



## Project information

<b>Project full title</b>	Research Infrastructure Access in Nanoscience & Nanotechnology
<b>Project acronym</b>	RIANA
<b>Grant agreement no.</b>	101130652
<b>Instrument</b>	Research and Innovation Action (RIA)
<b>Duration</b>	01/03/2024 – 29/02/2028
<b>Website</b>	<a href="http://riana-project.eu">riana-project.eu</a>

## Deliverable information

<b>Deliverable no.</b>	D3.1
<b>Deliverable title</b>	Reviewer Guidelines
<b>Deliverable responsible</b>	ULUND
<b>Related Work-Package/Task</b>	WP3/Task 3.1
<b>Type (e.g. Report; other)</b>	R - Document, report
<b>Author(s)</b>	Marketa Sjögren, Doriana Orbanic, Tom Minniberger, Michael Stuckelberger
<b>Author(s) affiliation</b>	ULUND, DESY
<b>Dissemination level</b>	Public
<b>Document Version</b>	1
<b>Date</b>	05.08.2024
<b>Download page</b>	/

## Document information

<b>Version no.</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Comment</b>
0.1	27.05.2024	Marketa Sjögren, Doriana Orbanic	Draft document
0.2	29.05.2024	Michael Stuckelberger	First revision
0.3	30.05.2024	Marketa Sjögren, Doriana Orbanic	Second revision
0.4	09.06.2024	Michael Stuckelberger	Third revision
0.5	05.08.2024	Michael Stuckelberger, Tom Minniberger	Finalization





## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>Introduction</b>	3
<b>Role of PRP Chairs</b>	3
<b>Role of Reviewers</b>	4
<b>Appeals</b>	4
<b>Help</b>	4
<b>Review Form</b>	5



## RIANA – GUIDE FOR THE PROPOSAL REVIEW PANEL

### Introduction

---

RIANA will provide researchers with access to instrumentation and expertise from across 69 infrastructures in Europe, with the aim of promoting excellence in nanoscience and nanotechnology. The selection of proposals is based on a thorough scientific review and moderation process that is defined by these guidelines.

Access is subject to the assessment of a scientific proposal by an independent proposal review panel (PRP) and availability of measurement time at the selected host infrastructures. The PRP consists of a pool of more than 100 Reviewers who are mostly members of review panels at infrastructures already and have been nominated for their expertise in specific techniques and areas of nanoscience and nanotechnology. The panel is chaired by three external members who supervise the evaluation procedures and the cooperation with the Reviewers: the Chair of the panel and two Co-Chairs.

### Role of PRP Chairs

---

The Chairs of the PRP act as review moderators. They will check that the proposal is compliant with the eligibility criteria for nanoscience and nanotechnology and reject the non-eligible applications prior to the technical feasibility check.

Thresholds for acceptance will be defined on central project level and reviewed periodically to keep high scientific excellence standards and adapt to availability of offered tools. The PRP Chairs will coordinate the activities and discussions of the panel.

The PRP Chairs will meet in person or online as appropriate at least twice per year to identify and solve difficulties which may arise in relation to submissions, scores and distribution across infrastructures.

The final decision on acceptance or rejection of a given project will be taken by the PRP Chairs, taking into account the scores and recommendations of the Reviewers and the availability of the requested instruments. The global threshold for acceptance will be set by the RIANA Executive Board.

A decision by the PRP Chairs on the acceptance of a proposal is without prejudice to the right of the chosen infrastructures to decline access on reasonable grounds (including conflict of interest, capacity limitations, financial limitations). All infrastructures have a local right of veto for access.

PRP Chairs must not disclose or otherwise exploit confidential information for any purpose.

## Role of Reviewers

---

Reviewers are invited to review proposals that fall within their category of expertise by the PRP Chairs. All proposals will be reviewed by at least three different Reviewers. Not more than 6 proposals are expected to be reviewed per Reviewer and year. The RIANA project runs on a continuously open call system, allowing submission of proposals at any time. The subsequent review will also be managed in a continuous manner.

Reviewers are expected to contribute to the evaluation process of submitted proposals by delivering concise reviews using the online Review Form available in the ARIA portal <https://apply.riana-project.eu/>

Reviewers should evaluate the full proposal consisting of the 3-page Project Description and an online Proposal Form. Information on team members of the proposal is available but not to be considered in the evaluation.

Evaluation of the projects will be single blinded to ensure the confidentiality of the evaluation process. If a Reviewer has a conflict of interest reviewing a proposal, it should be declared to the RIANA PRP Chair at the earliest convenience ([prp-chair@riana-project.eu](mailto:prp-chair@riana-project.eu)).

Reviewers are asked to express their opinions on the project through the Review Form by (a) giving concise comments to the Proposers, (b) scoring specific aspects of the proposals, and (c) recommending acceptance or rejection of the proposal. The comments and average score from all reviewers will be anonymously communicated to the Main Applicant with the final decision of the PRP Chairs.

Matching the categories in the Project Description of proposals, there are 4 scores (Q1 – Q4) to be given using scales of 0 – 10 for Q1 and Q2, and 0 – 5 for Q3 and Q4, where 10 and 5 are the best scores. Each reviewer should target an average and median score of half the maximum, and a standard deviation of a quarter of the maximum (i.e., 5+/-2.5 for Q1 and Q2, and 2.5+/-1.25 for categories Q3 and Q4).

Reviews should be submitted online within 1 – 2 weeks of receiving the request.

Reviewers are bound to respect the confidentiality of information provided in a proposal received through RIANA and must not disclose or otherwise exploit confidential information for any purpose.

## Appeals

---

If the Main Applicant wishes to appeal the decision of the PRP Chairs, they must contact the Chair directly and explain the reasons for appeal. The Chair will decide whether the decision can be revised without referral back to the panel or the Reviewers, or whether it requires further discussion. The Chair will keep the Main Applicant informed of the process and outcome of the appeal.

## Help

---

PRP Chairs and Reviewers may contact the portal Administrator at [admin@riana-project.eu](mailto:admin@riana-project.eu) for technical help with the online review process. For all other queries, the Administrator will forward to the appropriate contact person within RIANA.

PRP Chairs and Reviewers may wish to take advice from the requested infrastructures about the technical feasibility of the work proposed. This can be done (bearing in mind issues of confidentiality of the proposed work) through the Administrator.

## Review Form

**Q1 SCIENTIFIC / TECHNOLOGICAL EXCELLENCE:** Is the proposed work considered scientifically and/or technologically excellent? Depending on whether the proposal addresses rather fundamental or applied research and development, Q1 refers to scientific or technological excellence, e.g. the expected increase of the Technology Readiness Level (TRL).

Score: \_\_\_\_\_ 0 – 10

*0-1 = Not competitive, 2-3 = Satisfactory, 4-5 = Average, 6-7 = Good, 8-9 = Very good, 10 = Excellent*

**Q2 METHODS:** To what extent are the proposed methods and chosen techniques suitable to achieve the goals? Is the experiment design sound? If there are not enough details provided in the proposal to properly evaluate the methodological approach and technical feasibility, the score should be low.

Score: \_\_\_\_\_ 0 – 10

*0-1 = Not competitive, 2-3 = Satisfactory, 4-5 = Average, 6-7 = Good, 8-9 = Very good, 10 = Excellent*

**Q3 IMPACT:** How large is the expected impact of the proposed work? Depending on whether the proposal addresses rather fundamental or applied research and development, Q3 refers either to impact on societal challenges or safety for environment, or to economic impact.

Score: \_\_\_\_\_ 0 – 5

*0 = Not Competitive, 1 = Satisfactory, 2 = Average, 3 = Good, 4 = Very good, 5 = Excellent*

**Q4 LEVEL OF CROSSDISCIPLINARITY:** To what extent does the project exploit crossdisciplinary approaches? Are the proposed techniques complementary? Does each of them add value to the project? Proposers seeking access to techniques offered by the same network should receive a poor score.

Score: \_\_\_\_\_ 0 – 5

*0 = Not Competitive, 1 = Satisfactory, 2 = Average, 3 = Good, 4 = Very good, 5 = Excellent*

**C1 SHARED COMMENTS:** Reviewers should provide argumentation for the scores given and comment on the overall evaluation of the proposal. This will be shared with the proposal team.

*Shared comments are mandatory.*

**C2 CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS:** Reviewers are welcome to share additional information that could be helpful for the Chairs of the Proposal Review Panel. Any information given here is confidential and will not be shared with the proposal team.

*Confidential comments are optional.*

**R Recommendation:**  Accept  
 Reject

*“Accept” means the Reviewer recommends the proposal to be granted transnational access (TA).  
“Reject” means the Reviewer does not recommend the proposal to be granted TA access.*