CNCS

National Research Council

uefiscdi

Executive Agency for Higher Education,
Research, Development and Innovation Funding

THE NATIONAL PLAN FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION 2015-2020, PNIII

Subprogramme 1.1 – Human Resources, Postdoctoral Research Projects 2021 Call for proposals

Guidelines for Experts (Evaluators)

Content :

Romanian National Research Council and its executive agency, UEFISCDI, welcome you as a scientific evaluator for the Postdoctoral Research Projects Call 2021 (PD - 2021). This document specifies in detail the evaluation process, its inputs and outputs, and defines the responsibilities of the participants in the process.

1. General Information of the call

The major goal of this call is to support young researchers with PhDs who want to develop a professional career in scientific research activity at research institutions in Romania. The Call is addressed to young researchers from Romania and from abroad, with achievements demonstrated through the quality and the recognition of their obtained scientific results.

- ✓ The maximum funding granted for a project, with a maximum duration of 24 months, is 250.000 lei (about 52 000 EUR).
- ✓ The budget allocated to this call for proposals, for the entire implementation period, is 30.000.000 lei (about 6,25 mil EUR).
- ✓ The estimated funding rate is 36.14%.

The selection of the project proposals for funding is based strictly on their merits, assessed through peer review evaluation performed by experts in the field, with excellence as the sole criterion.

2. Governance of the call

The National Research Council is an advisory body of Ministry of Research, Innovation and Digitization (MCID). The NRC consists of representatives of national RDI system (academia, national research institutes, Romanian Academy), having a scientific profile internationally recognized. The NRC is the scientific coordinator of the call and supervises the activity of UEFISCDI.

The Executive Agency for Higher Education, Research, Development and Innovation Funding, **UEFISCDI,** is a research funding agency. It organizes competitions and subsequently monitors the implementation of research projects accepted for funding. UEFISCDI manages approximately 22% of the public funds allocated to research, development and innovation.

The expert evaluators are internationally recognized independent experts who meet the selection criteria according to the call documents. They are responsible for the scientific evaluation of the submitted proposals according to the evaluation criteria.
The experts perform the work in a personal capacity and must not represent any organization.
During the evaluation process an expert could receive the task of Rapporteur (may act as both evaluator and Rapporteur for a number of allocated projects).

The Scientific Officers (SOs) are representatives of the National Research Council (avoiding potential conflict of interest) whose role is to support and monitor the evaluation process, ensure that all steps and procedures are strictly followed. These SOs also check the quality of the Individual Evaluation Reports (IERs) and Consensus Reports (CRs) and the consistency between comments and scores, at any stage (i.e., both before and after submission). When necessary, they contact the Experts to ask for clarifications, to pinpoint potential conflicting statements or inappropriate/incorrect statements. All such communication will be carried out exclusively in the online evaluation platform. Under no circumstances the scientific officers (SOs) will be involved in the evaluation process, interfere with the experts' assessment of the proposals or influence their decisions.

3. Conflict of Interest

Experts must declare that they can carry out the evaluation of a proposal with total confidentiality, impartiality and competence. They must not find themselves in situations where their impartiality might be questioned, or that could raise suspicion on their recommendations being affected by elements that lie outside the scope of the evaluation.

A disqualifying conflict of interest exists if an expert:
- was involved in the preparation of the project proposal;
- stands to benefit directly should the proposal be accepted;
- has a close family relationship with the applicant;
- works in the same institution as the applicant or was employed by the applicant`s organization within the previous 3 years;
- is involved in a contract or research collaboration with the applicant or had been so in the previous 3 years;
- has co-authored a scientific publication with the applicant in the last 3 years;
- is in any other situation that could cast doubt on his or her ability to evaluate the proposal impartially, or that could reasonably appear to do so in the eyes of an external third party.

Before starting the assessment of proposals allocated to them, the evaluators will need to login at the Submission and Evaluation platform, www.uefiscdi-direct.ro. Upon login, the evaluators get access to the Principal Investigator/Project Leader and Mentor information and the proposal's summary of the respective allocated proposals. This will allow the experts to check their potential conflict of interest and directly announce the UEFISCDI staff if such conflicts are identified. Full access to the proposal is given after the expert has confirmed that there is no conflict of interest.

The expert evaluators must notify UEFISCDI, via email/in writing, at any moment during the evaluation process, if they become aware that either one of these conditions is not satisfied or that they are in conflict of interest. When a potential conflict of interest is reported by an expert or brought to the attention of UEFISCDI by other means, UEFISCDI will analyse the circumstances and decide on a case-by-case basis whether the conflict is real. In the latter case, the expert will be excluded from the evaluation of the respective proposal.

Once you have confirmed that you do not have a conflict of interest, you will be given full access to proposals.

4. Contractual agreement

The relationship between UEFISCDI and the expert evaluators is defined by a contractual agreement written and signed by both parties. By signing this agreement, the expert evaluators accept the conditions regarding the evaluation tasks, the confidentiality, the conflict of interest, and the use of personal data by UEFISCDI, according to the provisions of the Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (GDPR) and to the Law 190/2018 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data. More details are available at: https://uefiscdi.ro/protectia-datelor-cu-caracter-personal. UEFISCDI cannot allocate proposals to an expert who has not been officially appointed (i.e., the expert has signed the contractual agreement and, in doing so, has agreed to the terms laid down in it, including, in particular, confidentiality and conflict of interest aspects).

The evaluators will be remunerated for their activities after the finalization of the evaluation process. The following expenses will be covered by the call:
- 55 € (49 € net amount) evaluation fee per one individual evaluation;

- 55 € (49 € net amount) additional fee per proposal assigned as Rapporteur;

The expert must sign the "Contractual Agreement" with all the appendixes and upload them to the evaluation platform (dedicated section).
Omission to upload the „Contractual Agreement" and its appendixes, in due time, to the dedicated section of the online evaluation platform, will lead to delay of payment for the activity as expert evaluator/Rapporteur!

5. Evaluation process
The evaluation process is described in the Call document, https://uefiscdi.gov.ro/resource-825079-information-package-pd-2021_english-version.pdf.

The eligibility check is made by UEFISCDI staff. If, during or after completion of the evaluation phase, a non-compliance with any of eligibility criteria is found, the project proposal will be declared ineligible and will be excluded from the competition.

5.1. General principles of evaluation (for individual/consensus step)
- ✓ The expert must assess the proposals by themselves – do not delegate this task to anybody else.
- ✓ The expert should evaluate the proposal as it is, not as it could be or as the expert would like it to be, and without giving any recommendations or suggestions.
- ✓ Each criterion/sub criterion must be addressed by a list of Strengths/Weaknesses of minimum 200 and maximum 2000 characters. Comments should be delivered as a bullet point list of strengths (+) and weaknesses (-), listed separately, under the titles "Strengths" and "Weaknesses". General comments or comments that describe parts of the proposal are not acceptable.
- ✓ Each argument should be placed under the specific criterion, with great care of not mixing criteria (e.g., comments about the work plan will not be placed under "State of the art" or comments about the novelty of the project should not be placed under "Quality of the Principal Investigator").
- ✓ All comments should be clear statements, based on facts presented in the proposal and not on opinions of the experts (e.g. comments as "*I think that", "My impression is", "It seems that", "The applicant should", "It may be better"*, etc. must be avoided).
- ✓ All facts that are considered relevant to the current proposal should be considered, regardless of the section of the proposal where these are to be found. E.g., if the proposal describes the work plan in the "*Project Feasibility*" section, it must be carefully assessed.
- ✓ Any comment referring to inexistent or irrelevant criteria for the present competition is considered a procedural mistake which may lead to a successful redress and justify a re-evaluation of the proposal. Never penalize a proposal based on information that the applicant was not expected to provide (e.*g., do not assess the TRL since these are basic research projects, or do not assess socio economic impacts if these are not relevant for the domain/area or are not specifically required; please do not confuse socio economic impact with dissemination*).
- ✓ The comments should assess the quality of the described criterion under evaluation and not summarise it or suggest improvements.

- ✓ A weakness should be addressed only once so that double penalization does not occur. (*E.g., the methodology may be weak, which may reflect in evaluating both criteria 2.2 and 2.3. However, the expert must decide where to address the criticism and penalize the proposal only once*;
- ✓ The IER must be carefully checked for conflicting statements, especially when these may pop up under different criteria. (*E.g., a weakness could be that the proposal has not sufficient novelty (C1) while a strength would be that the proposed methodology is novel (C2); these statements must be harmonized)*; Remember that IERs are sent to the applicants and comments in IERs must be carefully prepared in order to contain clear weaknesses and strengths of the proposal.
- ✓ The expert must treat all proposals equally and evaluate them impartially on their merits. Comments that hint, indicate or refer to names, numbers, gender, institutions, nationality, and age are strictly forbidden.
- ✓ There is no scoring at the individual evaluation stage.
- ✓ Scores are proposed AFTER the Consensus Report is finalized and they must fully reflect the balance between Strengths and Weaknesses (and not vice versa). Scores must reflect the overall assessment of a criterion and the experts must use the full range of scores to appropriately highlight the quality of the proposal (*E.g., it is not correct to have a score of 4.5 for a criterion where only positive comments are listed, without any weaknesses; equally wrong is to find a major weakness, as, e.g.: The methodology does not support the proposed solution and scoring it with 4.0*);
- ✓ The experts should keep in mind that they are evaluating a project proposal and not a research paper. The comments should assess the quality of the described criterion under evaluation and not summarise it or suggest improvements.

A personal touch to the experts: **Please, evaluate the proposal as you would like it to be evaluated if it were yours: be objective, dispassionate, unbiased, fair and polite.**

5.2 Task of expert evaluators
The expert evaluators are required to:
- read the "Call documents" and the "Guide for Experts";
- inform UEFISCDI about a disqualifying or a potential conflict of interest;
- read and objectively evaluate the assigned project proposals;
- meet all deadlines of the evaluation process;
- fill in and submit the evaluation sheet for each assigned project proposal, providing comprehensive comments that evaluate the proposal in a critical way, addressing all the evaluation criteria for each point, avoiding summarizing and advising on improvements, clearly highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal as it was submitted by the applicant and not its potential;
- read the rebuttal (if any);
- actively participating in consensus discussions regarding all assigned project proposals, by using the "forum" type interface available on the online evaluation platform; comments at the consensus stage are compulsory;
- elaborate the consensus report (Rapporteurs only) based on the individual evaluations, the rebuttal (if any) and the discussions with the other evaluators and ultimately agree the scores

for each evaluation criterion that fully reflects the agreed comments in the final evaluation report.
- not disclose the proposals assigned to third parties;
- communicate with the assigned Scientific Officer from the National Research Council and Technical Officer from UEFISCDI for any issue that might appear at any moment during the evaluation process.

5.3 Proposal evaluation stages

According to the Document Call, the Funding Application uses Times New Roman font type, 12 font size, 1.5 line spacing and 2 cm margins. Any modification to these parameters (excepting the tables, figures or their captions) is forbidden. **The pages exceeding the established limits will not be taken into consideration in the evaluation process.** The imposed number of pages (Section C – Funding application) does not contain the bibliographic reference; these will be written on additional pages. For each section, the text marking the information and the mandatory sections of the application will be maintained.

Observation: Unfortunately, the large numbers of proposals not respecting the template (more than 50%), imposed us to accept all these proposals as eligible. However, the experts will be specifically informed about the project proposals which are not complying with the template of the funding application, and they will need to pay special attention to these projects.

5.3.1. Individual Evaluation. Each eligible proposal is evaluated independently, online, by at least 3 experts, using the platform www.uefiscdi-direct.ro. The Individual Evaluation Report **(IER)** provides a list of strengths (grouped under "Strengths") and weaknesses ("Weaknesses") for each evaluation (sub) criterion, according to the evaluation sheet (*shown in section 5.3.6 of this Guide).*
- ✓ **No scores are awarded in the Individual Evaluation Report!**
- ✓ **Information found in pages that exceed the maximum limit for each section will be disregarded!**

To ensure a fair and homogeneous evaluation across a specific domain, the expert will have access to the statistical chart of all competing Principal Investigators/Project Leaders and Mentors and as well as to the B1.2 (*Visibility and impact of the scientific contribution of the project leader)* and B2 section (*Visibility and impact of the scientific contribution of the mentor*).

When all IERs have been submitted, the experts will have access to each other's comments and may adjust their own remarks during this phase. This is required especially when there are conflicting statements, which should be solved before the rebuttal.

5.3.2. Rebuttal. The IERs are sent to the applicants, with the invitation to submit a rebuttal on the comments expressed by the experts within five working days. The rebuttal is limited to 6.000 characters (including spaces) and consists in counterarguments strictly regarding the criticism formulated by evaluators. The applicant should not include in the rebuttal any supplementary information. *New facts or information that appear in the rebuttal but have not been described in the proposal shall be disregarded*. The experts should carefully read the responses of the applicant and assess whether, after checking with the proposal, they maintain their opinion. The answer of the applicant is not compulsory, and its absence will not affect the next stage of the evaluation process.

5.3.3. The Consensus Report (CR). After rebuttals are received from the applicants, the evaluation process enters the consensus phase, under the coordination of a Rapporteur, selected among the

three initial experts. The task of the Rapporteur is to coordinate the consensus discussions through a "forum" type interface available on the online evaluation platform, taking into consideration the applicant's rebuttal (if any). The Rapporteur will identify agreements as well as divergences in the IERs, will exchange views with the other experts and will propose comments acceptable to all the experts involved. Where the views are very different, the Rapporteur will engage the other two experts in a focused discussion on the major disagreements and will seek to clarify any difference of opinion and contradictions. All experts have to actively participate in the discussion and clearly express their opinion in a reasonable time (5 working days after the discussion started). Please **note** that the CR is NOT a collection of all statements from each IER, but comments that reflect the opinions of all experts regarding the evaluated criteria.

a) *Once the consensus is reached*, the Rapporteur will write the CR in the form of a bulleted list of Strengths and Weaknesses for each criterion. The comments in the final CR must be clearly formulated, reflecting opinions of all experts. In brief, the CR MUST NOT contain: i) any reference to the applicant's name, gender, age, institutional affiliation or the other experts involved and their IERs; ii) copy-pasted parts of the proposal. Comments MUST be comprehensive, clear, refer to all sub criteria and not limited to one short sentence, explain weaknesses. Comments MUST NOT make suggestions for improvements.

The Rapporteur will propose scores for each criterion, AFTER reaching consensus on the comments and strictly in agreement with the balance between the final comments listed as Strengths and Weaknesses. Keep in mind that the CR gives the final agreed view of the proposal. Everyone's voice must be heard and all must agree to the final scores and comments. **Both high and low scores must be supported by appropriate comments. Ensuring consistency between comments and scores is of paramount importance to guarantee a good quality CR**. The other two experts will then express their opinion on the CR and scores by voting "agree" or "disagree" on the same platform.

If all experts agree on the CR, the consensus is reached.

b) *If the consensus is not reached*, the three experts will be asked to score for each evaluation criterion, in accordance with the agreed comments (strengths and weaknesses they have identified). A fourth expert evaluator will be invited to the evaluation committee, who will elaborate the evaluation sheet and will award her/his scores for each criterion. The four scores for each criterion will then be averaged, and the farthest score from the average will be eliminated. The remaining three scores will then be averaged for each criterion, and the fourth expert will be invited to write the final report, selecting from the strengths and weaknesses identified by all experts those comments that met the consensus, so that all strengths and weaknesses for each criterion are in line with the score awarded.

5.3.5. Quality check of the reports (IER /CR)

The evaluation process will be monitored during both individual and consensus steps by the **Scientific Officers.** They will assist the funding agency, UEFISCDI, with evaluation management and monitoring. The Scientific Officers will not read the proposals and will not assess the scientific content of the IERs or CRs. They will merely point out issues that decrease the quality of the IER or CR (see above), such as:
   - putative conflicts between perceived strengths and weaknesses (e.g., the same aspect of the

proposal is identified both as a strength and as a weakness);
- inadequate comments as, e.g., comments placed under the wrong criterion or comments about irrelevant issues which are not required by the call;
- mismatches between comments and scores in the CR (e.g., a score of 4.5 in the absence of any identified weakness);
- names, age, gender, numbers etc. (see above);
- other issues that may decrease the quality of the report.

5.3.6 Evaluation Sheet

Make your judgment against the official evaluation criteria, as stated in the Evaluation Sheet, and nothing else. Please deliver your comments as a clear bullet point list of comments listed as Strengths (+) and Weaknesses (-). When no weakness is identified, the Report should state: "*Weaknesses. No major weakness identified.*"

  1. Principal Investigator and Mentor (40% of the total score)

The expert should assess to what extent the past achievements of the Principal Investigator/Project Leader and the Mentor (enumerated in sections B1.1, B1.2, B2, B3, B4.1, B4.2) guarantee and/or contribute to the success of the current proposal.

Principal Investigator

Criterion 1.1 Quality of the PI's research output - 60% of the total score of Criterion 1

(See sections B1.1, B1.2 and B4.1 of the Funding Application)

Evaluate to what extend the PI's research has led to progress in their field of expertise. Comment on the importance of the PI's scientific discoveries, as reflected in their track record (focus on the PI's papers as a main author). Citations may be considered only as strengths. Please take into account that this is only a postdoctoral grant and thus the PI's citation number and H-index are not relevant.

Mentor

Criterion 1.2 Impact of the Mentor's research output and leadership - 20% of the total score of Criterion 1

(See sections B2 and B4.2 of the Funding Application)

Evaluate to what extent the Mentor's scientific output is internationally recognized. Comment on the international visibility of the Mentor's scientific output as reflected, for example, in the citation number, H-index and/or ranking (Q1-Q4) of their published work. Evaluate to what extent the Mentor's capacity to autonomously manage scientific activities as a researcher and/or research group leader is demonstrated (as indicated by their track record as corresponding author and their ability to attract research funding).

(in the case of the Humanities, please take into account the relevance and impact of the journals and publishers for the professional sub-field of the Mentor, as well as the presence of specific publications in the online catalogues of major international libraries).

(in the field of Mathematics, while the use of numerical indicators in evaluating the Mentor is permitted, it is not particularly encouraged. The evaluation of this criterion should not be based exclusively on such indicators, and should vastly include the evaluator's objective assessment of the intrinsic value of the Mentor's scientific contributions and its actual impact on advancing the state-of-the-art in the specific mathematical field).

(for 1.2. please see statistical charts of H-index, citations and Q1/Q2 articles of all competing Mentors, for use if relevant)

Criterion 1.3 Match between the Mentor's previous research output and proposed topic - 20% of the total score of Criterion 1

(See section B3 of the Funding Application)

Evaluate to what extend the Mentor's research output is relevant for the present project. Comment on how the previously published work of the Mentor relates to the proposed research.

Specific guidance for Criterion 1*:* The comments in this section must reflect the overall excellence of the PI and Mentor, taking into account each sub-criterion (1.1, 1.2, 1.3). While bibliometric measures of the excellence (e.g., the Hirsch index, number of papers or citations) are important for the Mentor, these should be used in a judicious manner. These should not be the main and only reason for penalizing the proposal. E.g., simply stating that "the Mentor (or, even worse, the PI) has an H-index = x" without any other explanation should be considered sufficient for a low score. Experts should evaluate the qualities of PI and Mentor against all achievements described in the proposal. In assessing the publication/patent record of an applicant or Mentor (criterion 1.1 and 1.2), experts are advised to pay a special attention to the quality of PI's and Mentor's publications as a main author. In sections B1.2 and B2 of the application form the requirement is to list the most significant scientific contributions (articles or books) **maximum of 10 items in total**.

The CV of the Mentor in section B4.2 should be evaluated in relation to each of both associated criteria (1.2 and 1.3). The achievements and overall excellence should be assessed in relation to the proposed research. Numbers, in general, are important, however **these are not the only or best indicator of the researcher's excellence**. E.g., patents or other achievements should also be considered. In addition, more emphasis should be placed on the quality of the publications, as opposed to their quantity. A small number of high-impact publications may be of higher value, compared to a large number of papers in low impact journals.

2. Research Project (60% of the total score)

The expert should assess to what extent the goals, proposed solution, motivation, novelty, methodology, implementation, described in sections C1 – C5, guarantee and/or contribute to the success of the current proposal.

Criterion 2.1 State-of-the-art and originality/innovation - 30% of the total score of Criterion 2

(See section C1 of the Funding Application)

Evaluate whether the problem addressed by the project is clearly identified in relation to the state-of-the-art in the field. Comment on the originality and novelty of the proposed solution.

Criterion 2.2 Research objectives, methodology and work plan - 30% of the total score of Criterion 2

(See section C2 of the Funding Application)

Evaluate the clarity and coherence of the scientific objectives. To what extent is the proposed methodological approach suitable for reaching these objectives? How effective is the work plan in terms of achieving the proposed objectives? Comment on the coherence of the approach in terms of tasks, activities and time scales.

Criterion 2.3 Feasibility resources - 20% of the total score of Criterion 2

(See section C3 of the Funding Application)

To what extent the available infrastructural support will ensure successful implementation of the project? Why is the host institution relevant for the proposed project?

Criterion 2.4 Risks and contingency plans - 10% of the total score of Criterion 2

(See section C4 of the Funding Application)

To what extent the risk analysis correctly identifies potential pitfalls? Also comment on the effectiveness of the alternative solutions proposed.

Criterion 2.5 Expected impact and dissemination plan - 10% of the total score of Criterion 2

(See section C5 of the Funding Application)

To what extent is the expected scientific output of the proposed work realistically described and how likely is it to lead to significant progress in the field? What is the expected impact of the project on the PI's career development? How will the proposed research impact (the visibility of) the host institution? Also, comment on the quality of the proposed measures to disseminate the scientific output of the proposal. Social, economic, or cultural impact should be considered only if relevant for the proposed research.

Criterion 3 Budget; this section will not be scored

(See section C6 of the Funding Application)

Please provide an overall assessment of the research budget requested and evaluate to what extent it is justified by the proposed research activities. There will be no score associated with this criterion, but the assessment will be useful to the funding agency in negotiating the final financial award.

NOTES:

1. The final score will be automatically calculated as a weighted sum of the scores for each sub criterion multiplied by 20 (final score between 0 and 100), when introduced into the online platform.

Final grade = 20*[(s1.1*60/100 + s1.2*20/100 + s1.3*20/100)*40/100 + (s2.1*30/100 + s2.2*30/100 + s2.3*20/100 + s2.4*10/100 + s2.5*10/100)*60/100], where si.j is the score for criterion i.j.

2. Experts should make sure that their comments on each criterion are:
   - *Concrete* i.e., they are explicitly referring to the information in the proposal
   - *Complete* i.e., they address all the facets specified by the criterion
   - *Consistent* i.e., they match the score, according to the scoring table and are not contradictory
   - *Inoffensive* i.e., they do not contain discriminatory, offensive statements or adjectives
   - *Explanatory* i.e., it is clear what makes a comment a weakness or a strength. Examples of poor comments "*The methodology is described*" (is it enough? insufficient? excellent? new? obsolete?), "*The novelty is not good*" (why? what is missing?), etc.

5.3.7 Assessment against the Evaluation Criteria

The Rapporteurs propose a score **only after** consensus has been reached on the comments; make sure that the comments are **concrete**, **complete** (i.e., address all questions) and **consistent** with the semantics of each score, namely:

0	**ABSENT**	The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to *missing or incomplete information*

1	UNSATISFACTORY	The criterion is addressed in an *inadequate manner*, or there are *serious inherent weaknesses*
2	SATISFACTORY	While the proposal *broadly addresses* the criterion, there are *significant weaknesses*
3	GOOD	The proposal addresses the criterion *well*, although *improvements would be necessary. A number of weaknesses/shortcomings are present.*
4	VERY GOOD	The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although *certain improvements are still possible. A small number of weaknesses/shortcomings are present.*
5	EXCELLENT	The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. *Any shortcomings are minor*

Scores of 0, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, …., 4.0, 4.5, 5.0 (i.e., **half scale**) should be given for each of the eight evaluation criteria.

The scores must reflect the strengths and weaknesses and they must be in line with the comments.

Scores below 5 (i.e., also 4 or 4.5) must fully reflect the identified shortcomings/weaknesses, which should be clearly indicated in the Consensus Report.

6. Transparency

The list of the expert evaluators who participated in the evaluation process will be published on the UEFISCDI's website, after the end of the competition. The list will not identify the expert evaluators assigned for each project proposal.

7. References:

In creating this guide, we adopted several guidelines and principles from the following sources:
1. H2020-MSCA, EJD Manual for experts, 2019
2. ESF - *European Peer Review Guide. Integrating Policies and Practices into Coherent Procedures*, 2011: http://www.esf.org/activities/mo-fora/publications.html
3. ERC - *ERC Grant Schemes Guide for Peer Reviewers*, 2011:
http://erc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/document/file/GuideForERCPeerReviewers_2012%20 20092011.pdf
4. http://ec.europa.eu/research/pdf/workshop_igb/rtd_evaluation_process.pdf

NOTE: Remember that nobody knows everything, and other peoples' point of view is as valid as your own. And there is no shame in learning and changing your mind!