Peer Review Form: \*YYYY\* Research Awards

INSERT PROJECT LABEL

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reviewer |  |
| Institution |  |
| Response due date |  |

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR REVIEWERS**

1. Please complete Section A – Peer review
2. Please read Section B - Declaration of interests in review of applications for research funding
3. Please complete Section C – Declaration of interests

## SECTION A – PEER REVIEW

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Quality** | Please comment on the degree of excellence of the proposal making reference to:  • Novelty, and timeliness  • Ambition  • Appropriateness and rigour of the proposed methodology |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Impact** | Please comment on the potential impact of this research, specifically   * Does the project address an important problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field? * If successful, will it bring about a significant advance in knowledge or approach? |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Value for Money** | Please comment on whether the proposed costs are justified. |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Applicant** | Please comment on the applicants’ ability to deliver the proposed project making reference to:  • Appropriateness of the track record of the applicant(s)  • Balance of skills of the project team, including academic  partners. |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Leadership Potential** | Given the applicant’s current career stage, please comment on the potential (and the expected timescale) for them becoming a research leader |
|  | |

### **Overall Assessment**

My judgement is that this proposal is (tick as appropriate):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Poor |  |
| 2. Fair |  |
| 3. Good |  |
| 4. Strong |  |
| 5. Very strong |  |

Reviewer’s Signature:…………………………………..

Date of Review:…………………………………………

## SECTION B

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS IN REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH FUNDING

1. **Scope**

This policy applies to:

* Members of the TSA’s Research Committee (RESCOM), both scientific and lay members
* External peer reviewers of applications for research funding
* Any external advisors on research matters

Its principles and requirements should be observed by all involved in decision-making on behalf of the TSA.

1. **General principles**

A conflict of interest is any situation in which the personal interests of an individual volunteer or staff, or the loyalty which they owe to another organisation or person, could influence, or appear to influence, a decision they make. This might include:

* Pecuniary (or financial interests) such as shares, employment, substantial gifts of monetary value or other payments to an individual or close relative (such as a spouse) from a relevant company or individual relevant to the TSA’s business
* Non-pecuniary (non-financial interests) relating to loyalties or relationships between an individual or close relative (such as a spouse) with a relevant institution or individual relevant to the TSA’s business
* Academic collaborations or appointments (renumerated or otherwise) that involve the applicant, their department / institution.

It is inevitable that conflicts or potential conflicts of interest will occur from time to time. Even the appearance of an unmanaged conflict of interest can damage an organisation's reputation. It is therefore important that conflicts of interest are managed effectively in order to ensure that all affected by TS can have confidence that the TSA seeks to work in their best interests at all times.

The TSA recognises the following standards to be observed at all times. These standards are based on the seven principles of public life (the ‘Nolan principles’):

**Selflessness**   
Individuals should act in terms of the interest of people affected by TS. They should not do so in order to gain financial or other benefits for themselves, their family or their friends.

**Integrity**   
Individuals should not place themselves under any financial or other obligation to outside individuals or organisations that might seek to influence them in the performance of their role.

**Objectivity**   
In carrying out their roles for the TSA, including making appointments, awarding contracts, or recommending individuals for rewards and benefits, individuals should make choices on merit.

**Accountability**   
Individuals are accountable for their decisions and actions to the Board and, ultimately, to the membership of the TSA, and must submit themselves to whatever scrutiny is appropriate to their office or role.

**Openness**   
Individuals should be as open as possible about all the decisions and actions that they take. They should give reasons for their decisions and restrict information only when other specific interests, such as commercial sensitivity or personal confidentiality, clearly demands.

**Honesty**   
Individuals have a duty to declare any private interests relating to their role and to take steps to resolve any conflicts arising in a way that protects the interest of those affected by TS and the TSA.

**Leadership**   
Individuals should promote and support these principles by leadership and example.

## Managing conflicts of interest – on research matters

**3.1 Declarations**

The TSA will maintain a central register of interests, and this register will be publicly available**.** Members of RESCOM are required to declare their interests and should complete and submit a Declaration of Interests form annually (by 1 January) and amending it at any time when changes occur.

Peer reviewers should submit a compelted form alongside their review.

### 3.2 Consideration of Research Awards – Committee members

Members of our RESCOM will be required to declare interests at the beginning of relevant meetings as well as submitting an annual declaration of interest.

Where grants awards are being awarded, members will not be able to deliberate on a whole grant round if there is an award is being considered from their own employing institution, or in associated with an applicant who is a spouse or close relative.

An ongoing working academic relationship with an applicant is not a barrier to being involved in the process as long as this is declared and considered at the beginning of the process of grant consideration.

### 3.3 Consideration of Research Awards - Peer review

In assigning external peer reviewers for assessment of applications, TSA staff and members of RESCOM will make all efforts to avoid conflict of interests.

Reviewers will not be assigned applications from their own employing institution, and careful consideration will be given when an application from the reviewer’s institution has been submitted as part of the wider award round.

Applicants themselves will not be peer reviewers for any other applications during a grant round to which they have made a submission.

Once having completed a declaration form; when a potential conflict is viewed as significant (by the reviewer themselves, TSA staff or in consultation with the Chair of RESCOM), the peer reviewer will be removed from the review of an individual application or the whole review process.

1. **Declaring gifts**

Any trustee, volunteer or member of staff receiving a gift valued at more than £25 as a result of their position or role at the TSA, is required to declare it as soon as possible. If the acceptance of any gift might give rise to criticism or concern about a conflict of interest, it should be politely declined. For all gifts over £25, the Chief Executive will decide whether the trustee, volunteer or member of staff can retain the gift.

## SECTION C

### **Declaration of Interests**

I declare that I have read and understood the Tuberous Sclerosis Association policy ‘***Declaration of Interests in review of applications for research funding’.*** I hereby declare the following interests according to the TSA’s policy:

|  |
| --- |
| **Personal pecuniary interest** |
| Description (if you have no interests in this category, state ‘None’) |
|  |
| **Personal family interest** |
| Description (if you have no interests in this category, state ‘None’) |
|  |
| **Non-personal pecuniary interest** |
| Description (if you have no interests in this category, state ‘None’) |
|  |
| **Personal non-pecuniary interest** |
| Description (If you have no interests in this category, state ‘None’) |
|  |
| **Additional question for external peer reviewers:**  Please detail any relationship to the applicant, their department or their institution that you feel is pertinent to the review such as appointments, working relationships, academic collaborations, frequent joint publications, direct academic competition or disputes. |
| Description (If you have no interests in this category, state ‘None’) |
|  |

Signature:………………… …………………………………………….

Name (*please print*):…………………………………………………….

Date:………………………