

Reviewer's Opinion

Public Education Development Research Program

Evaluation of the Final Report for the 2021–2025 Application Period

Research Group Name MTA-AVKF Learning Environment Research Group

Research Group Leader Éva Gyarmathy

| Score (publication performance)* | 0

| Opinion (underline as appropriate) | excellent / satisfactory / unsatisfactory |

| Research Group's Own Website | excellent / acceptable / inadequate or unavailable |

1) Scientific Quality of Professional Results

Score (1–5): 3

Justification (500 characters):

The results presented in the report are of considerable professional interest, but their public dissemination (international publications) has not taken place. The planned activities were carried out, but the publication of results has not occurred.

2) Publication Performance and Scientific Impact

Score (1–5): 1

Justification (500 characters):

The project does not meet the minimum publication requirements, so this dimension cannot really be evaluated. Even awarding 1 point is questionable. Only one English-language journal article has been published, which belongs to a Q1 category in a field unrelated to psychology or education (Q2 in another field). All other publications marked as Q1 are still in some stage of the publication process.

3) Quality and Usability of Educational Materials

Score (1–5): 3

Justification (500 characters):

Based on the report, progress has been made over the four years in this area, including measurements and impact assessments. I am compelled to assign a middle score, since progress occurred but the project has not been completed.

4) Dissemination

Score (1–5): 4

Justification (500 characters):

Numerous workshops, conferences, and Hungarian-language materials reached a wide audience through various channels. The reviewer is left with only minor reservations.

5) Contribution to the Development of the Professional-Scientific Community

Score (1–5): 4

Justification (500 characters):

There are defended dissertations, but ironically, the reviewer teaches at the institution where only one of the listed 11 students belongs (BME Computational and Cognitive Neuroscience MSc program). The rest were BME students but not from our Faculty/Department/Program.

6) Overall Evaluation

Score (1–5): 1

Justification (500 characters):

For the reasons outlined above, the failure to meet the minimum criteria means this aspect cannot be properly evaluated. Therefore, I can only recommend the minimum score of 1 point.

Note: *Publication Performance Scoring

- D1 = 100 points
- Q1 = 50 points (1 article published, but not in psychology/education; Q1 in one field, Q2 in another)
- Q2 = 40 points
- Q3 = 20 points
- Q4 = 10 points

This section should include the point value of Scopus-indexed publications published during the four years.

For publications submitted jointly by two research groups, points should be divided 50–50%.