannot review the proposal, please let the program manager know or log into PAMS, where you can indicate electronically that you decline to participate.

We know you are very busy, and we appreciate the time it takes to participate in the review process. Thank you for performing this important service.

This message was sent on behalf of the program manager, Dr. Pappannan Thiyagarajan, who can be reached at [p.thiyagarajan@science.doe.gov](mailto:p.thiyagarajan@science.doe.gov). Replies to this message will not reach the intended recipient.

**Subject:** Request to Review DOE (BES) Proposal [REDACTED]  
**From:** PAMS <PAMS.Autoreply@science.doe.gov>  
**Date:** 5/8/2018, 3:07 PM  
**To:** Cedomir Petrovic <petrovic@bnl.gov>

Dear Dr. Cedomir Petrovic:

The Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) within the Department of Energy Office of Science requests that you review the proposal listed below. To access the proposal and submit your review, please use the DOE Office of Science [Portfolio Analysis and Management System \(PAMS\)](#).

**Task:** Mail In Review ([Link](#))

**Due Date:** 06/08/2018

**Proposal Number:** [REDACTED]

**Principal Investigator:** [REDACTED]

**Institution:** [REDACTED]

**Proposal Title:** [REDACTED]

**Solicitation:** N/A,

To access the proposal and enter the review, you must have a PAMS account. Our records indicate that you already have a PAMS account. Please log into your PAMS account and click on the Tasks tab to get started with the review. If you have any trouble using PAMS, please contact the PAMS Helpdesk at (855) 818-1846 (toll-free number) or (301) 903-9610 or [sc.pams-helpdesk@science.doe.gov](mailto:sc.pams-helpdesk@science.doe.gov).

If you have any questions about this proposal or review, please contact the program manager, Dr. Michael Pechan, at (301) 903-0540 or [Michael.Pechan@science.doe.gov](mailto:Michael.Pechan@science.doe.gov). If you cannot review the proposal, please let the program manager know or log into PAMS, where you can indicate electronically that you decline to participate.

We know you are very busy, and we appreciate the time it takes to participate in the review process. Thank you for performing this important service.

This message was sent on behalf of the program manager, Dr. Michael Pechan, who can be reached at [Michael.Pechan@science.doe.gov](mailto:Michael.Pechan@science.doe.gov). Replies to this message will not reach the intended recipient.

**Subject:** Invitation to serve -- Reverse Site Visit, August 31-Sept. 1; Germantown, Maryland  
**From:** "Fitzsimmons, Tim" <Tim.Fitzsimmons@science.doe.gov>  
**Date:** 3/23/2015, 4:06 PM  
**To:** "petrovic@bnl.gov" <petrovic@bnl.gov>  
**CC:** "Gersten, Bonnie" <Bonnie.Gersten@science.doe.gov>, "Fitzsimmons, Tim" <Tim.Fitzsimmons@science.doe.gov>

Dear Cedomir,

The US Department of Energy (DOE) [1] is supporting an award with the Louisiana Board of Regents [2] entitled, "Building Neutron Scattering Infrastructure in Louisiana for Advanced Materials." [1] The award is describe in the attached abstract. We will be inviting the PIs to present their research and future plans at a reverse site visit at DOE's Germantown, Maryland facility on Monday, August 31st and Tuesday, September 1st. If you do not have a conflict in reviewing, I was wondering if you might be able to help as one of the external reviewers? Reviewers would be responsible for writing up review comments within 2 weeks of the reverse site visit.

I hope you will be able to join us.

With my thanks,

Tim Fitzsimmons

[1] Materials Sciences and Engineering Division and the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research  
[2] and via subcontracts: Louisiana State University, Louisiana Tech University, Tulane University, and the University of New Orleans

---

**Timothy J. Fitzsimmons, Ph.D.**  
[Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research](#) **301-903-9830**  
Scattering and Instrumentation Sciences Team, SC-22.21 301-903-9513 (FAX)  
Division of Materials Sciences and Engineering [tim.fitzsimmons@science.doe.gov](mailto:tim.fitzsimmons@science.doe.gov)  
Office of Basic Energy Science  
Office of Science

**Office Location:**  
Germantown Building, F-418  
19901 Germantown Road  
Germantown, Maryland

**Postal Address(e-mail is preferred)**  
U.S. Department of Energy, SC-22.2/GTN  
Washington DC 20585-1290

---

— Attachments: —

LA Public Abstract-final.docx

16.9 KB

**Subject:** Early Career reviewer FY14

**From:** "Gersten, Bonnie" <Bonnie.Gersten@science.doe.gov>

**Date:** 10/16/2013, 10:38 AM

**To:** "'petrovic@bnl.gov' (petrovic@bnl.gov)" <petrovic@bnl.gov>

**CC:** "Fitzsimmons, Tim" <Tim.Fitzsimmons@science.doe.gov>

Dear Cedomir,

I would like to request for you to serve as a reviewer for ~6 applications relevant to your expertise (in this case for the Panel on Synthesis and Processing Science and the panel on Experimental Condensed Matter Physics) that were submitted to the Office of Science Early Career Research Program (see <http://science.energy.gov/early-career/> and text below this email for more details). I recognize that I am requesting a significant commitment and this may be the second or third time over the last year or so that DOE Basic Energy Sciences (BES) has come to you with such a request. However, I hope that you are as excited as we are about this opportunity to bring some outstanding new scientists into the BES programs and that you will be willing to be a part of the process.

If you agree to serve as a reviewer, you will register with, and use, a web-based system called "PAMS" to access your assigned applications and, after writing your reviews, to upload them to the same system. Each application will be from a single PI and the Project Narrative will be no longer than 15 pages. We anticipate that you will be able to access your applications on Dec. 16, 2013 or soon thereafter. You will be asked to complete and enter your reviews by **February 7, 2014**.

Since time is of the essence, please email your decision to me as soon as possible. Should you agree to help us out, you will be contacted in December with information about the proposal assignments along with instructions for accessing them and entering reviews.

If you have already agreed to review Early Career applications for another BES or other Office of Science program, please let me know your preferences and I will coordinate with the appropriate program managers here at DOE. If any other questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me. I look forward to hearing from you.

At this time, if you know can you also please let me know if you are planning to be involved in submitting an EFRC application. More about the EFRC application process can be found at: <http://science.energy.gov/bes/efrc/>.

Best regards,

Bonnie Gersten

Bonnie Gersten, Ph.D.  
Program Manager  
Dept of Energy  
Office of Science, Basic Energy Sciences  
Division of Materials Sciences and Engineering  
Tel: 301-903-0002  
FAX: 301-903-9513

Mail Address:  
SC-22.2 Germantown Bldg  
1000 Independence Ave., SW  
Washington, DC 20585-1290

Street and FEDEX Address:  
19901 Germantown Road  
Germantown, MD 20874

**Subject:** Request to review a proposal from Professor xxxxxxxx at xxxxxx University  
**From:** "Kelley, Richard" <Richard.Kelley@science.doe.gov>  
**Date:** 1/5/2011, 3:18 PM  
**To:** "petrovic@bnl.gov" <petrovic@bnl.gov>  
**CC:** "Kelley, Richard" <Richard.Kelley@science.doe.gov>, "Mariani, Jorge" <Jorge.Mariani@science.doe.gov>

Dear Cedomir ,

The Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES) funds fundamental research in areas relevant to Department of Energy missions. A scientific and technical peer review of the proposed work is part of our merit review process for selecting high quality research for awards. These reviews are of considerable value and assistance to us in developing and maintaining the excellence of our research program.

I would very much appreciate your review and evaluation of the research proposal (**Abstract attached**) entitled:

[REDACTED]  
If you can review, I will promptly send the full proposal by e-mail.

In formulating your opinions about the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed work, please address the following four criteria, which are listed in order of **decreasing** importance:

**1) Scientific and/or technical merit of the project;**

Consider, for example, the influence that the results might have on the direction, progress, and thinking in relevant scientific fields of research; the likelihood of achieving valuable results; and the scientific innovation and originality indicated in the proposed research.

**2) Appropriateness of the proposed method or approach;**

Consider, for example, the logic and feasibility of the research approaches and the soundness of the conduct of the research.

**3) Competency of the personnel and adequacy of proposed resources;**

Consider, for example, the background, past performance, and potential of the investigator(s); and the research environment and facilities for performing the research.

**4) Reasonableness and appropriateness of the proposed budget.**

Please read the enclosed *Information for Peer Reviewers* before proceeding with your review. If you are unable to review the research proposal, please e-mail or phone me and destroy the proposal promptly. When writing your review, bear in mind that we may transmit an anonymous verbatim copy of your assessment to the principal investigator for comments.

**I appreciate that this request may come at a time when you may be exceptionally busy; however, I need to receive your review by February 18, 2011 or anytime earlier. Please submit your written evaluation by e-mail (preferred) to [richard.kelley@science.doe.gov](mailto:richard.kelley@science.doe.gov) and to [jorge.mariani@science.doe.gov](mailto:jorge.mariani@science.doe.gov) or by fax.**

Thoughtful peer review plays a critical role in assuring the quality of the national scientific enterprise. Our selection of research proposals for awards will be based upon the findings of the scientific peer evaluations, our assessment of the importance and relevance of the proposed work to the mission of BES, and the availability of funding. Your contribution to this process is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you very much for considering this request,

Dick Kelley

\*\*\*\*\*  
Richard D. Kelley, Ph.D.  
Program Manager, Materials Chemistry  
Division of Materials Sciences and Engineering  
U. S. Department of Energy  
Tel: (301) 903-6051  
Fax: (301) 903-9513  
E-mail: [richard.kelley@science.doe.gov](mailto:richard.kelley@science.doe.gov)  
Internet: <http://www.sc.doe.gov/bes>

Postal Delivery address:  
SC-22.2/Germantown Building  
U.S. Department of Energy

**Subject:** Review One Proposal by June 15  
**From:** "Ying, Charles" <CYING@nsf.gov>  
**Date:** 5/23/2019, 2:18 PM  
**To:** "petrovic@bnl.gov" <petrovic@bnl.gov>

Dear Cedomir,

Could you review a proposal by Saturday, June 15?

This is for a full proposal in response to Mid-scale Research Infrastructure-1 (Mid-scale RI-1), [NSF 19-537](#), for up-to-5-year projects between \$6 million and \$20 million. Based on the preliminary proposal evaluation, we have just received a full proposal submitted by [REDACTED] and others at [REDACTED] University on development of [REDACTED] instruments, in collaboration with [REDACTED] in Japan, for a new single-crystal-growth facility in the United States for growing quantum materials, optical materials, and materials for sensors and energy. I select you because of your relevant expertise in crystal growth using various methods and your interest in various quantum materials. The project description is 20 pages long, plus a Project Execution Plan in the Supplementary Document section.

Please let me know your decision. If yes, we will send you a formal review request by Friday, May 24. I understand a short turn-around time (3 weeks). I hope that you can help.

Best Regards,

Charles

=====

Charles Ying  
Program Director  
Materials Innovation Platforms (MIP) & National Facilities and Instrumentation (NaFI)  
Division of Materials Research (DMR)  
National Science Foundation (NSF)  
2415 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
E-mail: [cying@nsf.gov](mailto:cying@nsf.gov)  
Phone: 703-292-8428  
<http://www.nsf.gov/materials>

**Subject:** NSF Electronic Proposal Review Request - Proposal No. - [REDACTED]

**From:** obernal@nsf.gov

**Date:** 1/26/2009, 4:01 PM

**To:** petrovic@bnl.gov

Proposal Number: [REDACTED]

Institution: [REDACTED]

PI: Albert [REDACTED]

PIN: [REDACTED]

NOTE: You will not receive a paper copy of this proposal unless you request it.

Dear Dr. Petrovic ,

The quality of the awards selected for support by the National Science Foundation depends greatly on the critical judgments of expert reviewers. I hope you will help us evaluate the proposal listed above by providing comments about each project described. Please note its strengths and weaknesses taking both NSF merit review criteria, i.e., INTELLECTUAL MERIT and BROADER IMPACTS, into account.

This proposal was submitted under the Research in Undergraduate Institutions (RUI) activity to support faculty research at a predominantly undergraduate institution. NSF encourages research by faculty members of such institutions, both to ensure a broad national base for research and to help faculty members stay at the cutting edge of their disciplines. The specific objectives of RUI are to:

- support high-quality research by faculty members of predominantly undergraduate institutions with active involvement of undergraduate students,

- strengthen the research environment in academic departments that are oriented primarily towards undergraduate instruction, and

- promote the integration of research and education.

RUI is fully integrated into the regular disciplinary programs of the Foundation, and RUI proposals are evaluated and funded by NSF programs in the disciplinary areas of the proposed research. While the involvement of undergraduate students is an important feature of RUI, the overriding purpose of RUI is the support of faculty research.

The principal difference between RUI proposals and "regular" NSF proposals is the additional requirement that RUI proposals include as supplementary documentation an Impact Statement that describes the expected effects of the proposed research on the research and educational environment of the institution. It is important that you as a reviewer read that statement, since it may contain information important to your evaluation of the proposal under NSF's review criterion relating to "broader impacts of the proposed activity."

Reviewers are asked to take into account the special circumstances under which RUI investigators work and to recognize that the pace of their research and publication rates may be slower than at a research university because of heavier teaching loads; limited availability of support personnel, facilities and equipment; as well as the involvement of undergraduates, rather than graduate students, in the research.

Keeping the above goals and description of the RUI activity in mind, the proposal should be evaluated using NSF's two Merit Review Criteria.

Some proposals may cover a number of different research areas, so there may be aspects of a given proposal that fall outside your immediate expertise. In these instances, please provide comments in detail for areas in which you feel comfortable. You are also welcome to provide any general remarks you feel are appropriate.

If an applicant has had recent NSF support, we request your comments on the results from that support. Suggestions for additional reviewers are encouraged and appreciated, especially if you are unable to review the proposal.

Your comments will be most helpful if you are able to provide them within six weeks. If a brief delay in responding is necessary, I would rather receive your review a little late than not at all. However, if you are not able to review the proposal, if you feel that you might have a potential conflict, or if your review is likely to be delayed for an extensive period, please notify me at your earliest convenience.

Please contact me if you have any questions. Thank you very much for your help with this review. Your comments are important to NSF's evaluation of the proposal, and as feedback to the investigator submitting the proposal.

We very much appreciate the time and thought that you put into preparing your review.

Sincerely,

**Oscar Orlando Bernal**

**Program Director**

**Condensed Matter Physics**

National Science Foundation

E-Mail: obernal@nsf.gov Phone: (703)292-2199

#### REVIEW PROCEDURE

To access the proposal:

(1) Go to the Proposal Review window on the FastLane web page:

<[https://www.fastlane.nsf.gov/jsp/homepage/prop\\_review.jsp](https://www.fastlane.nsf.gov/jsp/homepage/prop_review.jsp)>

**Subject:** Review request for U.S.-Israel Binational Science Foundation - proposal xxxxxxx [BET]  
**From:** US-Israel Binational Science Foundation <system@bsf.org.il>  
**Date:** 12/31/2018, 2:23 AM  
**To:** <petrovic@bnl.gov>

Dear Prof. Cedimir Petrovic,

You have been recommended as a reviewer for a research proposal which was submitted to the recent annual BSF competition for research grants. We would appreciate it greatly if you could review this proposal, helping us to select the proposals which are most worthy of our support.

The BSF (United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation) is a high level grant-awarding institution, established by the governments of the United States and Israel in 1972, to support cooperative scientific research projects of mutual interest and for peaceful purposes. To date, some 46 Nobel Laureates and many winners of the Lasker, Wolf and other noted science prizes have participated in BSF-sponsored research activities. Recently, we have started a large series of joint funding programs with the NSF, but the present proposal IS NOT part of the NSF-BSF programs. You can read more about the BSF on our website [www.bsf.org.il](http://www.bsf.org.il).

The proposal details are given below and the abstract is attached to this email (Confidential!).

Please let us know by replying to this message, or by answering on the web, whether or not you will be able to review this proposal(within a 30-day period or later). If you agree to review, we will send you a UserID and Password that will enable you to read the entire proposal on the web.

If you find that you are unable to review this proposal, it will be of great help to us if, in your reply, you could recommend alternative potential reviewers for it. (Name and institution will be sufficient).

If you wish to start the review immediately, use the link given below to open your RESPONSE FORM:

On the form you will be able to:

- [1] Accept or reject our request.
- [2] Browse through the complete application. (We request that you observe the confidentiality of the information in the research proposal; please note that to see the PDF of the entire proposal, you must first fill in the online acceptance form).
- [3] Fill out a review form according to the guidelines, within 30 days (confidential).
- [4] Suggest additional reviewers.

Your time and attention are highly appreciated. Your valued and specialized review will play a vital role in the BSF's decisions regarding which projects to support. If you need further assistance please contact me directly.

Sincerely,

Dr. Yair Rotstein,  
Executive Director  
United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation  
Jerusalem, Israel  
Tel (972)(2) 582-8239  
Fax (972)(2) 582-8306

The proposal data is:

-----  
xxxxxxx: xxxxxx xxxxxxxxx [BET]

Submitted by :

-----  
Dr. xxxxxx, USA.  
Prof. xxxxxx, Israel.



-----

The link to Login to the BSF website:

[www.bsf.org.il/ElectronicSubmission/Default.aspx?QS1=PetCed0080673&QS2=ZAMIMA85](http://www.bsf.org.il/ElectronicSubmission/Default.aspx?QS1=PetCed0080673&QS2=ZAMIMA85)

If the above link does not open properly, please enter the following data in the URL of your browser:

[www.bsf.org.il](http://www.bsf.org.il)

and then use your UserID and password to login.

UserID: PetCed0080673

Password: ZAMIMA85

— Attachments: —

---



73.2 KB

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft · 53170 Bonn, Germany

**Personal/Confidential**

Professor Cedomir Petrovic  
Brookhaven National Laboratory  
P. O. Box 5000  
UPTON NY 11973-5000  
USA

**Physics, Mathematics,  
Geosciences**

Kennedyallee 40  
53175 Bonn, Germany

Dr. Cosima Schuster

Phone: +49 228 885-2769  
Fax: +49 228 885-2777  
cosima.schuster@dfg.de

Please direct enquiries to:  
Simone Junior

Phone: +49 228 885-2832  
Fax: +49 228 885-2777  
simone.junior@dfg.de  
www.dfg.de

Ref.: [REDACTED]

27 November 2014 Ju

**Project:** [REDACTED]  
**Applicant:** [REDACTED]

Dear Professor Petrovic,

On behalf of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (German Research Foundation), I would like to request your assistance in reviewing the attached proposal, on a voluntary basis. The DFG relies on the expertise of peer reviewers, such as yourself, in evaluating proposals submitted to its highly competitive programmes.

The review process and criteria are explained in the **review process guidelines** [http://www.dfg.de/formulare/10\\_20/](http://www.dfg.de/formulare/10_20/). Your review will be treated confidentially. Please note, however, that an anonymised copy of your review may be shared with applicants. This procedure is followed in all cases where a proposal has been rejected by the DFG.

**In order to process this application in the next meeting of the grants committee, we would appreciate receiving your review**

**by January 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014.**

**If this is not possible please contact us so that we can give you more time to prepare your review.  
Please refer to the previous proposal which is enclosed.**

Please submit your evaluation via our „elan“ electronic portal:  
<https://elan.dfg.de>.

Thank you in advance for your time. If you have any questions concerning the review process, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Cosima Schuster

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft · 53170 Bonn, Germany

**Personal/Confidential**

Professor Cedomir Petrovic  
Brookhaven National Laboratory  
P. O. Box 5000  
UPTON NY 11973-5000  
USA

**Physics, Mathematics**

Kennedyallee 40  
53175 Bonn, Germany

Dr. Michael Mößle

Phone: +49 228 885-2351  
Fax: +49 228 885-713320  
michael.moessle@dfg.de

Please direct enquiries to:  
Andreas Bothur

Phone: +49 228 885-2527  
Fax: +49 228 885-2777  
andreas.bothur@dfg.de  
www.dfg.de

Ref.: [REDACTED]

22 January 2020 ABo

Project: [REDACTED]  
Applicants: [REDACTED]

Dear Professor Petrovic,

On behalf of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (German Research Foundation), I would like to request your assistance in reviewing the attached proposal, on a voluntary basis. The DFG relies on the expertise of peer reviewers, such as yourself, in evaluating proposals submitted to its highly competitive programmes.

The review process and criteria are explained in the **review process guidelines** [http://www.dfg.de/formulare/10\\_20/](http://www.dfg.de/formulare/10_20/).

Please **use the attached reply form** to complete your review.

We will treat your review confidentially. The DFG will anonymise the reviews and share them with the applicants and other reviewers involved in assessing the proposal.

In the interests of the applicant, we request that you submit your review **by 17<sup>th</sup> February 2020**. Should this not be feasible, please inform me as soon as possible so that we may plan accordingly.

Please submit your review online via our elan portal at <https://elan.dfg.de/en>.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Michael Mößle



# Appointment letter for European Research Council referees in peer review evaluations

Town, date: Brussels, 24/02/2011

First and last name of the expert: Cedomir Petrovic

Contact email address: petrovic@bnl.gov

Expert registration number: 19184

## Subject: European Research Council Peer Review Evaluation

Dear Colleague,

Thank you for agreeing to assist the *European Research Council Executive Agency*, "ERCEA", in the peer review evaluation of proposals submitted under the FP7 "*Ideas*" *Specific Programme*. Further to your identification as peer reviewer, this *appointment letter* will confirm your willingness to participate in the evaluation of proposals under the "*Ideas*" *Specific Programme* as a referee. Please note that according to the "*Ideas*" Annual Work Programme<sup>1</sup>, referees assisting the ERC evaluation panels are not compensated for the tasks they perform.

The present *appointment letter* constitutes an agreement between you and ERCEA, acting under the powers delegated by the European Commission<sup>2</sup>, to contribute to the ERC peer review evaluation. However, this *appointment letter* does not constitute an obligation for ERCEA to assign you a task. This agreement enters into force on the date of the last signature of this *appointment letter* and shall remain valid until the end of the FP7 "*Ideas*" *Specific Programme*.

The terms and conditions set out in the annexes to this *appointment letter* form an integral part of this *appointment letter*. Any amendment to this *appointment letter* shall be agreed in hand writing or using the electronic communication tool referred to in the *General Conditions*.

In accordance with the "**General conditions**" attached to this *appointment letter* (and accessible at the following website:

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:327:0051:0070:EN:PDF>) you may be invited to perform specific assignments in relation to the peer review evaluation of a particular call under the FP7 "*Ideas*" *Specific Programme*.

<sup>1</sup> Commission Decision C(2009)5928 of 29 July 2009, for the year 2010, (cf. point 4.6.2).

<sup>2</sup> Commission Decision C (2008)5694 final of 8 October 2008.

This *appointment letter* enables, but does not oblige you, to perform any of these specific assignments: prior to any assignment, the ERCEA will contact you by the agreed communication channel<sup>3</sup> to verify your availability and willingness, and to confirm your availability by written or electronic transaction.

Your confirmation of availability for each assignment will constitute your acceptance of the assignment. Refusal of a specific assignment by you does not preclude future assignments.

Each accepted assignment shall form integral part of this *appointment letter* as attachment to it.

The return address and contact details for any correspondence regarding this *appointment letter* are:

Pierre-Yves VOISIN  
ERCEA  
COV2 22/154  
B-1049 Brussels, Belgium  
erc-experts@ec.europa.eu  
+32 2 29 94 131

For any communication or request relating to your personal data, please contact the Controller responsible for these questions (the Director of the ERCEA) through the person mentioned above.

#### **For the ERCEA**

*Signature:*

*Brussels, date:*

#### **For the Referee**

By signing and returning this *appointment letter* duly signed to the address indicated above, I confirm that the personal data provided above are correct, that I have not made other changes to this *appointment letter* and that I accept the *General Conditions* attached to this *appointment letter* (and accessible at the following website:  
**<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:327:0051:0070:EN:PDF>**).

I commit myself to inform the ERCEA in due time of any change through the above contact details concerning my personal data, address, organisation and bank account where necessary.

---

<sup>3</sup> By fax, scanned documents sent by mail, on-line upload of document to the communication system, etc.

In particular:

### **CODE OF CONDUCT**

I agree to abide by the Code of conduct for independent experts in peer review evaluations acting as referee.

### **DECLARATION OF CONFIDENTIALITY**

I undertake not to reveal information on any proposal without the express written approval of the ERCEA. I understand that I will be held personally responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of any documents or electronic files sent and for returning, erasing or destroying all confidential material upon completing the peer review process, unless otherwise instructed.

### **DECLARATION OF ABSENCE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

I agree to abide by the rules concerning conflict of interest on the evaluation of proposals such as described in the "*ERC Rules for the submission of proposals and the related evaluation, selection and award procedures*"<sup>4</sup> and in the Code of conduct for independent experts acting as referees in peer review evaluations (Annex II to this *appointment letter*).

In particular:

- For each assignment, I undertake to inform the ERCEA immediately if I discover any disqualifying or potential conflict of interest with any proposal that I am asked to evaluate.
- For each assignment, I undertake to confirm that I have no conflict of interest (disqualifying or potential) for each proposal that I evaluate.

### **USE OF PERSONAL DATA**

I agree to the use of my personal data for the sole purpose of peer review and in compliance with the European legislation<sup>5</sup>.

### **For acceptance:**

*Signature:*

*Place:*

*Date:*

Cedomir Petrovic

---

<sup>4</sup> Commission Decision C(2007)2286 of 6 June 2007 as amended by Commission Decision 2010/767/EU of 9 December 2010 available at :

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:327:0051:0070:EN:PDF>

<sup>5</sup> Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council (OJ L8 of 12.01.2001, p1) "on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the Community institutions and bodies and on the free movement of such data".



# **Annex I – General Conditions to the model appointment letter for ERC referees in peer review evaluations**

## **SCOPE**

These *General Conditions* apply to the *appointment letter* for referees (*referred to also as independent experts*) assisting the ERCEA with peer review evaluation of proposals submitted for funding to the European Research Council (ERC) under the "*Ideas*" *Specific Programme*. Please note that peer review evaluation assignments for the ERC are overseen by the ERC Scientific Council.

For further information relating to the peer review evaluation you may consult the "*ERC Rules on Proposal Submission, Evaluation, Selection and Award Procedures*" relevant to the "*Ideas*" *Specific Programme* available at the following website address: (<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:327:0051:0070:EN:PDF>).

All correspondence related to the performance of the peer review evaluation should be sent to the address specified in the *appointment letter*.

## **APPOINTMENT**

Your appointment will be effective upon the signature of the *appointment letter* by yourself and the ERCEA.

The ERCEA can not make available to you any assignment of evaluation of proposals or any related confidential material as long as the *appointment letter* has not been signed by both parties.

Once you are appointed, the ERCEA may request you to carry out specific evaluation assignment(s). Acceptance of the assignment(s) will require confirmation of your availability.

These will normally consist of remote review using electronic communication.

## **USE OF ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION TOOL**

ERCEA may set up a secure electronic communication tool, which may be used as a means of communication between you and ERCEA, provided its use is agreed in the signed *appointment letter* between you and the ERCEA.

In such case, you will be able to access the electronic communication tool on the basis of an authentication system.

The aim of the electronic communication tool is to enable any transaction following the signature of the *appointment letter*, such as the processes of accepting a specific assignment, the amendment of the *appointment letter* or of a specific assignment.

## **INABILITY TO PERFORM OBLIGATIONS AND TERMINATION**

If, for some reason, you are not able to fulfil the assignment you have accepted, you are requested to inform the ERCEA immediately.

You may not delegate to, or be replaced, by another person in carrying out evaluation assignments without the prior written approval of the ERCEA.

In case of breach of any substantial obligation arising from the performance of the peer review evaluation or in respect of the terms of the *Code of conduct* or the *confidentiality and absence of conflict of interest Declarations*, the ERCEA may terminate your appointment immediately at any time without formal notice. The termination of appointment shall become effective on

the date of receipt of the notification by the independent expert. The notification should be sent by the ERCEA in writing by registered mail with acknowledgement of receipt.

#### **PROCESSING OF PERSONAL DATA**

All personal data contained in the present *appointment letter* shall be processed in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council (OJ L8 of 12.01.2001, p1) "on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the Community institutions and bodies and on the free movement of such data". Such data shall be processed solely in connection with the implementation and follow-up of the appointment, without prejudice to a possible transmission to the bodies in charge of a monitoring or inspection task in accordance with European legislation.

Independent experts may, on written request, gain access to their personal data and correct any information that is inaccurate or incomplete. They should address any questions regarding the processing of their personal data via the official who signed the present *appointment letter*. Independent experts may lodge a complaint against the processing of their personal data with the European Data Protection Supervisor at any time.

#### **OTHER CONDITIONS**

Any results obtained by you in performance of the peer review evaluation shall be the property of the European Union, which may use them as it sees fit, except where industrial or intellectual property rights already exist.

The ERCEA shall not under any circumstances or for any reason whatsoever is liable for damage sustained by you during the performance of the evaluation work.

The provisions of the *appointment letter*, of the specific assignments, of the present *General conditions*, including the *Code of conduct* and the *confidentiality and absence of conflict of interest Declarations* do not constitute an employment agreement and the ERCEA is not liable to provide you with any compensation or coverage in the event of injury or illness.

#### **APPLICABLE LAW AND COMPETENT COURT**

Assigned tasks are governed by the terms of this *appointment letter* and the accepted specific assignments, by the relevant Union law and, on a subsidiary basis, by the Law of Belgium.

The General Court or on appeal the Court of Justice of the European Union, shall have sole jurisdiction to hear any dispute between the *European Union* and any independent expert concerning the interpretation, application or validity of this *appointment letter* and related assignments.

## **Annex II – Code of Conduct for independent experts acting as referees in peer review evaluations**

1. The task of an independent expert is to participate in a confidential, fair and equitable peer review evaluation of each proposal according to the procedures described in the "*ERC rules on proposal submission, evaluation and award procedures*" relevant to the "*Ideas*" *Specific Programme* and in any programme-specific evaluation document. He/she must use his/her best endeavours to achieve this, follow any instructions given by the ERCEA to this end and deliver a constant and high quality of work.
2. The independent expert works as an independent person. He/she is deemed to work in a personal capacity and, in performing the work, does not represent any organisation.
3. The independent expert must sign the *appointment letter* before starting the work, by which he/she accepts the present *Code of conduct*.
4. In doing so, the independent expert commits him/herself to strict confidentiality and impartiality concerning his/her tasks.
5. If an independent expert has a direct or indirect link with a proposal or any other vested interest, is in some way connected with a proposal, or has any other allegiance which impairs or threatens to impair his/her impartiality with respect to a proposal, he/she must declare such facts to the responsible ERCEA official as soon as he/she becomes aware of this.
6. In addition, the independent expert signs a declaration at the bottom of the individual assessment report for each proposal that he/she examines for the ERCEA notifying that no conflicts of interest for this particular proposal exist. The ERCEA ensures that, where the nature of any link is such that it could threaten the impartiality of the independent expert, he/she does not participate in the peer review evaluation of that proposal, and, if necessary, competing proposals.
7. Independent experts may not discuss any proposal with others, including other independent experts or ERCEA officials not directly involved in the peer review evaluation of the proposal.
8. Unless foreseen by the procedure, independent experts may not communicate with persons involved in the proposal, namely *principal investigator*, eventual team members or any person linked to the *applicant legal entity*. Independent experts' advice to the ERCEA on any proposal may not be communicated by them to the *applicant legal entity* or to any other person.
9. Independent experts are not allowed to disclose the names of other independent experts participating in the peer review evaluation. The ERCEA makes public list of names of appointed experts once a year without indicating which proposals they have evaluated.
10. The independent expert will be held personally responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of any documents sent by postal mail or electronic files sent and returning, erasing or destroying all confidential documents or files upon completing the remote review as instructed. In such instances, independent experts may seek further information (for example through the internet, specialised databases, etc.) in order to allow them to complete their examination of the proposals, provided that the obtaining of such information respects the overall rules for confidentiality and impartiality. Independent experts may not show the contents of proposals or information on *applicant legal entities*, *principal investigators* or eventual team members to third parties (e.g. colleagues,

students, etc.) without the express written approval of the ERCEA. It is strictly forbidden for independent experts to make contact with anyone involved in the proposals.

11. Independent experts are required at all times to comply strictly with any rules defined by the ERC for ensuring the confidentiality of the peer review evaluation process and its outcomes. Failure to comply with these rules may result in exclusion from the immediate and future peer review evaluation processes, without prejudice to penalties that may derive from other applicable Regulations.

## **Circumstances in which a conflict of interest may exist**

All independent experts are required to confirm that they have no conflict of interest (disqualifying or potential) **for each proposal** that they are asked to examine. If an independent expert identifies a conflict of interest relating to a proposal he/she receives, the course of action depends on whether it is a disqualifying or a potential conflict of interest.

An independent expert may not participate in the evaluation of proposals to a call to which he/she has himself/herself submitted a proposal.

A **disqualifying conflict of interest** exists if an independent expert:

- Was involved in the preparation of the proposal
- Stands to benefit directly should the proposal be accepted or rejected
- Has a close family relationship with any person representing an *applicant legal entity* in the proposal
- Has close family ties or personal relationship with the applicant scientist/s of the proposal
- Has a significant collaborative, conflicting or ongoing mentor / mentee relationship with the applicant scientist/s of the proposal
- Is a director, trustee or partner of an *applicant legal entity* of the proposal
- Is employed, or was employed within the previous three years, by the *applicant legal entity* of the proposal<sup>6</sup>
- Is in any other situation that would compromise his or her ability to evaluate the proposal impartially

---

<sup>6</sup> When an expert is working in a different department/laboratory/institute to the one where the work is to be carried out, and where the constituent bodies operate with a high degree of autonomy, the ERCEA may exceptionally allow the expert to participate in the evaluation, if duly justified by the limited size of the pool of qualified experts.



A **potential conflict of interest** may exist, even in cases not covered by the clear disqualifying conflicts indicated above, if an independent expert:

- Is already involved in a contract or research collaboration with an *applicant legal entity*, or had been so in the previous three years
- Is in any other situation that could cast doubt on his or her ability to evaluate the proposal impartially, or that could reasonably appear to do so in the eyes of an external third party.



## REVIEWER REPORT FORM

## Renewal of Canada Research Chair

Chairholder	
University: 	File # : 232764
Name of Chairholder: 	Reviewer : 3

### Instructions to Reviewers - Confidentiality, Use and Disclosure of Information

The documentation given to you by the Canada Research Chairs Secretariat contains personal and confidential information. To prevent unauthorized access, it must be stored and handled in a secure manner at all times. When you no longer require the material, please destroy it in a secure manner (e.g., by deleting electronic files, shredding or burning paper or returning it to the Chairs Secretariat).

Material entrusted to you must be used only for the purposes of review and assessment, and may not be used for other purposes. Applications and reviews must be treated as strictly confidential and must not be discussed or disclosed to anyone without prior approval from the Secretariat. You must not contact the Chairholder's institution or the Chairholder for more information about the proposal. If you need any additional information, please contact the Chairs Secretariat.

#### IMPORTANT NOTICE

To safeguard your anonymity, please ensure that you **do not identify yourself** through your comments or indicate your name within the text of your review. Once the peer review of the nomination is complete, the text of your appraisal will be sent to the institution and the nominee exactly as submitted by you (i.e. without any changes or edits).

### Conflict of Interest

Reviewers are in a conflict of interest if they:

- are affiliated with the nominating institution (including hospitals and research institutes);
- have a personal relationship with the nominee (includes close friend, relative, former PhD or postdoctoral supervisor, mentor, a student previously under the nominee's supervision);
- have collaborated (i.e. have published, have been a co-researcher) with the nominee in the last five years;
- are involved in the proposed program of research;
- are in a position to gain or lose financially/materially from the outcome of the nomination.

If you are uncertain as to whether a conflict of interest exists, you must contact the Chairs Secretariat.

### Reviewer's Declaration

I have read Instructions to Reviewer - Confidentiality, Use and Disclosure of Information and agree to comply with its terms.

I confirm that, I do not have a conflict of interest with the Chairholder, within the terms and rules of the Canada Research Chairs Program described above.

Name (please print) : Cedomir Petrovic

Signature: Cedomir Petrovic

Affiliation: Johns Hopkins University Brookhaven National Laboratory

Date: January 10th 2019



**World Scientific Publishing Co.**

27 Warren Street, Ste. 401-402 Hackensack, NJ 07601 USA  
Tel: +1 (201) 487 9655 x 302 Fax: +1 (201) 487 9656 email: [cdavis@wspc.com](mailto:cdavis@wspc.com)

## **R e f e r e e   R e p o r t**

**Title of Manuscript:**



**Author(s)/Editors:**



**Series:**



Name of referee: Cedomir Petrovic, PhD

Position held: Principal Investigator  
Center for Emergent Superconductivity  
Condensed Matter Physics & Materials Science Department  
Brookhaven National Laboratory

Address: Brookhaven National Laboratory  
Bldg. 510B  
Upton, NY 11973-5000

E-mail: [petrovic@bnl.gov](mailto:petrovic@bnl.gov)

**Subject:** ESF\_Invitation to review an application\_ [REDACTED]  
**From:** Camelia Steinmetz <CSTEINMETZ@esf.org>  
**Date:** 1/23/2019, 9:36 AM  
**To:** "petrovic@bnl.gov" <petrovic@bnl.gov>

Dear Dr Petrovic,

The European Science Foundation – Science connect ([www.esf.org](http://www.esf.org)) has been missioned to implement the independent external evaluation process of applications received within the frame of the **Call for research professors at [REDACTED] University**. Every two years [REDACTED] University announces 6 vacancies for research professors.

The selection of the candidates is a two-step process. First, a preselection is carried out by the Research Council of [REDACTED] university to bring down the number of candidates to 15. In the second step, these 15 candidates are invited to provide a research plan and present it to the Research Council. In advance of the interviews, all 15 applications and research plans are assessed by three independent evaluators. The ESF identifies and appoints these experts (without any input or interference from the University of [REDACTED]). Based on the applications, the interviews and the reviewers' assessment reports, the university's Research Council will make a final selection of 6 candidates and appoint them as research professors.

With reference to your expertise, we have identified you as a potential referee to assess the application below:

**Name of the applicant:** [REDACTED]

**Area of expertise:** advanced materials fabrication, atomic layers

**Short summary of the applicant's proposed research project:** Heterostructures of Atomic Layers for Optoelectronics

[REDACTED]

**Keywords:** *2D materials, heterostructures, CVD, optoelectronic devices, MQW LEDs*

- Full application size: 36 pages including a CV, achievements track record, synopsis of a scientific proposal, motivation of the candidate's application, integration within [REDACTED] University
- Your task: rate 8 criteria, provide an overall comment and questions to the candidates. Minimum of 480 words (60 words/criterion)
- Evaluation deadline: **22<sup>nd</sup> February 2019** - However, if the date is an issue, please let me know as soon as possible by sending a message to [csteinmetz@esf.org](mailto:csteinmetz@esf.org)
- Compensation: honorarium of 150 € per completed, appropriately substantiated review
- In case of conflict of interest: please inform me as soon as possible.

We would be grateful if you could let me know within the next two days, whether you agree, or not, to act as a referee in the above regard. Should you reply positively, you will receive the application, guidelines and assessment form to be completed and sent back to me as a Word document.

We earnestly hope that your interest and availability will allow you to take part and look forward to your reply. Should you have any questions or queries about the process, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,



Camelia STEINMETZ

**Camelia Steinmetz**

Administrator

European Science Foundation  
1, quai Lezay-Marnésia- BP 90015  
67080 Strasbourg cedex – France  
Phone: +33 (0)3 88 76 71 17  
Email: [csteinmetz@esf.org](mailto:csteinmetz@esf.org)

Visit our new website [www.esf.org](http://www.esf.org)



**Subject:** Evaluation request for [REDACTED]  
**From:** Nir Shaviv <nir.shaviv@mail.huji.ac.il>  
**Date:** 2/14/2019, 5:06 PM  
**To:** "Petrovic, Cedimir" <petrovic@bnl.gov>

Dear Prof. Petrovic,

Attached please find an evaluation request for [REDACTED] who we are considering for a tenure track position at the Racah Institute of Physics, at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Please let us know whether you can complete an evaluation within 3 weeks. I hope you will find the time to help us, it will be highly appreciated.

Many thanks,  
-- Nir



**Prof. Nir Shaviv |**  
Chairman

Racah Institute of Physics

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem  
T +972.54.4738555 | W +972.2.6585807 | F +972.5611519  
[Email nir.shaviv@mail.huji.ac.il](mailto:nir.shaviv@mail.huji.ac.il)  
| Skype nirshaviv

---

— Attachments: —

Review_Request_for_[REDACTED]_from_Petrovic.pdf	204 KB
CV-plus-ResearchStatement.pdf	589 KB