

Guidelines

for Reviewing Proposals under the Funding Initiative “Global Minds in DFG Consortia”

Preliminary Note

The review follows the criteria listed in section I, which are derived from the objectives of the funding initiative. A detailed description of these objectives is to be found in the “Global Minds in DFG Consortia” guidelines (DFG form 1.92).

www.dfg.de/formulare/1_92

Please be sure to consider the formal aspects of the review as set out in section II. For details of the structure of the review and the decision-making procedure, see section III. If you have any questions, please contact the person responsible for the review at the DFG Head Office.

I Criteria for the Review

1 Quality of the proposed research project

The following aspects are relevant in assessing the quality and coherence of the research project:

- Scientific quality of the project (esp. topic, objectives, coherence, convincing work programme, advancement of knowledge, innovative approach and, where applicable, prospects of application)
- Feasibility of the research project (scientific objectives, planning and structuring of the work programme and, where applicable, project-specific/thematically relevant preliminary work)
- Integration in and added value for the research programme of the host Collaborative Research Centre/Cluster of Excellence

2 Qualification and motivation of the person for whom the funding is requested

- Expertise relevant to the proposed research project
- Quality of the individual's research work and publications to date, relevance to the research field
- Accomplishments to date and international visibility of the individual's research
- Where appropriate: contribution to the expertise of the host consortium
- Anticipated benefit in terms of the career development of the person for whom the funding is requested

3 Integration in the consortium and support by the host institution/s

- Contribution of the person for whom the funding is requested to structural measures of the host institution (e.g. participation in supporting researchers in early career phases, teaching, research data management, governance structures etc.)
- Integration by the host institution/s – available resources and supportive measures

II Formal Aspects of the Review

1 Confidentiality

All proposals submitted to the DFG, correspondence with reviewers and the reviews themselves are to be treated confidentially. The confidentiality of the third-party content to which you have access as a reviewer precludes disclosure to third parties and utilisation for your own and/or third-party research purposes. This also means that the review itself may only be carried out by the reviewer in person and may not be delegated to third parties. We ask you not to identify yourself as a reviewer to third parties; in the case of written reviews, this includes the applicants themselves. This allows the DFG to release the content and arguments of the reviews to applicants in a completely anonymised and if necessary redacted form.

2 Conflicts of Interest

At each stage of the proposal process, the DFG Head Office examines whether there may be any appearance of bias, favouritism or conflict of interest. However, not all circumstances that might raise doubts about the neutrality of reviewers and members of the responsible decision-making bodies are verifiable by the DFG.

We therefore ask you yourself to verify carefully and at an early stage whether there are any reasons that might give rise to the appearance of bias. For details, see DFG form 10.201.

www.dfg.de/formulare/10_201

Should circumstances exist that may be interpreted as a conflict of interest, please inform the responsible DFG staff before submitting your written vote or participating in a review meeting. If you submit an assessment or participate in a DFG meeting without first having contacted the DFG regarding a possible conflict of interest, the DFG Head Office will assume that, to the best of your knowledge, no apparent conflict of interest exists. If you do not become aware of an apparent conflict of interest until after submitting your written vote or attending a meeting, you should also contact the DFG Head Office immediately.

3 Equity and Diversity

In all of its funding programmes, the DFG actively promotes equity and diversity in the German research system. For this reason, proposal reviews should not disadvantage applicants due to academically irrelevant criteria such as age, gender or disability. Consider the applicant's academic career development rather than their age. You may make allowance for certain non-academic disadvantages in your evaluation. Unavoidable delays in an applicant's academic career (such as longer training periods, publication gaps or less time spent abroad as a result of childcare responsibilities) should be given adequate consideration. For further information on equity and diversity in research, see:

www.dfg.de/diversity/en

4 Obligation to Observe the Principles of Good Research Practice¹

The principles of good research practice must also be observed during the review processes. A violation of these principles can result in a charge of scientific misconduct. Scientific misconduct is defined as the intentional and grossly negligent statement of falsehoods in a scientific context, the violation of intellectual property rights, impeding another person's research work, or breaching the principles set out in the section on confidentiality. The circumstances of each case will be considered on an individual basis. In cases where scientific misconduct has been established, the DFG may impose one or more sanctions in accordance with its Rules of Procedure, depending on the nature and severity of the misconduct. For further information on good research practice, see:

www.dfg.de/good_scientific_practice

¹ The principles of good research practice can be found in detail in the DFG [Code of Conduct – Guidelines for Safeguarding Good Research Practice](#).