

BSF GUIDELINES FOR REVIEWERS

Proposals submitted to the BSF are sent for evaluation to reviewers from the U.S., Israel, Europe and other countries. Since peer reviews are critical to the BSF grant review process, we request that your evaluation be detailed and specific. Please provide your comments and ratings in accordance with the instructions below. Also, please indicate if you have a potential conflict of interest, for example a personal relationship, recent/current collaboration or having been the PhD advisor of one of the PIs.

It is BSF policy to make suitably edited copies of reviewers' comments available to the applicants. The identity of reviewers and their overall ratings will be kept strictly confidential and the reviews are edited to remove remarks that identify the reviewer or are personal in nature.

Please also note that the BSF accepts two types of applications, regular and 'start-up'. The latter is a two-year grant program for newly appointed scientists that does not require preliminary results, but is otherwise reviewed in the same fashion and using the same criteria as regular proposals. During panel deliberations that follow the external review process, these 'start-up' applications are given special consideration.

Please use the BSF electronic review system for recording your proposal evaluation and your overall detailed remarks. However, should you experience any difficulty with the electronic review submission, we will gladly receive your evaluation as an email attachment.

In the space allotted for comments please analyze the proposal with reference to the following points:

- A) **Intellectual Merit:** The scientific and/or technological merit of the research proposal. Please, give special attention to the originality and novelty of the proposed research. Also, make sure to discuss the working hypotheses, the work plan and methodology, including a fallback plan if so required.
- B) **Importance & Broader Impact:** The importance of the proposed study and the impact the research will have on its field if successful. For example: Is the proposed research transformative (it builds on previous research findings but it is not repetitive)? Do you expect secondary outcomes of the research, e.g. it will lead to breakthroughs in medicine or will have societal benefits?
- C) **Cooperation:** Please consider the following points in your remarks:
 - a. Does the proposed research in the different laboratories consist of interdependent, complimentary parts of a single program? Will the outcomes of the collaboration be more than the sum of the individual efforts?
 - b. Does one of the PIs provide essential research facilities, field materials or advanced equipment to the collaborating PI?
- D) **PI Suitability** and scientific environments: Please discuss the qualifications of the investigators and the facilities available for performing the research.
- E) **Time Schedule:** Discuss the timeline proposed to complete the suggested research. Is it realistic or is it too ambitious?

- F) **Strengths and Weaknesses:** Give a short description of the strengths and weaknesses of the application.
- G) **Overall Recommendations:** Indicate your overall impression of the expected cooperation and assign the proposal a final grade as described below (typically, only applications that score high on the cooperation and receive ‘Excellent’ merit scores by a majority of the reviewers are recommended for funding):

E (Excellent). “Excellent” grades should not be given lightly and should be reserved for near-perfect proposals where there are few or no critical remarks. It is essential that you express your enthusiasm by providing strong arguments that highlight the proposal’s strengths and its eligibility for funding.

VG (Very Good). “Very Good” proposals score high on intellectual merit, work plan, PI strength etc. but reviewers do have some remarks that require consideration by the PIs. Although these proposals will likely not be elected for funding, the proposed research is considered of high caliber. It is assumed that PIs will benefit from reviewer input when they consider resubmission in a subsequent funding cycle.

G (Good). “Good” grades are given to proposals that present an interesting research question but reviewers express concerns about hypotheses, work plan, methodology and/or other aspects of the proposal. Typically, proposals in this category have additional challenges with respect to organization and presentation, often also with use of the English language. PIs may consider resubmission of such proposals provided they address reviewers’ concerns effectively and extensively.

F (Fair). Proposals that receive “F” grade typically lack a clear research question and hypotheses. Scientific background, formulation of research plan and other aspects of the proposals all exhibit serious flaws. Proposals in this category have clear weaknesses with respect to organization and presentation, and are poorly prepared. The shortcomings of these proposals are such that they should not be considered for resubmission.

P (Poor). “Poor” proposals lack in intellectual merit and meaningful collaboration. They exhibit all hallmarks of “Fair” proposals but they typically have additional problems.

If you wish to find out more about the BSF, please visit our website at: <http://www.bsf.org.il>

[A] Merit : The scientific and/or technological merit of the research proposal. Please refer also to the innovative aspects and to the working hypothesis and methodology, including the discussion of a fallback plan if required.
[B] Importance : Is the topic significant, if successful, what the possible impact it may have on the scientific field, improvement of human health, or on society in general.
[C] Cooperation: Please refer to the following points:

- Does the research in the different laboratories consist of interdependent parts of a single program?
- Does one of the PIs provide research facilities, materials or equipment to the other PI?

[D] PI Suitability and scientific environments: Please discuss the qualifications of the investigators and the facilities available for performing the research.
[E] Time schedule: The time required to complete the suggested research. Is it too much? Too little?
[F] Strengths and weaknesses: Give a short description of the strengths and weaknesses of the application.

<p>Enter your evaluation: Please relate to points as mentioned above. Comprehensive critique is requested and appreciated.</p> <p>For more information read the Guidelines for reviewing.</p>	<p>[a] Scientific and technological merit (including innovation and methodology): [b] Significance and impact on the field: [c] Expected cooperation: [d] Qualifications of the applicants and available means: [e] Time schedule: [f] Strengths and weaknesses:</p>
Cooperation:	Choose: <input type="text"/>
Final Merit:	Choose: <input type="text"/>
Please suggest additional reviewers: Name, affiliation (email if available)	Choose: Excellent Very Good Good Fair Poor
Save the information:	<input type="button" value="(For continuing at a later time)"/>

[A] Merit : The scientific and/or technological merit of the research proposal. Please refer also to the innovative aspects and to the working hypothesis and methodology, including the discussion of a fallback plan if required.
[B] Importance : Is the topic significant, if successful, what the possible impact it may have on the scientific field, improvement of human health, or on society in general.
[C] Cooperation: Please refer to the following points:

- Does the research in the different laboratories consist of interdependent parts of a single program?
- Does one of the PIs provide research facilities, materials or equipment to the other PI?

[D] PI Suitability and scientific environments: Please discuss the qualifications of the investigators and the facilities available for performing the research.
[E] Time schedule: The time required to complete the suggested research. Is it too much? Too little?
[F] Strengths and weaknesses: Give a short description of the strengths and weaknesses of the application.

<p>Enter your evaluation: Please relate to points as mentioned above. Comprehensive critique is requested and appreciated.</p> <p>For more information read the Guidelines for reviewing.</p>	<p>[a] Scientific and technological merit (including innovation and methodology): [b] Significance and impact on the field: [c] Expected cooperation: [d] Qualifications of the applicants and available means: [e] Time schedule: [f] Strengths and weaknesses:</p>
Cooperation:	Choose: <input type="text"/>
Final Merit:	Choose: High Medium Low
Please suggest additional reviewers: Name, affiliation (email if available)	Can Not Evaluate