

## Definition of NRF Rating Categories

It must be borne in mind that the peer evaluation process is intricate and not mechanistic. Ultimately the judgement of the members of the Assessment Committees and their wisdom which has some intangible components must be relied upon. Hence interpretation of words such as 'broad field', 'narrow area', 'considerable', etc. form an important part of the Assessment Committees' task in their role of assessment of reviewers' reports.

Cat	Definition	Sub-category	Description
A	Researchers who are unequivocally recognised by their peers as leading international scholars in their field for the high quality and impact of their recent research outputs.	A1	A researcher in this group is recognised by all reviewers as a leading scholar in his/her field internationally for the high quality and wide impact (i.e. beyond a narrow field of specialisation) of his/her recent research outputs.
		A2	A researcher in this group is recognised by the overwhelming majority of reviewers as a leading scholar in his/her field internationally for the high quality and impact (either wide or confined) of his/her recent research outputs.
B	Researchers who enjoy considerable international recognition by their peers for the high quality and impact of their recent research outputs.	B1	All reviewers are firmly convinced that the applicant enjoys considerable international recognition for the high quality and impact of his/her recent research outputs, with some of them indicating that he/she is a leading international scholar in the field.
		B2	All or the overwhelming majority of reviewers are firmly convinced that the applicant enjoys considerable international recognition for the high quality and impact of his/her recent research outputs.
		B3	Most of the reviewers are convinced that the applicant enjoys considerable international recognition for the high quality and impact of his/her recent research outputs.
C	Established researchers with a sustained recent record of productivity in the field who are recognised by their peers as having: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>produced a body of quality work, the core of which has coherence and attests to ongoing engagement with the field</li> <li>demonstrated the ability to conceptualise problems and apply research methods to investigating them.</li> </ul>	C1	All of the reviewers are firmly convinced that the applicant is an established researcher as described and who, on the basis of the high quality and impact of his/her recent research is regarded by: <p>Some reviewers as already enjoying considerable international recognition;</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The overriding majority of reviewers as being a scholar who has attained a sound/solid international standing in their field, but not yet considerable international recognition;</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The overriding majority of reviewers as being a scholar whose work focuses mainly on local and/or regional issues and who as a scholar at a nationally leading level has substantially advanced knowledge and understanding in the field by contributing to new thinking, a new direction and/or a new paradigm.*</p>
		C2	All of the reviewers are firmly convinced that the applicant is an established researcher as described. The applicant may, but need not, enjoy some international recognition for the quality and impact of his/her recent research outputs.
		C3	Most of the reviewers concur that the applicant is an established researcher (as described).

\*This definition is restricted to those researchers whose area of research prevents (or precludes) them from meeting the requirements of either definition 1 or definition 2.

