Research contribution evaluation
Maxime Pelcat
mpelcat@insa-rennes.fr
v3 13/11/2021

Creative Commons Attribution Share-Alike version 3 license. http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0

Idea: (what do you want to try? Why does it make sense? What previous research inspires the work (cite)? What theory do you use?)

Should be:

Specific (simple, sensible, significant). Measurable (meaningful, motivating). Achievable (agreed, attainable). Relevant (realistic and resourced). Time bound (time limited, timely).

Can include sub-contributions

Hypothesis: (be precise, why do you suppose this will work? What are your assumptions on the system for the idea to work?)

□ Expected qualitative Gain: (Which one?):

Problem: (why is it important? What is the context?)

□ Expected quantitative Gain: (Which one?):

Competitors and differentiation: (why is you proposition new? How does it differentiate from other studies? Cite papers from refs)			
		Expected assets	
		novel	
	nt		
	important	fty	
	rod	crafty	
	Ë.		
		↓	
		demonstrated	
Experimentations (How do you demonstrate that your idea works? How do you show that you go beyond state-of-the-art?			
What is/are your baseline(s)? How do you compare?)			
Limitations: (What limitations do you see in your experimental setup?	Target: (which journal	or conference?)	
What will you, a priori, not be able to demonstrate with it?)			
References			