

European Peer Review Guide Integrating Policies and Practices into Coherent Procedures

ERRATA

30 October 2011

The following five corrections must be made to the content of the European Peer Review Guide:

1- Page 53, under *Right to Reply*, Second paragraph:

The Paragraph reads:

- **Right to Reply:**

“....

For calls that are continuously open or have fixed collection dates during the year, instead of a right to reply, the applicant can submit the proposal again, taking the individual/remote reviewers' and panel reports into consideration. “

The Paragraph should be changed to:

- **Right to Reply:**

“....

For the responsive-mode variations or unsolicited proposals when either the call is always open or opens and closes very regularly and at known fixed intervals in a year, the proposals may be resubmitted taking the individual/remote reviewers' and panel reports into consideration. This can partly serve the function of the right to reply. However, for the solicited-mode or managed-mode variations the possibilities of re-submission are either not available or allowed but in subsequent year and would involve significant efforts. For these situations it is much more necessary to provide the right to reply.“

2- Page 54 second paragraph

The Paragraph now reads:

According to the ESF Survey Analysis Report on Peer Review Practices, 36.8% of the responding organisations do a preliminary selection carried out by the organisation's scientific staff (50%) or by external reviewers based in institutions outside the organisation country (50%). The preliminary selection is based on a preliminary proposal for 85.7% of the respondents, and on a letter of intent for 14.1%. 78.9% proceeds without a preliminary selection; in this latter case the evaluation is based on full proposals for 42.9% of the organisations⁶⁵.

The Paragraph should be changed to:

According to the *ESF Survey Analysis Report on Peer Review Practices*:

- For Individual Research Programmes, 52% (14/27) of the responding organisations indicated preliminary selection as a distinct stage in their peer review process. The majority of these (9/14) conduct their preliminary selection using full proposals. Considering the non-international organisations only, the preliminary selection is carried out by external reviewers working outside the organisation's country (58.3% or 7/12); external reviewers inside the organisation's country (33.3%, 4/12); organisation's own scientific staff (25%, 3/12) and standing committees (25%, 3/12) with two organisations indicating other means also;

- For Career Development Programmes, 44% (11/25) stated that they do a preliminary selection, with the majority (8/11) using full proposals for their preliminary selection. Focusing on the non-international organisations only, the preliminary selection is carried out by external reviewers working outside the organisation's country (60% or 6/10); external reviewers inside the organisation's country (20%, 2/10); organisation's own scientific staff (30%, 3/10); and standing committees (40%, 4/10) with two organisations indicating other means also;

3- Page 55 two Tables on the top of the page:

The caption of the first Table should read:

- “For Individual Research Programmes, the survey's results are the following:”

This Caption of the second Table should read:

- “For Career Development Programmes, and pertinent to the five categories mentioned before, the following specific eligibility criteria may also be considered:”

4- Page 58 - SECTION 6.2.1, 3rd paragraph

The underlined phrase should be inserted in the paragraph as illustrated below:

“*For International Collaborative Research Programmes*, 7/19 (36.8%) of the responding organisations have reported that their peer review process contains a preliminary selection. Preliminary selection based on an outline proposal is indicated by the majority of these respondents at 85.7% (6/7); Considering the non-international organisations only, the preliminary selection is carried out by external reviewers working outside the organisation's country (50% or 2/4), external reviewers inside the organisation's country (1/4); organisation's own scientific staff (2/4); and standing committees (1/4). Three organisations have indicated also other means for pre-selection.”

5- Page 59 – Paragraph on Confidentiality

The underlined phrase should be inserted in the paragraph as illustrated below:

“16 out of 17 respondents in the survey have indicated that the identity of the individual/remote reviewers is kept confidential from the applicants. One organisation has indicated that the applicants themselves suggest the reviewers. All 17 organisations disclose the identity of the applicants to the individual/remote reviewers. 14 organisations do not disclose the identity of their individual/remote reviewers at large (to the scientific communities), two organisations always disclose this information and one does this only on demand⁷⁶.”