



Anonymised Review: Information and author guidelines

ANSTO has agreed to participate in an Australian trial of *anonymised review of research infrastructure access proposals* to aid the removal of structural barriers to the career progression of Women in STEM. The review trial, co-ordinated by the Office of the Australian Government Women in STEM Ambassador, Prof. Lisa Harvey-Smith, seeks to establish whether unconscious bias in the Australian research sector is adversely affecting the success rate of women in science.

While ANSTO's preliminary analysis shows that women are not disadvantaged by ANSTO's review process with success rates slightly higher than male colleagues, the Australian review overall will provide valuable data in relation to the role unconscious bias has in access allocation processes.

ANSTO's Australian Centre for Neutron Scattering will participate in this trial. Neutron beam and combined neutron-deuteration submissions will be subject to the Anonymised Review process. Requests to the National Deuteration Facility for deuteration only will not be subject to anonymised review.

The main difference will be that scientific merit reviewers and the Program Advisory Committee will not have access to applicants' identity, institution, or track record. This also means that the review criteria will not include 'track record' information as part of the scoring or ranking process. The Program Advisory Committee meeting will be observed by a member of the Office of the Women in STEM Ambassador, as part of the study.

The process for scientific scoring of merit access proposals for the Australian Centre for Neutron Scattering remains unchanged whether a neutron beam only or combined neutron and deuteration proposal.

All merit access proposals are also subject to separate technical feasibility and safety reviews. Identifying and track record information will be included at this stage to adequately assess the applicant's technical and safety track record. Identifying information will not be included in the outcome of the technical reviews, which can be referred to by the Program Advisory Committee assessing the ranking of the overall application. Guidelines on how to write a technical review without revealing identifying information will be available to those reviewers.

Final approval of proposals after the scientific ranking process will still be subject to the usual considerations, such as the capacity available for the requested capability.

What this means for applicants

The Australian Centre for Neutron Scattering and National Deuteration Facility 2022-1 round will be opening in August 2021 rather than March as usual to allow time for portal modifications to be made.

Modifications to our user portal will be made to enable the anonymised review to be undertaken. User Guidelines will be available to aid users in the application process. The usual identifying information will be collected but won't be made available to scientific reviewers or program advisory committees.

The recommended two-page PDF experimental section of merit access proposals will need to be written so as not to identify the applicant/s. Guidelines on how to achieve this are available now with examples to come from previous applications to the Australian Centre for Neutron Scattering.

Compliance checks

Submissions in the anonymised review rounds will be subject to a compliance check against the 'Anonymity Guidelines for Principal Investigators (or authors)'. Submissions found not to be compliant will be 'flagged' in the data provided to the study organisers. No changes will be made to any proposals received.



Anonymised Review: Information and author guidelines

Can you opt out?

Partly! All submissions for the 2022-1 and 2022-2 rounds are expected to comply with the Anonymised Review Guidelines, however the Principal Investigator may choose not to provide data associated with their proposal to the study. There will be a section in the portal where you may choose for your data (as listed below) not to be provided to the study.

What data is provided to the study?

No identifying information nor specifics of the experimental plan are provided to the study research team. The study research team receive the following information:

- Unique identifier (anonymised) for applicant
- Applicant's institution
- Requested beamline/instrument allocation
- Program Advisory Committee ranking
- Program Advisory Committee recommendation for access and beamline/instrument allocation
- Final recommendation for access after capacity review by ANSTO
- Approved beamline/instrument allocation



The ANSTO research portal www.portal.ansto.gov.au

Anonymity Guidelines for Principal Investigators (or authors)

Don't "water down" or obscure your science, your methods, or your tools; simply write about your work in the third person, in a way that does not intentionally identify the applicant(s).

These guidelines will help conceal the identities of the applicant and ensure a fairer proposal evaluation process.

- 1. Do not include author names or affiliations anywhere in the experimental text**
This includes but is not limited to, page headers, footers, diagrams, figures, or watermarks.
- 2. When citing references within the proposal use third person neutral wording**
This especially applies to self-referencing. For example, replace phrases like "as we have shown in our previous work (Doe *et al* 2010)" with "as Doe *et al* (2020) showed..."
- 3. Do not refer to previous projects using language that reveals the identity of the applicant(s)**
For instance, rather than write, "we observed another cluster, similar to the one we are proposing under ___program #XXXXX," instead write, "___program #XXXXX has observed this target in the past..."
- 4. Use references to published work including work citable by a DOI, without including information that may reveal the identity of the applicant(s)**
If you cite exclusive access datasets or non-public software that may reveal or strongly imply the investigators on the proposal, use language like, "obtained in private communication or " from private consultation."
- 5. Do not include acknowledgements, or the source of any grant funding in the experimental section of the submission**
- 6. Team expertise and background are provided as supplementary information and should not be made available in the experimental section of the submission.**

Examples of compliant proposals to ensure anonymity will be provided for information.