

EPSRC Reviewer Helptext

Strategic Packages

GEN1	<p>General</p> <p>These notes are intended to provide reviewers with specific guidance for the completion of the reviewer form. They should be read in conjunction with the reviewer protocols. Specific guidance is available for each individual section of the report you are completing. A full justification for your assessment of the proposal should be provided. The prompts are given as a reminder of those issues that are likely to be most significant in determining the overall merit of a proposal. Please provide as full a response as you believe you are qualified to. You should note that your review will be sent back, unattributed, to the investigator, who will then be allowed the opportunity to comment on any factual errors and answer any specific queries you have raised.</p>
GEN2	<p>Assessment methodology</p> <p>You are asked to assess the proposal/report against a number of criteria. These criteria may vary according to the scheme or Programme the proposal has been submitted to. Prompts are provided as a reminder of those issues that are likely to be most significant in determining the overall merit of a proposal. A full justification for your assessment of the proposal should be included in each section: please provide as full a response as you believe you are qualified to.</p> <p>You are asked throughout to assess “the proposal” but please be clear that this means the ideas, concepts and approaches contained therein not the specific form of the document itself. The clarity of presentation may help or hinder your ability to review a proposal, so a comment to this effect would be appropriate, but this should not become in any form a competition in stylish writing. Elegance of presentation is not of itself an assessment criterion for an EPSRC grant!</p> <p>There is no set way for answering questions on the form. However, prioritisation panels generally find reviews most useful where they explicitly identify the main strengths and weaknesses in the proposal, while also giving a clear view on which should be accorded the greater significance and why. It is also a helpful technique to raise issues or concerns with the proposal in the form of explicit questions for the applicants. This makes it easier for the panel to assess how complete and convincing the applicants responses are.</p>
GEN3	<p>Ethics</p> <p>It is important that EPSRC funds are used ethically and responsibly but this is mainly assured by requiring that universities have in place and operate appropriate ethical approval processes. Ethical considerations should not therefore normally be an assessment criterion and you should not take these into account when making your assessment.</p> <p>If the proposal is in a subject or area that causes you serious personal concern, to the extent that you feel you cannot provide an objective review, then you should decline to review the proposal giving the reason as other, and stating “ethical issues” in the comment box. If you have a concern that the proposal raises ethical issues that have not been clearly identified or addressed, then you should raise this directly with EPSRC who will need to make a policy decision on how the proposal should be treated.</p>
GEN5	<p>Web links in the proposal</p> <p>The proposal you are asked to review includes a case for support. In some instances, the case for support may include a link to a web site containing information on the research proposed. Reviewers are not required to consider this additional information when</p>

	providing comments on a proposal. If you do choose to look at this information, it is possible that your anonymity to the applicant will be compromised
GEN6	<p>Call for Proposals</p> <p>This proposal has been submitted in response to an open call against the Strategic Packages funding Scheme. You are asked to read that scheme and to make your assessment of the proposal within the context of the aims, objectives and specific assessment criteria for it. The call document can be found on the EPSRC web page at http://www.epsrc.ac.uk/funding/routes/capacity/Pages/strategicpackages.aspx</p>
EXC1	<p>Excellence</p> <p>No detailed programme of work is required in making the case for a strategic package so the main quality assessment will be based on the calibre of the proposed candidate which you should comment on under the Applicant section of the form. Please therefore only use this section to comment on other quality aspects related to this proposal where relevant. Where no other such comment is needed simply indicate this on the form.</p>
IMP1	<p>Importance</p> <p>Drawing upon what the applicant has said, reviewers should comment on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The UK need in this area in the context of the status of the research field in the UK and internationally; • The difference this appointment would deliver to the benefit of the UK. <p>In assessing this aspect of the proposal you should comment explicitly on how this appointment could be expected to help establish or maintain a world leading research capability. In addition, where appropriate, you should also indicate if this appointment would contribute to, or help maintain the health of other research disciplines, contribute to addressing key UK societal challenges, or contribute to current or future UK economic success and/or enables future development of key emerging industry(s).</p>
PAT1	<p>Pathways to Impact</p> <p>No Pathways to Impact statement is required for this proposal, as there is no specific detailed research programme to link one to. You should therefore not comment under this section.</p>
MAN1	<p>Management and Planning</p> <p>As there is no specific detailed project or associated project plan there is no requirement to comment under this heading.</p>
RES1	<p>Resources</p> <p>Please comment on the extent to which the proposal justifies the resource requested from EPSRC. You should draw attention to anything in your view that has been requested but not justified or conversely needed but not identified. You should also comment on the suitability of arrangements for accessing resources other than through the grant, such as by collaboration with external groups.</p>
CALL1	<p>Specific Call Criterion – University Track Record and Ability</p> <p>This proposal has been submitted against a call, which has a specific additional assessment requirement. Please comment on the extent to which the university submitting the proposal is best placed in the UK to host the appointment in this research area, making reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The research environment at the university, the benefits to the UK of locating the appointment at this institution; • Plans for developing the research area, the broader subject/discipline and forging new links; • The plans for supporting the appointment both through the strategic alignment of financial resources and through activities to engage them with the UK research and funding environment.

ASS1	<p>Overall Assessment</p> <p>You should provide your overall assessment of the proposal. Think of this as your report to the prioritisation panel, highlighting the strengths and weaknesses you identified in the individual questions and then making a clear and explicit recommendation about whether or not you believe the proposal warrants funding. Please indicate the relative weighting you have given to each aspect in reaching your overall conclusion.</p>
ASS3	<p>Overall Score</p> <p>You should assign a score using the six point scale provided. This should reflect your overall conclusion, and should be consistent with your comments on the individual sections of your review taking account of all the assessment criteria and the various weightings you applied.</p>
ASS4	<p>Level of confidence</p> <p>To assist the prioritisation panel in reaching their overall conclusion on the proposal, and to help EPSRC in monitoring the effectiveness of its reviewer selection procedures, you are asked to indicate your confidence with regard to this review. This should report your own confidence, or otherwise, in being able to make your assessment, <i>not</i> your confidence in the success of the proposal if it were funded. If, for any reason, you feel that you are not able to assess the proposal, please advise EPSRC accordingly</p>