# Checklist for Reviewers

Referring to this check list as you prepare a review will help you to produce comments which are both fully informative for ESRC Introducers and useful for applicants.

When preparing for the review ensure that you consider:

- Do you have the time available to complete the review?
- Do you have any conflict of interest as a reviewer with the proposal?
- Have you read the entire proposal thoroughly?
- Are you familiar with and do you accept the ESRC's Code of Practice for reviewers?
- Have you made yourself familiar with the call specification documents?
- Are you familiar with the range of scores and assessment criteria?
- Are you unclear about anything? (If so, please contact the appropriate person at ESRC)

Remember to:

- Base your review on the quality of the social science on its own terms, accordingly to the case made by the applicants.
- Review the ideas, concepts and approaches of the research not the specific form of the document itself. Elegance of presentation is not in itself an assessment criterion for an ESRC grant. The clarity of presentation may help or hinder your ability to review a proposal, so a comment to this effect would be appropriate.
- Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal and where possible provide a clear view on which should be accorded the greater significance and why. Raise issues or concerns with the proposal in the form of explicit questions for the applicants. This assists the panel to assess how complete and convincing the principal investigators response is.
- Provide clear evidence of your own expertise in the subject area and state if you are unsure about something.
- Make a reasoned judgement against each assessment criteria, based on the evidence provided (or lack of it) or your wider expertise in the area.

Writing the review:

- Are the comments provided informative and objective?
- Are the scores provided against each assessment criterion consistent with your comments?
- Are the overall scores provided consistent with your overall view of the proposal?
- Is the language in the feedback to the applicant clear and jargon-free?

- Can the issues identified be realistically addressed by the principal investigators response to the reviewer feedback?

Finally, when completing the review, please check:

- Have you completed all components of the review and noted where you feel you have the relevant expertise to comment?
- Have you avoided making any statements in the feedback which might disclose your identity?
- Are the comments provided informative, objective and written in a way that allows them to be fed back to the applicants?