

## UKRI International Development Peer Review College - Reviewer Webinar - 16 May 2018

### Questions and Answers:

<b>Questions and answers in relation to being a Hubs reviewer and a College member:</b>	
Which date will the reviews for the current call be sent out?	We have experienced some technical issues which have resulted in a slight delay. We anticipate that the reviews will be sent out via Je-S in early-mid July.
During an RFP, how many proposals are sent to each reviewer for reviewing?	This will depend on the College member's expertise and the disciplines covered by the proposals received.
Will the names of reviewers be available somewhere on the web?	The names of reviewers will not be made public. There is a list and visualisation of all College members on the UKRI website: <a href="https://www.ukri.org/research/global-challenges-research-fund/ukri-international-development-peer-review-college/">https://www.ukri.org/research/global-challenges-research-fund/ukri-international-development-peer-review-college/</a>
Will we be able to contact anyone if we face problems with Je-S after we receive documents for review?	You can contact the Je-S helpdesk: <a href="mailto:JeSHelp@rcuk.ac.uk">JeSHelp@rcuk.ac.uk</a>
Can you explain more about conflict of interest?	A good question to ask yourself is: Would a neutral observer have confidence in the impartiality of the review? If there is significant doubt, then the relationship should be treated as a conflict. For what constitutes conflicts of interest for Hubs reviewers, please also have a look at: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-kh9exBXgFg">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-kh9exBXgFg</a>
I am part of an inter-disciplinary research hub application being submitted this May. Does that make me ineligible to review any proposals in this round alone or all future rounds?	It makes you ineligible to be a reviewer for the Hubs Call only, not for any future rounds unless you become involved in the submittal of a proposal.
I applied for the call, however, the proposal was not invited for full submission. Do it falls under conflict of interest?	This would not constitute a conflict of interest.

If it happens that a team in your institution submits a proposal you are not involved in, are you excluded from reviewing?	Yes, if you are from the same institution as any of the applicants that would be a conflict of interest. As you would have a conflict of interest, you would not be able to take part in the reviewing for the Hubs. But you would be considered as a reviewer for future calls.
As reviewer, am I allowed to apply for grant or funding as well?	For this specific call we are not intending to invite applicants on Hubs proposals to review other Hubs. Generally, as a reviewer you are not excluded from applying to other calls. Please check individual calls for information about eligibility: <a href="https://www.ukri.org/funding/funding-opportunities/">https://www.ukri.org/funding/funding-opportunities/</a>
Sometimes due to conflict of interest, some applicants may request to exclude certain reviewers (like they do in journals for review of manuscripts).	We would consider such requests on a case-by-case basis.
How many reviewers are assigned to a proposal?	For each Hubs proposal six reviewers are assigned. However, if there are partial reviews this figure will increase.
Does being a previous beneficiary of GCRF funding in running projects disqualify one from being a reviewer?	No, it does not.
How do I respond through the Je-S in case I can only review part of the proposal?	In Je-S, once you have clicked into 'Peer Review', 'Documents', 'Open' (the proposal in question), then in the left-hand column you'll see a section named 'Area of Expertise'. You can add the information here.
How to review the proposal partially as mentioned previously?	In Je-S, once you have clicked into 'Peer Review', 'Documents', 'Open' (the proposal in question), then in the left-hand column you'll see a section named 'Area of Expertise'. You can add the information here and indicate the areas outside your expertise.
If I was to review a proposal partially...how would I give the overall score...would I contribute to the score? How?	You should score the proposal fully within the area / discipline that you are reviewing.
Is there a process to moderate the ranking and the reviewer comments given as the reason for rank? At times the two might not be the true reflective of each other	We are not asking reviewers to rank proposals if they have been asked to review one or more proposals. Each proposal should be assessed on its own merits only. We are asking reviewers to give a final judgment of the proposal by ticking one of the six grades options.
How are different assessments aggregated in order to reach consensus?	It is the job of the panel to weigh up all the reviews and the PI response and to ensure that all proposals are treated fairly and consistently. It is the job of the reviewer to assess a proposal on its own merits.
When a protocol is interdisciplinary and many reviewers do not complete the review, is it not putting the PI at a disadvantage when his/her protocol is reviewed by many people?	We will ensure that we have enough reviews for a proposal. It is the job of the panel to weigh up all reviews and the PI response and to ensure that all proposals are treated fairly and consistently.

Will payments be made to the persons who are selected as experts in the submitted projects?	For College members, the training and information that members receive along with the esteem of being a member of the UKRI College and the insight into what makes a good GCRF proposal will provide College members with valuable information and insight that they can apply to their own academic / research practice. Reviewers are not paid a fee.
Do reviewers get feedback on their reviews, so that they can make improvements?	This is something that we are thinking about at the moment and whether we can do this. We will keep the College informed.
Are we going to have regular Webinars like this one after we start the actual review work or this only for the induction stage?	The Hubs Reviewer webinar was part of the initial training and information for College members. We are currently considering follow-up training but would also like to hear from College members with their ideas for future training: <a href="mailto:InternationalPeerReview@rcuk.ac.uk">InternationalPeerReview@rcuk.ac.uk</a>
Can one spread the word about the funding opportunities within the organization?	Yes, that would be really helpful, so please share GCRF funding opportunities within your organisation. You can find new calls listed on the UKRI webpage: <a href="https://www.ukri.org/funding/funding-opportunities/">https://www.ukri.org/funding/funding-opportunities/</a>
Is it possible to have the UKRI college decentralised inform of centres in selected Universities in developing countries (inform of UKRI centres)?	Please go to this webpage for more information on UKRI International: <a href="https://www.ukri.org/research/international/">https://www.ukri.org/research/international/</a> For more information on the UKRI College members, a membership list and visualisation is available on the College webpage: <a href="https://www.ukri.org/research/global-challenges-research-fund/ukri-international-development-peer-review-college/">https://www.ukri.org/research/global-challenges-research-fund/ukri-international-development-peer-review-college/</a>
<b>Questions and answers in relation to Hubs reviews:</b>	
Can a given institution belong to two or more Interdisciplinary Research Hubs	Yes, an organisation may be involved in as many Hub applications as they wish.
How do you evaluate that a group is at the forefront nationally and internationally?	Information about the track record of the Principal Investigator and all Co-Investigators can be found in their CVs, with additional information potentially included within the Case for Support. These documents should provide information about each individuals skills and experience, funding history and relevant publications which can help you make a judgement as to whether they have the appropriate skills and experience and are the best individuals to deliver the proposed programme. You should also consider whether the proposed techniques/ methodologies are the most up to date. I.e. Are you aware of other groups who are using a more advanced/up-to-date approaches?

Is there any difference for you between interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary approaches?	There are a number of different definitions for multi- inter- and trans-disciplinary. For the purposes of the Hubs call, what we are looking for is for the proposals to demonstrate that they have created partnerships which bring together all of the relevant disciplines required to successfully deliver the proposed work. In addition, the applicants must demonstrate that an integrated approach has been taken, with disciplines working together from the beginning. We are particularly keen to support those proposals which bring together disciplines which do not typically collaborate together.
Do we expect the proposals to have already obtained ethical clearance?	The applicants should demonstrate that they are aware of all of the ethical implications of their proposed work, and the licences required. This includes ethical implications associated with the health and safety of the researchers involved and the environmental impacts of the research as well as elements relating to human participation and animal research. Applicants do not need to have obtained all licences/clearances at the application stage, but these will need to be in place before an award is made.
Can you clarify what exactly do applicants need to put/demonstrate in their application proposal as far as interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary issues are concerned in their case study?	Within the proposal the applicants should identify the individuals and partners involved in the proposed work and what their individual roles/contributions as well as how this will feed in to the overall objectives of the proposal. In addition, applicants should identify how the interactions between the various partnerships will be managed.
What are some of the strategies that would show interdisciplinary research teams?	We would expect the proposal to demonstrate the involvement of individuals from a range of disciplinary backgrounds, and as a result for the proposed work to be developed collectively and consider different perspectives/approaches. In particular, we are looking for an integrated approach where individuals from different disciplines work together from the beginning rather than silos of disciplinary work which is only integrated at the end.
What would be some of the skills be that I would look for in interdisciplinary research teams?	Some proposals may include individuals with a track record in working on interdisciplinary projects. It is also important that there is a clear plan for how all of the partners will interact and how the project will be managed to make sure that the overall approach is effective and the different disciplines involved can work together easily.
Is there a preferred template or guidance on what would comprise a well-constructed impact pathway for proposed research?	<p>Each proposal must include a Pathways to Impact statement which is specific to the individuals and anticipated outcomes for this project.</p> <p>Applicants are encouraged to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identify and actively engage relevant users of research and stakeholders at appropriate stages</li> <li>• articulate a clear understanding of the context and needs of users and consider ways for the proposed research to meet these needs or impact upon understandings of these needs</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>outline the planning and management of associated activities including timing, personnel, skills, budget, deliverables and feasibility</li> <li>include evidence of any existing engagement with relevant end users.</li> </ul>
6900 characters are quite few for the overall assessment.	It is the maximum word limit in Je-S for the 'Overall assessment' and cannot be changed.
You recommended noting the national or international prominence of the applicants as one of the review criteria. The Unconscious Bias webinar suggested that commenting on the reputation of the group was an implicit bias. Can you please clarify?	As a reviewer you will see the PI's and the Co-I's CVs and these will help you assess whether the applicants have the skills, knowledge, experience, etc. required. So we are asking you to make an objective assessment of this, rather than assess them on their reputation.
How to evaluate the collaboration relationship of each party? Do they have to show established collaboration?	It is not essential for proposals to include established collaborations, and in many cases a mixture of more established and new partnerships will be identified. For both new and established partnerships we ask reviewers to consider whether the partnership seem genuine, whether it is the right partnership to deliver the proposed aspect of the work, and whether the appropriate plans/management are in place to allow the partners to work together effectively.
Is there any prioritisation we should take into account whilst reviewing? For instance, is "interdisciplinarity" more important than "good value for money"?	All assessment criteria for this call are equally important, and as a reviewer you should consider and provide comments about how you think the proposal meets each criteria.
Does such funding require collaborative application with the west or as African researchers? Can an African based researcher apply direct?	For this call the lead applicant must be from an eligible UK based organisation, however we would expect all proposals to have partnerships with researchers in the relevant DAC list countries. These partners should have a significant role in the co-design, intellectual leadership and delivery of the Hub.
Sustainability has been an issue in the past for most projects, as a reviewer what things can one be looking out for to ensure sustainability?	Within the Pathways to Impact statement, applicants should include a description of the steps taken to ensure that partnerships, resources, capacity and capability are sustained and strengthened beyond the lifetime of the award, and the strategy to leverage additional activity, impact and financial/in-kind contributions (including from the private sector).
What is meant with intractable challenges faced by developing countries?	Proposals submitted to this call should identify a difficult and complex challenge which we have struggled to address in the past. They must explain how their proposed Hub will use novel interdisciplinary research approaches and perspectives to delivery progress towards addressing the chosen challenge.

<p>For reviewers with little or no insight into any country specific cost, it makes it difficult to assess financial feasibility. How do you address that?</p>	<p>In many cases it will be very difficult to consider the appropriateness/feasibility of the costs in great detail, however we ask reviewers to consider aspects including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- whether the scale of activity proposed and the overall budget seems justified by the potential impact they propose to deliver</li> <li>- whether the balance of costs between partners seems to be in line with the distribution of the work</li> <li>- Whether the number of staff and resources seems broadly appropriate for the work proposed</li> </ul>
<p>What does governance here entail?</p>	<p>Governance is an important part of research projects of this size and complexity. All applicants have been asked to outline their project management and governance plans and are required to have an executive group and independent advisory group. Further details on the minimum requirements for governance can be found here: <a href="https://www.ukri.org/files/legacy/gcrf-calls/gcrf-hubs-full-stage-organisation-and-governance-guidance-pdf/">https://www.ukri.org/files/legacy/gcrf-calls/gcrf-hubs-full-stage-organisation-and-governance-guidance-pdf/</a></p>
<p>Normally, how do we evaluate the research counterparts from developing countries in terms of their capability?</p>	<p>The eligibility of overseas research partners will be assessed by UKRI, which includes a minimum threshold in terms of research capacity/capability. Beyond this not all organisations need to have the same capability, however for each organisation involved, you should consider whether they have identified individuals with the required skills and experience and that they have access to and/or have requested the resources needed to carry out the work proposed.</p>