****

**SCIENCE COUNCIL**

## Guidelines for review and reviewers

The review process will independently evaluate two aspects of the proposal:

### Technical Review

Technical aspects will be considered through a technical evaluation which will assess the feasibility of the proposed work: e.g., availability of resources such as software packages and libraries, adequacy of the proposed approach for the target architecture, characteristics of typical jobs (maximum run-time, number of CPUs for parallel jobs, memory requirements, etc.) to assist ICHEC staff in determining optimal scheduling policies. Possible conflicts with the ICHEC's scheduling policies will also be highlighted in this document (e.g., users wishing to run 4 core jobs for 3 or 4 weeks). Technical evaluations will be undertaken by a support scientist selected from ICHEC staff.

Applications that fail the Technical Review will be discussed with the researcher to see if the application can be successfully modified. If not, the application will be rejected.

### Scientific Review

The scientific value of the proposed work will be undertaken through a peer review process managed by ICHEC's Science Council, except where computational resources are sought as part of a project which has already been peer-reviewed by a third-party science funding agency. In the latter case, the Science Council will normally accept the agency's scientific assessment and the proposal will be assessed only on its technical merits. In all other cases, the Science Council alone will decide whether to accept or reject an application, as well as make recommendations to ICHEC's Manager of Operations for the level of resources to be allocated to successful applications.

Applications for each classification are subject to different levels of review in accordance with the processing power requested for the application. Reviewers are selected from among the members of the Science Council by the Chairperson according to disciplinary experience, except for Class A as noted below. In detail:

* Class A applications will be reviewed by two reviewers, at least one of whom must be based outside of the Republic of Ireland.
* Class B applications will be reviewed by two reviewers.
* Class C are exempt from Scientific peer review.

Scientific evaluations will be carried out with a different level of scrutiny depending on the class of applications.

* Applications for Class C access will have minimum scientific requirements, for which a half-page overview of the research undertaken will be adequate.
* The scientific case for Class B applications will require a more detailed description of the research, and must satisfy the reviewers that the work described is of sufficient quality to be published in a refereed publication.
* Finally, Class A applications must include a strong and detailed case for funding clearly establishing the High Impact nature of the problem under investigation. Such applications are expected to lead to high impact publications, and as such must be supported by a strong scientific case.

Class A and B applications will be independently reviewed by two reviewers, at least one of whom must based outside of the Republic of Ireland in the case of Class A applications.

Reviewers will assess the proposal according to the structure specified to applicants (below) and comment on the quality, strengths or shortcomings of each aspect of the proposal. An overall mark should be assigned on the following scale:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 9-10 | outstanding in all respects and likely to lead to very high-impact publications |
| 7-8 | excellent project, likely to lead to publications in leading journals |
| 6 | very good, well-balanced application, likely to lead to international peer-reviewed publications |
| 5 | good - a reasonable application which may lead to publication and/or conference proceedings |
| 4 | application requires substantial further development |
| 2-3 | very poorly written or with little scientific merit; should not be funded |

The procedure for assessing applications is as follows:

The Chairman allocates each reviewer c. 3 proposals and the reviewer then agrees:

1. to review the proposal and to acknowledge that it is in their field of competence
2. to confirm that they do not have a conflict of interest
3. not to discuss the application with a third party
4. to deliver the review on time

Reviewers have access to PDF files of the applications and a history of the PI’s use of ICHEC resources, are provided at initial request for review. The review process involves providng detailed comments on the overall merit of the application under the following headings:

1. Scientific Merit
2. Reasonable demand of resources
3. PI/ applicant track record
4. Presentation of project plan

The review process should produce a mark out of 10. Successful Class A applications should score of at least 8/10 for both reviews to get funded, according to the international norms (INTAS) that ICHEC subscribes to, and successful Class B applications should score at least 6/10 for both reviews.

All deliberations of the Science Council are strictly confidential in order to ensure that applicants have the confidence to present a comprehensive description of their project.