MEMO TO: NSERC APPLICANT

You will find enclosed a Message to Applicant prepared by the Evaluation Group (EG) that reviewed your Discovery Grant application. This message represents the consensus opinion of the evaluation group.

You will also find enclosed copies of the external referee reports received regarding your application. You should note that:

- Referee reports are only one of a number of factors taken into consideration by the EG. External referees review applications in isolation, and not in the context of a severe competition for limited funds. The opinions expressed therein are those of the referees – they do not necessarily reflect the views of the EG.

- Some referees do not respond in time for their reports to be used by the evaluation group. In such cases, a note to this effect will appear on the report. Although late reports were not used, they are enclosed for your information as they may contain useful advice.

- The names of the referees and any reference to a third party have been removed from the reports in accordance with the federal Privacy Act.

If the referee reports were not prepared in the official language of your choice (for correspondence), NSERC would be pleased to translate them on request.

You may consult the instructions given to the external referees which can be found on the NSERC website at http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/OnlineServices-ServicesEnLigne/instructions/140/e.asp?prog=dg.

We hope that you will find this information helpful.

Research Grants Division
March 2013

NOTE AU : CANDIDAT DU CRSNG

Vous trouverez ci-joint un Message au candidat préparé par le groupe d'évaluation (GE) qui a évalué votre demande de subvention à la découverte. Ce message reflète le consensus de l'opinion du groupe d'évaluation.

De plus, vous trouverez ci-joint une copie des rapports d'examineurs de l'extérieur portant sur votre demande. Veuillez noter que :

- ces rapports ne représentent qu'une partie des facteurs dont tient compte le GE dans l'élaboration de ses recommandations. Les examinateurs évaluent les demandes isolément et non dans le contexte d'un concours pour des fonds limités. Il est important de noter que les opinions exprimées dans ces rapports sont celles des examinateurs et ne reflètent pas nécessairement celles du groupe d'évaluation.

- les rapports de certains examinateurs qui ont répondu trop tard n'ont pu être utilisés par le groupe d'évaluation. Lorsque tel est le cas, le rapport porte une note à cet effet. Néanmoins, nous vous faisons aussi parvenir ces rapports, car ils peuvent contenir des conseils utiles.

- le nom des examinateurs de même que toute référence à une tierce personne ont été enlevés conformément à la Loi fédérale sur la protection des renseignements personnels.

Si les rapports d'examineurs de l'extérieur ont été préparés dans la langue autre que celle de votre choix (pour la correspondance), le CRSNG se fera un plaisir de vous les traduire sur demande.

Vous pouvez consulter les instructions qui sont données aux examinateurs de l'extérieur et qui se trouvent dans le site web du CRSNG (http://www.nserc-crsng.gc.ca/OnlineServices-ServicesEnLigne/instructions/140/f.asp?prog=dg).

Nous espérons que ces renseignements sauront vous être utiles.

La Division des subventions de recherche
Mars 2013
MESSAGE TO APPLICANT

This message represents the consensus opinion of the Evaluation Group that reviewed your application.

Applicant's Name, Appl. ID, Institution / Nom de famille, numéro de la demande, établissement du candidat
Bar-Natan, Dror D, 262178-2013, Toronto

Type of Grant / Genre de subvention
Discovery Grants Program - Individual Programme de subventions à la découverte - individuelles

Evaluation Group / Groupe d'évaluation
Mathematics and Statistics Mathématiques et statistique

Application Title / Titre de la demande
Knot Theory, Algebra, and Higher Algebra

The Evaluation Group rated your application as follows:

Excellence of the Researcher(s) / Excellence du ou des chercheurs : Strong

Merit of the Proposal / Mérite de la proposition : Outstanding

Training of Highly Qualified Personnel / Formation de personnel hautement qualifié : Outstanding

Cost of Research / Coût de la recherche : Normal
Additional Comments / Commentaires additionnels:

In the 2013 competition, the Mathematics and Statistics Evaluation Group evaluated a total of 288 Discovery Grants applications. NSERC Discovery Grants applications are assessed by Evaluation Group members according to peer review guidelines of the NSERC’s Peer Review Manual. A copy of the NSERC's Peer Review Manual can be found on NSERC Website.

In some aspects, the applicant might find that external referee reports appear to be inconsistent with the comments and/or recommendations made by the Evaluation Group. To understand this, one must take into account the fact that external referees read a maximum of three (3) NSERC proposals in a given year; most often, they read only one. Consequently, they cannot have the same comparative view as that of Evaluation Group members, who each read and evaluate on average 50 applications.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Phase</th>
<th>Discovery of Funded Experiments are lower than those for the proposed research.</th>
<th>Discovery of Funded Experiments are within the norm for the proposed research.</th>
<th>Discovery of Funded Experiments are higher than those for the proposed research.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**The Discovery of Funded Experiments should be read in conjunction with the Proposal Analysis (PAP) and other relevant documents.**

**Training of PAP:**
- High: The proposals are strong and comprehensive, covering all aspects of the project. The proposals are well-written and clear, with a strong focus on the project's goals and objectives. The proposals are supported by strong evidence and data, and are well-organized and easy to read.
- Normal: The proposals are generally strong, with good coverage of the project's goals and objectives. The proposals are well-written and clear, with a clear focus on the project's goals and objectives. The proposals are supported by good evidence and data, and are well-organized and easy to read.
- Low: The proposals are weak, with limited coverage of the project's goals and objectives. The proposals are poorly written and unclear, with a lack of focus on the project's goals and objectives. The proposals are not well-supported by evidence and data, and are poorly organized and difficult to read.

**Merit of the Proposal:**
- High: The proposals are of exceptional quality, with strong evidence and data supporting the project. The proposals are well-written and clear, with a strong focus on the project's goals and objectives. The proposals are well-organized and easy to read.
- Normal: The proposals are of good quality, with strong evidence and data supporting the project. The proposals are well-written and clear, with a clear focus on the project's goals and objectives. The proposals are well-organized and easy to read.
- Low: The proposals are of poor quality, with limited evidence and data supporting the project. The proposals are poorly written and unclear, with a lack of focus on the project's goals and objectives. The proposals are poorly organized and difficult to read.

**Executive Summary:**
- Exceptional: The executive summary is well-written and clear, with a strong focus on the project's goals and objectives. The executive summary is well-organized and easy to read.
- Strong: The executive summary is strong, with a good focus on the project's goals and objectives. The executive summary is well-organized and easy to read.
- Moderate: The executive summary is moderate, with a fair focus on the project's goals and objectives. The executive summary is well-organized and easy to read.
- Weak: The executive summary is weak, with limited focus on the project's goals and objectives. The executive summary is poorly organized and difficult to read.

**Strong Points:**
- The proposals are well-written and clear, with a strong focus on the project's goals and objectives. The proposals are well-supported by evidence and data, and are well-organized and easy to read.
- The proposals are of exceptional quality, with strong evidence and data supporting the project. The proposals are well-written and clear, with a strong focus on the project's goals and objectives. The proposals are well-organized and easy to read.

**Weak Points:**
- The proposals are weak, with limited coverage of the project's goals and objectives. The proposals are poorly written and unclear, with a lack of focus on the project's goals and objectives. The proposals are poorly organized and difficult to read.
- The proposals are of poor quality, with limited evidence and data supporting the project. The proposals are poorly written and unclear, with a lack of focus on the project's goals and objectives. The proposals are poorly organized and difficult to read.

**Relevance:**
- High: The proposals are strongly relevant to the project's goals and objectives. The proposals are well-supported by evidence and data, and are well-organized and easy to read.
- Normal: The proposals are moderately relevant to the project's goals and objectives. The proposals are well-supported by evidence and data, and are well-organized and easy to read.
- Low: The proposals are weakly relevant to the project's goals and objectives. The proposals are poorly supported by evidence and data, and are poorly organized and difficult to read.

**Impact:**
- Exceptional: The proposals have a strong impact on the project's goals and objectives. The proposals are well-supported by evidence and data, and are well-organized and easy to read.
- Strong: The proposals have a strong impact on the project's goals and objectives. The proposals are well-supported by evidence and data, and are well-organized and easy to read.
- Moderate: The proposals have a moderate impact on the project's goals and objectives. The proposals are well-supported by evidence and data, and are well-organized and easy to read.
- Weak: The proposals have a weak impact on the project's goals and objectives. The proposals are poorly supported by evidence and data, and are poorly organized and difficult to read.

**Commanding Intellectual Capital:**
- Exceptional: The proposals have a strong commanding intellectual capital. The proposals are well-supported by evidence and data, and are well-organized and easy to read.
- Strong: The proposals have a strong commanding intellectual capital. The proposals are well-supported by evidence and data, and are well-organized and easy to read.
- Moderate: The proposals have a moderate commanding intellectual capital. The proposals are well-supported by evidence and data, and are well-organized and easy to read.
- Weak: The proposals have a weak commanding intellectual capital. The proposals are poorly supported by evidence and data, and are poorly organized and difficult to read.

**Discovery of Grants with Indicators:**
- The proposals have a strong discovery of grants with indicators. The proposals are well-supported by evidence and data, and are well-organized and easy to read.
- The proposals have a strong discovery of grants with indicators. The proposals are well-supported by evidence and data, and are well-organized and easy to read.
- The proposals have a moderate discovery of grants with indicators. The proposals are well-supported by evidence and data, and are well-organized and easy to read.
- The proposals have a weak discovery of grants with indicators. The proposals are poorly supported by evidence and data, and are poorly organized and difficult to read.