

IFS Review Guidelines

HOW Log into the IFS Community here:
<https://Intl-foundation-science.force.com/community/s/login/>

If you are new to the IFS Community, sign-up for an account here:
<https://intl-foundation-science.force.com/community/CommunitiesSelfRegCustom>

Click on the MY REVIEWS tab to see a list of your reviews for this session. Detailed instructions on how to submit a review can be found on the IFS Community.

Thank you for considering to support IFS. Reviewers are asked to provide descriptive comments. To assist the reviewer in the analysis of the proposal the form also contains scoring for different aspects of the application. Since we are a capacity-building organisation we ask that reviewers try to give constructive feedback to the applicants and suggestions for contacts that can widen their scientific networks. As part of our goal to empower early-career scientists in low and lower-middle income countries, IFS strives to promote women in science. We want our review process to be fair and inclusive and therefore encourage our reviewers to be mindful of unconscious biases when giving their review.

A research application should only be recommended for support if the applicant is qualified for the work proposed and if the project is scientifically sound, well justified, feasible, and sufficiently detailed and shows scientific progress of the applicant. The proposal must demonstrate knowledge of the subject area, identify knowledge gaps, have clear research objectives and testable hypotheses or research questions, and develop a convincing, doable and appropriately costed research plan and given thought to potential outputs and outcomes. Whenever applicable, projects should comply with any ethical regulations.

IFS awards two types of grants, a Basic Grant, which is a first-time application and a Renewal Grant, which is only available for previous grantees.

When reviewing a **Basic Grant Application**, please consider the following:

- The scientific environment in which the applicant operates
- Has the applicant explained the relevance of the project in relation to the ecological and socio-economic environments at local, national, or regional level?

When reviewing a **Renewal Grant Application**, in addition to the above, please consider the following:

- If the final report and project completion form are included in the additional documents, has the applicant delivered the previous project according to the objectives and given a sufficient explanation if these have not been met?
- If the report is not included, this means that the grantee has already satisfactorily fulfilled their reporting obligations. In this case, we ask that you only to review the application.

When reviewing a **Revised Application** (Basic or Renewal) defined by the ending "REV" in the application reference, please consider the following:

- Has the applicant sufficiently addressed any previous review comments?
- If the applicant has made significant changes the project, please do a full evaluation of the project.

Your identity will be kept anonymous when comments are given to the applicant. These will be either passed on verbatim or may be slightly edited depending on other external reviews and subsequent discussion in the Scientific Advisory Committees (SAC).

We thank you in advance for your kind assistance and look forward to hearing from you.

OUTLINE: THE BASIC GRANT REVIEW FORM

SECTION A: QUALITATIVE REVIEW

- Most important part of your review
- Will be used by SAC to evaluate strengths and weaknesses of proposal
- Applicant receives comments, feedback and suggestions for contacts/training
- Option to provide confidential comments if needed

SECTION B: SCORING

- Tool to assist you in the analysis of the proposal
- May be used by SAC to reach the final recommendation
- Not forwarded to applicant

SECTION C: FINAL RECOMMENDATION

- Your final recommendation to IFS
- You can also declare if you know the applicant or have a conflict of interest
- Will be used by SAC to reach the final recommendation

OUTLINE: THE RENEWAL GRANT REVIEW FORM

REPORT FROM THE PREVIOUS RESEARCH PERIOD

- Comments and scores on the results and publications of the previous project
- Used by SAC to evaluate the quality of the outcomes of the previous project
- SAC may incorporate your comments in the response to the applicant

PROPOSAL FOR NEXT RESEARCH PERIOD

- Comments and scores on the current proposal
- Used by SAC to evaluate strengths and weaknesses of proposal
- SAC may incorporate your comments in the response to the applicant

YOUR RECOMMENDATION TO IFS

- Your final recommendation to IFS
- Will be used by SAC to reach the final recommendation